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Summary

S.1 Introduction and Overview of the Project Area

The Glendale Boulevard-Hyperion Avenue Viaduct Complex (viaduct complex) is located between Atwater Village to the north and Silver Lake and Los Feliz to the south, in the City of Los Angeles. Figure 1-1 shows the overall project vicinity. The viaduct complex, completed in 1929, spans approximately 1,190 feet over the Los Angeles River, Interstate 5 (I-5), and Riverside Drive. Figure 1-2 shows the project location and depicts the viaduct complex and the immediate area.

The viaduct complex consists of the following structures:

- Waverly Drive Bridge (Bridge Number 53C-1179)
- Hyperion Avenue Viaduct, over Riverside Drive (53C-1882)
- Hyperion Avenue Viaduct, over I-5 (53-1069)
- Hyperion Avenue Viaduct, over the Los Angeles River (53C-1881)
- Southbound Glendale Boulevard Bridge, over the Los Angeles River (53C-1883)
- Northbound Glendale Boulevard Bridge, over the Los Angeles River (53C-1884)

The viaduct complex is generally aligned along a southwest-northeast axis and is bounded by Ettrick Street on the south and Glenfeliz Boulevard on the north. The width of the existing roadway on Glendale Boulevard is approximately 34 feet in each direction. The width of the existing roadway on Hyperion Avenue is 54 feet total in both directions.

S.2 Purpose and Need

The purpose of the proposed project is to:

- Reduce vulnerability of the Glendale Boulevard-Hyperion Avenue viaduct complex in major earthquake events
- Resolve design deficiencies of the Glendale Boulevard-Hyperion Avenue viaduct complex
- Improve traffic safety and traffic circulation to increase the operational efficiency of the viaduct complex

With the exception of the Waverly Drive Bridge, each of the bridge structures of the viaduct complex requires seismic retrofitting to meet current design standards of the City of Los Angeles (“City”) and State of California. The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Sufficiency Rating (SR) of the existing viaduct complex was determined to be “functionally obsolete.” The project would reduce the current risk to public safety due to inadequate design characteristics of the Complex and the potential for catastrophic damage resulting
from the recently revised Maximum Credible Earthquake (MCE) design criteria. In addition, existing geometric configurations of the several complex components do not meet current design standards for operational safety. There are also nearby circulation issues that detract from the operational efficiency of the viaduct complex, and would need the reconfiguration of the northbound I-5 off-ramp to Glendale Boulevard.

S.3 Proposed Action

The City, in conjunction with the Department of Transportation (“Caltrans”) and FHWA, is proposing to modify the existing viaduct complex to correct existing safety and operational deficiencies, address pedestrian safety issues, meet current seismic performance standards, and to restore original design details to the railings. Specifically, the proposed project would accomplish the following:

- Seismically strengthen vulnerable viaduct complex structures.
- Improve the Hyperion Avenue viaduct roadway by adding a center median barrier to physically separate northbound and southbound traffic, consolidate the existing two sidewalks into a single sidewalk along the west side of the complex, add a pedestrian crosswalk across southbound Glendale Boulevard at the northern end of the bridge, and restrripe the travel lanes to provide new lane widths (12-foot inner and 14-foot-wide curb lane).
- Widen the northbound and southbound Glendale Boulevard bridges over the Los Angeles River by approximately eight feet.
- Replace the existing deteriorated covered railings along both Glendale Boulevard bridges, along Hyperion Avenue, and along the Waverly Bridge with replica balustrades based on the original railing design.
- Realign the existing I-5 northbound off-ramp to northbound Glendale Boulevard to connect with Glendale Boulevard south of the current exit to allow left hand turns onto southbound Glendale Boulevard and signalize the new intersection.
- Add an access ramp from northbound Glendale Boulevard to the bike path along the Los Angeles River with an adjacent mini green space.
- Install a detention/infiltration basin utilizing the construction staging area between the I-5 and the Los Angeles River northwest of the viaduct as a permanent water quality–best management practice (BMP) for the purpose of permanent treatment of storm water runoff from a portion of the viaduct complex.
- As a mitigation measure to address pedestrian traffic and community impacts, construct an alternate pedestrian crossing over the Los Angeles River across the existing Red Car piers (downstream of the viaduct complex) to connect the bike path along the southwest side of the Los Angeles River with Glendale Boulevard on the northeast side of the River.
Design Options

In response to public comments received during the review period, the project has been revised to add bicycle lanes\(^1\) to the roadway of the Hyperion Avenue Viaduct (comprising three structures: Caltrans bridge numbers 53C-1882, 53-1069, and 53C-1881) as a design option. The bike lanes would be created by means of striping and symbols painted on the paved roadway. The addition of bicycle lanes will not involve any change to any of the historic features of the viaduct nor affect those features in any way. The viaduct (aka “bridge”) will not be widened. The approaches will not be widened. The space for the bike lanes will be accommodated by adjusting the width (or possibly the number) of the traffic lanes and/or adjusting the width of the median of the roadway. The environmental assessment (Sec. 1.3) describes the proposed roadway of the viaduct as having two 12-foot lanes, two 14-foot lanes, a 7-foot median and a 7-8-foot sidewalk along most of the viaduct length, all narrowing under the Waverly Drive Bridge (Caltrans bridge number 53C-1179). For the design option, various configurations are being considered; no decision has been made on which configuration to adopt. One preliminary, possible configuration could include 5-foot bike lanes, 11-foot traffic lanes, a 5-foot sidewalk and a 4-foot median for most of the bridge length, all narrowing under the Waverly Drive Bridge. Appendix K shows three possible configurations under consideration; other configurations may also be considered.

While the exact configuration has not yet been decided (the City is collaborating with a citizens’ advisory committee to develop the final configuration), the City has committed to including the bike lanes without any widening of the viaduct or changes to the design of the new barriers (aka “bridge railings”). No change to any historic features would be required under any configuration. The inclusion of bike lanes will not affect the ability of Caltrans to comply with any of the stipulations agreed to by Caltrans and the SHPO in the executed memorandum of agreement (MOA), prepared in compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, for this project.

The addition of bike lanes will not require widening or other structural changes to the viaduct or the approaches. The addition of the bike lanes will not require additional safety features that could affect the historic integrity or significance of the viaduct or the stipulations of the MOA.

The Proposed Action with design options including bicycle lanes is the preferred alternative.

---

\(^1\) Bicycle facilities are defined in the City’s 2010 Bicycle Plan, a component of the Transportation Element of the General Plan. A “bicycle lane” (aka “bike lane”) is defined as “a striped lane for one-way bicycle travel on a street or highway.” Caltrans refers to this facility as a “Class II bikeway.” Striping, other pavement markings, and signage on City bike lanes follow the Caltrans Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices.
S.4 Project Alternatives

Seven project alternatives were considered during the project development phase. Section 1.3 in Chapter 1 provides a detailed description of the project alternatives. These alternatives were developed and screened based on the capacity to meet the project purpose and need, the extent of environmental impacts and community disruptions associated with each, and comparative cost effectiveness.

S.4.1 No Build Alternative

Under a No Build Alternative, no improvements to the viaduct complex would be undertaken, including seismic retrofit/rehabilitation. Existing roadway, pedestrian, and rail deficiencies would remain along the viaduct complex as would its existing seismic vulnerability.

The No Build Alternative would not meet the project’s purpose and need.

S.5 Joint CEQA/NEPA Document

California participated in the “Surface Transportation Project Delivery Pilot Program” (Pilot Program) pursuant to 23 USC 327, for more than five years, beginning July 1, 2007 and ending September 30, 2012. MAP-21 (P.L. 112-141), signed by President Obama on July 6th amended 23 USC 327 to establish a revised and permanent Surface Transportation Project Delivery Program. As a result, Caltrans entered into a memorandum of understanding pursuant to 23 USC 327 (NEPA Assignment MOU) with FHWA. The NEPA Assignment MOU became effective October 1, 2012 and terminates eighteen months from the effective date of FHWA regulations developed to clarify amendments to 23 USC 327 or on January 1, 2017. The NEPA Assignment MOU incorporates by reference the terms and conditions of the Pilot Program MOU. In summary, Caltrans continues to assume FHWA responsibilities under NEPA and other federal environmental laws in the same manner as was assigned under the Pilot Program, with minor changes. With NEPA Assignment, FHWA assigned and Caltrans assumed all of the United States Department of Transportation (USDOT) Secretary's responsibilities under NEPA. This assignment includes projects on the State Highway System and Local Assistance Projects off of the State Highway System within the State of California, except for certain categorical exclusions that FHWA assigned to Caltrans under the 23 USC 326 CE Assignment MOU, projects excluded by definition, and specific project exclusions.

The City, as the CEQA lead agency, proposed to adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) based on the information in this joint environmental document. Further information specific to the CEQA analysis is contained in Chapter 3 and Appendix A.

Following receipt of public comments on this Initial Study/Environmental Assessment, the lead agencies considered the comments and took actions regarding the environmental document and the project. Before making a decision on approval of the project, the City determined whether to adopt a MND or require preparation of an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) under CEQA, and Caltrans decided whether to issue a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) or require preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) under NEPA.
S.6 Summary of Environmental Impacts

Environmental impacts resulting from the proposed project, Build Alternative 1, and the No Build Alternative, as analyzed in Chapter 2, are summarized in Table S-2 at the end of this chapter. CEQA Guidelines (Section 15126.2) require the disclosure of significant environmental effects that cannot be avoided if a project is implemented.

S.7 Permits and Approvals Needed

The proposed project would require permits, approvals, or coordination with various agencies, as summarized in Table S-1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table S-1: List of Agency Approvals and Permits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Department of Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Department of Fish and Wildlife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board (LARWQCB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Army Corps of Engineers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Historic Preservation Officer/Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (SHPO/ACHP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of Los Angeles, Department of Public Works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Los Angeles, Department of Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Los Angeles, Bureau of Sanitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Los Angeles, Board of Public Works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Los Angeles, Police Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Los Angeles, Department of Water and Power</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table S-2. Summary of Environmental Effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource Areas and Alternatives</th>
<th>Environmental Impacts</th>
<th>Impact Determination (CEQA/NEPA)</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures (CEQA) Minimization Measures (NEPA)</th>
<th>Impact after Minimization or Mitigation (CEQA/NEPA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Use and Planning</strong></td>
<td><strong>Temporary Impacts</strong></td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant</td>
<td>None Required</td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Access to local streets would be maintained during construction and residential and commercial land uses would not be adversely affected.</td>
<td>NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
<td></td>
<td>NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A minor amount of construction would occur on a narrow sliver of landscaped median along northbound Glendale Boulevard and the majority of the landscaped median would remain unaffected during construction.</td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant</td>
<td>None Required</td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>During the seismic upgrades, the abutment strengthening would occur from the area beneath the viaduct complex, which would require the temporary suspension of the revocable permit to two businesses. The City would have full control of the areas prior to construction.</td>
<td>NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
<td>None Required</td>
<td>NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Permanent Impacts</strong></td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant</td>
<td>None Required</td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant</td>
<td>NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
<td>None Required</td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant</td>
<td>NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The widening of the Glendale Boulevard bridges over the Los Angeles River would occur within the public right-of-way and would not affect the land use designations for the surrounding area.</td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant</td>
<td>None Required</td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The widening of the northbound Glendale Boulevard Bridge would require tapering of the new bridge width to the current roadway width just north of the bridge. This would utilize a small portion of landscaped median in the Glendale Boulevard right-of-way. No new right-of-way would be required and no trees would be removed.</td>
<td>NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
<td>None Required</td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant</td>
<td>None Required</td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant</td>
<td>NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
<td>None Required</td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant</td>
<td>NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Use and Planning</strong></td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant</td>
<td>None Required</td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant</td>
<td>NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table S-2. Summary of Environmental Effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource Areas and Alternatives</th>
<th>Environmental Impacts</th>
<th>Impact Determination (CEQA/NEPA)</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures (CEQA) Minimization Measures (NEPA)</th>
<th>Impact after Minimization or Mitigation (CEQA/NEPA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed Project</strong></td>
<td><strong>Permanent Impacts</strong></td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
<td>None Required</td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Because the proposed project would occur within existing right-of-way, it would not result in changes to adjacent land uses. The proposed project represents improvements to the existing viaduct complex and would not physically divide an established community or conflict with any land use plan, redevelopment plan, policy, or regulation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No Build Alternative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Temporary Impacts</strong></td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
<td>None Required</td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The No Build Alternative would not result in land use impacts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Permanent Impacts</strong></td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
<td>None Required</td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The No Build Alternative would not result in land use impacts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Use and Planning— Parks and Recreational Facilities</strong></td>
<td><strong>Proposed Project</strong></td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
<td>None Required</td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Temporary &amp; Permanent Impacts</strong></td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
<td>None Required</td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The project would not require the use of any parks and recreational facilities. The project would not result in a change in existing land use, and does not have the potential to affect Griffith Park. The project would not conflict with any regional and local community plans/programs, and would conform to existing land uses.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No Build Alternative</strong></td>
<td><strong>The No Build Alternative would not result in impacts to parks and recreational facilities</strong></td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
<td>None Required</td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Impacts – Community Character and Cohesion</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Areas and Alternatives</td>
<td>Environmental Impacts</td>
<td>Impact Determination (CEQA/NEPA)</td>
<td>Mitigation Measures (CEQA) Minimization Measures (NEPA)</td>
<td>Impact after Minimization or Mitigation (CEQA/NEPA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Project</td>
<td><strong>Temporary Impacts</strong></td>
<td>Construction of the proposed project would require traffic and parking restrictions, but would not substantially affect community character or cohesion because land uses and land use patterns would not be affected.</td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
<td>None Required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>During construction, vehicular and bicycle access would be maintained along all roadways, and cohesion between the Silver Lake and Atwater Village neighborhoods would not be substantially affected.</td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
<td>None Required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Construction of viaduct complex improvements would have traffic lane restrictions, but such effects would not diminish the historic nature of the bridge or affect community cohesion or character.</td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
<td>None Required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Construction along northbound and southbound Glendale Boulevard Bridges over the Los Angeles River would prohibit pedestrian access across the bridges</td>
<td>CEQA- Significant NEPA- Adverse</td>
<td>Implement T-2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Community Impacts – Community Character and Cohesion**
### Table S-2. Summary of Environmental Effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource Areas and Alternatives</th>
<th>Environmental Impacts</th>
<th>Impact Determination (CEQA/NEPA)</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures (CEQA) Minimization Measures (NEPA)</th>
<th>Impact after Minimization or Mitigation (CEQA/NEPA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Project</td>
<td>Permanent Impacts&lt;br&gt;Over the long-term, the seismic improvements would result in the continued cohesion of the Silver Lake and Atwater Village neighborhoods through the maintenance of vehicular and pedestrian access between the two neighborhoods.&lt;br&gt;The reconfiguration of the existing I-5 off-ramp would allow motorists exiting this off-ramp the option of turning left on Glendale Boulevard (southbound) rather than having to make a U-turn at Glenfeliz Boulevard to then travel south on Glendale Boulevard. The option would slightly reduce total vehicle miles traveled and reduce weaving from merging northbound traffic from Hyperion Avenue and Glendale Boulevard.&lt;br&gt;The proposed project would improve pedestrian safety along the viaduct complex, which would improve community cohesion and character.&lt;br&gt;The proposed project would increase access to the Los Angeles River bike path through the provision of a new access path from northbound Glendale Boulevard, which would improve community cohesion or character through increased community access to commuter resources.&lt;br&gt;The proposed project would provide replica railings based on the original balustrade design, which would improve community character through the provision of more accurate sense of the historic bridge’s details.</td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant&lt;br&gt;NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
<td>None Required</td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant&lt;br&gt;NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant&lt;br&gt;NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
<td>None Required</td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant&lt;br&gt;NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant&lt;br&gt;NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
<td>None Required</td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant&lt;br&gt;NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant&lt;br&gt;NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
<td>None Required</td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant&lt;br&gt;NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant&lt;br&gt;NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
<td>None Required</td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant&lt;br&gt;NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Community Impacts – Community Character and Cohesion**
### Table S-2. Summary of Environmental Effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource Areas and Alternatives</th>
<th>Environmental Impacts</th>
<th>Impact Determination (CEQA/NEPA)</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures (CEQA) Minimization Measures (NEPA)</th>
<th>Impact after Minimization or Mitigation (CEQA/NEPA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>No Build Alternative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Temporary Impacts</strong></td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant</td>
<td>None Required</td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Permanent Impacts</strong></td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant</td>
<td>None Required</td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Impacts – Environmental Justice</strong></td>
<td><strong>Temporary Impacts</strong></td>
<td>CEQA-Not Applicable</td>
<td>None Required</td>
<td>CEQA-Not Applicable NEPA- No High and Adverse Impact to a minority or low-income population.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NEPA- No High and Adverse Impact to a minority or low-income population.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Proposed Project**

**Temporary Impacts**

Construction of the proposed project would not result in adverse air, traffic or noise impacts, as discussed in Sections 2.4, 2.10, and 2.11. Construction along northbound and southbound Glendale Boulevard Bridges over the Los Angeles River would prohibit pedestrian access across the bridges. As a mitigation measure for this impact, an alternate pedestrian crossing would be constructed over the Los Angeles River across the existing Red Car piers (downstream of the viaduct complex). The pedestrian crossing would provide a detour route around the Glendale Boulevard Bridges during construction. With implementation of this mitigation measure, the impact is not considered adverse. Since construction of the proposed project would not result in adverse impacts there would be no significant adverse impacts to disproportionately affect minority populations.

**Community Impacts – Environmental Justice**
Table S-2. Summary of Environmental Effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource Areas and Alternatives</th>
<th>Environmental Impacts</th>
<th>Impact Determination (CEQA/NEPA)</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures (CEQA) Minimization Measures (NEPA)</th>
<th>Impact after Minimization or Mitigation (CEQA/NEPA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Permanent Impacts</td>
<td>The proposed project would result in moderate losses of historic fabric from both Glendale Boulevard bridges over the Los Angeles River. The impacts to these resources relate to the structures’ eligibility for listing in the NHRP and do not result in direct impacts to humans. Although the loss of historic fabric from the Glendale Boulevard bridges is not likely to affect the structure’s continued eligibility for listing by the NRHP, the loss of historic fabric itself is considered to be a permanent adverse impact. However, because the adverse impact is related to the loss of historic fabric and no adverse aesthetic impacts were identified, the adverse impact does not have the capacity to disproportionately and adversely affect either minority or low-income populations. The proposed project would not result in adverse impacts that could permanently and disproportionately affect either minority or low-income populations.</td>
<td>CEQA-Not Applicable NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
<td>None Required</td>
<td>CEQA-Not Applicable NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Areas and Alternatives</td>
<td>Environmental Impacts</td>
<td>Impact Determination (CEQA/NEPA)</td>
<td>Mitigation Measures (CEQA) Minimization Measures (NEPA)</td>
<td>Impact after Minimization or Mitigation (CEQA/NEPA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| No Build Alternative            | Temporary and Permanent Impacts  
The No Build Alternative would not result in new or additional impacts to the community (social, economic) or environmental justice issues relative to existing conditions. | CEQA-Not Applicable  
NEPA-Not Adverse | None Required | CEQA-Not Applicable  
NEPA-Not Adverse |
| Utilities/Emergency Services    |                        |                                  |                                                        |                                                  |
### Table S-2. Summary of Environmental Effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource Areas and Alternatives</th>
<th>Environmental Impacts</th>
<th>Impact Determination (CEQA/NEPA)</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures (CEQA) Minimization Measures (NEPA)</th>
<th>Impact after Minimization or Mitigation (CEQA/NEPA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed Project</strong></td>
<td><strong>Temporary Impacts</strong></td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant</td>
<td>None Required</td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construction of the proposed project would not result in substantial disruptions in utility services because underground utilities are identified and planned for during the project design process. The proposed project would follow the underground service alert (Dig Alert) program, as required by standard contract specifications. Construction is not expected to substantially affect the accessibility or response time of fire protection or police protection response units because the existing network of local streets provide alternative routes and because the Contractor would be required to prepare a Traffic Management Plan (TMP) subject to approval by the Los Angeles Department of Transportation (LADOT). Construction of the proposed project would result in generation of some demolition debris and construction debris. A high fraction of construction debris is typically recycled or reused because of its economic advantage over new materials. The fraction of debris deemed not suitable for recycling or reuse could be disposed of in an inert landfill, thereby saving valuable sanitary landfill capacity in municipal landfills. <strong>Permanent Impacts</strong> The proposed project would not result in additional demands for utilities or public services, or substantially affect the availability of or access to public facilities and services.</td>
<td>NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
<td>None Required</td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No Build Alternative</strong></td>
<td>The No Build Alternative would not result in new or additional impacts to utilities or emergency service providers relative to existing conditions because no construction would occur. The No Build Alternative would not provide needed seismic improvements to the viaduct complex, and would remain vulnerable to earthquakes.</td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant</td>
<td>None Required</td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
<td></td>
<td>NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Traffic and Transportation/Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities**
### Table S-2. Summary of Environmental Effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource Areas and Alternatives</th>
<th>Environmental Impacts</th>
<th>Impact Determination (CEQA/NEPA)</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures (CEQA) Minimization Measures (NEPA)</th>
<th>Impact after Minimization or Mitigation (CEQA/NEPA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Project</td>
<td>Temporary Impacts</td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
<td>None Required</td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construction of the proposed project would not increase traffic, but would temporarily reduce the capacity of the affected streets because there would be some lane closures. Temporary on-street parking restrictions along southbound Glendale Boulevard between Valleybrink Road and the viaduct complex and along the frontage roads that connect Waverly Drive to Rowena Avenue are also required. Staged construction in accordance with the approved TMP would be implemented with LADOT oversight and coordination.</td>
<td>Prior to construction and demolition work along the viaduct complex, protective barriers would be constructed along the exteriors of the structures to contain any debris, tools, or materials that could fall on sidewalks, roadways, property, or the Los Angeles River below. The placement of the protective barriers could require temporary detours or traffic lane restrictions during the evenings for one to two days at each location.</td>
<td>Some voluntary diversion of Hyperion Avenue through traffic (between San Fernando Road and Rowena Avenue) utilizing Fletcher Drive or Los Feliz Boulevard could occur but should not be substantial due to the additional travel distances, additional signalized intersections, and peak hour congestions.</td>
<td>Pedestrian access along the southbound and northbound Glendale Boulevard bridges could be prohibited during construction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
<td>None Required</td>
<td>Implement T-2: Construct an alternate pedestrian crossing on the Red Car piers that connects both banks of the LA River. The bridge, in conjunction with the new access to the LA River bikeway (from N/B Glendale Boulevard, will provide a detour around the Glendale Boulevard Bridges during construction.</td>
<td>CEQA- Not Significant NEPA- Not Adverse</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Traffic and Transportation/Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities**
Table S-2. Summary of Environmental Effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource Areas and Alternatives</th>
<th>Environmental Impacts</th>
<th>Impact Determination (CEQA/NEPA)</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures (CEQA) Minimization Measures (NEPA)</th>
<th>Impact after Minimization or Mitigation (CEQA/NEPA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Project</td>
<td>Permanent Impacts</td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant</td>
<td>None Required</td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Key intersections in the project area, Glendale/Glenfeliz, Glendale/Riverside, and I-5 Northbound Off-ramp/Glendale, would operate at acceptable levels of service. The reconfiguration of the northbound I-5 off-ramp to Glendale Boulevard would install a new signalized intersection at the terminus of the reconfigured off-ramp to allow left turns onto southbound Glendale Boulevard. This could create a potential sight distance issue as southbound traffic travels under the viaduct complex. This distance limit is considered potentially significant or adverse. Because the proposed project would not permanently affect traffic volume/capacity relationships along the viaduct or surrounding area, would not increase operational congestion at intersections, would not be a traffic generator, and would not affect local or regional traffic service standards or congestion management requirements, adverse impacts would not occur. The new bike path access from northbound Glendale Boulevard would allow bicyclists in the surrounding area another option to access the bike path. The proposed project would improve pedestrian safety along the viaduct complex and pedestrian access to the Los Angeles River bike path. The proposed project would provide seismic retrofits to the existing viaduct complex and increase the likelihood that the bridge would remain operational following a major seismic event.</td>
<td>CEQA-Significant NEPA-Adverse</td>
<td>T-1: The signalization for the realigned off-ramp intersection will include traffic control for southbound Glendale Boulevard traffic, north of the Hyperion Bridge overcrossing. Traffic control will include, but not be limited to, signalization to allow traffic to stop north of Hyperion Bridge overcrossing rather than at the new realigned off-ramp intersection. The design, placement, and operation of the device would meet LADOT and Caltrans requirements. None Required</td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant</td>
<td>None Required</td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
<td>None Required</td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant</td>
<td>None Required</td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
<td>None Required</td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant</td>
<td>None Required</td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
<td>None Required</td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant</td>
<td>None Required</td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
<td>None Required</td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant</td>
<td>None Required</td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
<td>None Required</td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant</td>
<td>None Required</td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
<td>None Required</td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Traffic and Transportation/Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities
## Table S-2. Summary of Environmental Effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource Areas and Alternatives</th>
<th>Environmental Impacts</th>
<th>Impact Determination (CEQA/NEPA)</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures (CEQA) Minimization Measures (NEPA)</th>
<th>Impact after Minimization or Mitigation (CEQA/NEPA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>No Build Alternative</strong></td>
<td>The No Build Alternative would not result in temporary or permanent impacts to traffic transportation/pedestrian and bicycle facilities; but would also not minimize the potential for damage of the viaduct complex from seismic events.</td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant</td>
<td>None Required</td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Visual/Aesthetics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant</td>
<td>None Required</td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Proposed Project**            | **Temporary Impacts**  
Temporary minor degradation of viaduct complex views would accompany project construction but because these effects would be temporary, would occur in a staged manner, and occur in urbanized areas where temporary view interruptions are common and necessary occurrences, these effects are not considered significant.  
Although construction would occur along the viaduct complex along Glendale Boulevard and at the abutments adjacent to Riverside Drive, construction would not affect the resources that form the basis for their designation as scenic highways. | CEQA-Not Significant             | None Required                                             | CEQA-Not Significant NEPA-Not Adverse                |
|                                | **Permanent Impacts**  
The proposed project would restore the original balustrade style railing system, which would be a visual improvement over the current covered railing system. Although the proposed project would also include crash-resistant protective barriers between the travel lanes and restored balustrades along Hyperion Avenue, as well as a center divider which would partially conceal the restored railing system, portions of the railing would be visible and the effect would be an improvement in the overall visual character of the viaduct complex.  
The proposed project would reinforce the spandrel columns with fiber wrap and shotcrete. These improvements are not expected to appreciably change the appearance of the columns or side views of the complex’s arch support structures because all spandrel columns would be reinforced and because the general form and appearance would not be altered. | CEQA-Not Significant             | None Required                                             | CEQA-Not Significant NEPA-Not Adverse                |
|                                | **Visual/Aesthetics**                                                                                                                                      | CEQA-Not Significant             | None Required                                             | CEQA-Not Significant NEPA-Not Adverse                |
Table S-2. Summary of Environmental Effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource Areas and Alternatives</th>
<th>Environmental Impacts</th>
<th>Impact Determination (CEQA/NEPA)</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures (CEQA) Minimization Measures (NEPA)</th>
<th>Impact after Minimization or Mitigation (CEQA/NEPA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Project</td>
<td>Permanent Impacts&lt;br&gt;The proposed project would not change existing shade or shadow characteristics of the viaduct complex.&lt;br&gt;The proposed project would refurbish and reuse the light poles and globes currently present on the viaduct complex. Additional electroliers (light poles) may be added in order to increase the illumination at the roadway, as required by the City’s Bureau of Street Lighting. However, the new lighting would not introduce a new source of glare or intrude on nearby properties because the light would be diffused.&lt;br&gt;The proposed viaduct complex improvements would not affect the landscaped median along Glendale Boulevard and would therefore not affect its scenic highway status. Similarly, the proposed improvements would not affect Riverside Drive or its scenic highway designation.&lt;br&gt;The pedestrian crossing connecting the left and right banks of the Los Angeles River utilizing the existing Red Car piers is visually consistent with the landscape unit, and does not intrude onto the aesthetic features of the viaduct complex.</td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant&lt;br&gt;NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
<td>None Required</td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant&lt;br&gt;NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant&lt;br&gt;NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
<td>None Required</td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant&lt;br&gt;NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant&lt;br&gt;NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
<td>None Required</td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant&lt;br&gt;NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant&lt;br&gt;NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
<td>None Required</td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant&lt;br&gt;NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant&lt;br&gt;NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
<td>None Required</td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant&lt;br&gt;NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant&lt;br&gt;NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
<td>None Required</td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant&lt;br&gt;NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant&lt;br&gt;NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
<td>None Required</td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant&lt;br&gt;NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant&lt;br&gt;NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
<td>None Required</td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant&lt;br&gt;NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Build Alternative</td>
<td>The No Build Alternative would result in no new or additional impacts to visual/aesthetic quality relative to existing conditions.</td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant&lt;br&gt;NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
<td>None Required</td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant&lt;br&gt;NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant&lt;br&gt;NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
<td>None Required</td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant&lt;br&gt;NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table S-2. Summary of Environmental Effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource Areas and Alternatives</th>
<th>Environmental Impacts</th>
<th>Impact Determination (CEQA/NEPA)</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures (CEQA) Minimization Measures (NEPA)</th>
<th>Impact after Minimization or Mitigation (CEQA/NEPA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed Project</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant</td>
<td>None Required</td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Temporary Impacts</td>
<td>NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construction activities associated with implementing seismic reinforcement and other bridge improvements would result in construction noise, dust, and traffic lane restrictions, but such effects would not diminish the historic nature of the bridge.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Permanent Impacts</td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant</td>
<td>None Required</td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The deteriorated railing would be restored along Waverly Drive over Hyperion Avenue, which would not adversely affect the bridge (53C1179).</td>
<td>NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>None of the modifications (sidewalks, median, barriers, railings, etc.) planned for the viaduct complex would have an adverse effect on the three Hyperion Avenue bridge structures (53C1882, 531069, and 53C1881).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The seismic improvements to the Complex would minimally alter the physical characteristics of these bridges and would be designed so that the size and scale of the new features do not adversely impact the original features. These changes would not introduce visual elements that diminish the integrity of the bridge.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pedestrian enhancements are planned for the vicinity of both Glendale Boulevard bridges, but these enhancements would not have an adverse effect on either of the bridges because these activities do not entail removing, changing or altering any historic features or fabric of these bridges.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Cultural Resources**
### Table S-2. Summary of Environmental Effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource Areas and Alternatives</th>
<th>Environmental Impacts</th>
<th>Impact Determination (CEQA/NEPA)</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures (CEQA) Minimization Measures (NEPA)</th>
<th>Impact after Minimization or Mitigation (CEQA/NEPA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed Project</strong></td>
<td><strong>Permanent Impacts</strong>&lt;br&gt;The project would have an adverse effect on the viaduct complex through the loss of historic fabric of both the Southbound Glendale Boulevard Bridge (53C1883) and the Northbound Glendale Boulevard Bridge (53C1884), which would be altered and widened. These improvements would result in a loss of historic fabric.</td>
<td>CEQA-Significant NEPA-Adverse</td>
<td><strong>H-1:</strong> Recordation to Historic American Engineering Record Specifications pursuant to Section 110(b) of the National Historic Preservation Act, etc.&lt;br&gt;<strong>H-2:</strong> Disseminate copies of the HABS/HAER report to appropriate local libraries, etc.&lt;br&gt;<strong>H-3:</strong> Online publication of historical information from HAER report.&lt;br&gt;<strong>H-4:</strong> Produce a video documentary about the bridge and its place among the famous bridges spanning the LA River.&lt;br&gt;<strong>H-5:</strong> Prepare traveling exhibits that address the history of the viaduct complex.&lt;br&gt;<strong>H-6:</strong> Consult with the SHPO regarding replication of original elements, etc.</td>
<td>CEQA- Not Significant NEPA- Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No Build Alternative</strong></td>
<td>The No Build Alternative would not result in new or additional impacts to historic resources relative to existing conditions.</td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
<td>None Required</td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Archaeological Resources</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Areas and Alternatives</td>
<td>Environmental Impacts</td>
<td>Impact Determination (CEQA/NEPA)</td>
<td>Mitigation Measures (CEQA) Minimization Measures (NEPA)</td>
<td>Impact after Minimization or Mitigation (CEQA/NEPA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Project</td>
<td><strong>Temporary and Permanent Impacts</strong>&lt;br&gt;Temporary impacts to archaeological resources are not anticipated from the proposed project due to the lack of such resources within the project APE and the disturbed nature of the project area. Although no archaeological resources are expected to be encountered during construction, a professional archaeologist would monitor all ground disturbing activities as requested by the Chairman of the Gabrielino/Tongva Tribal Council</td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
<td><strong>A-1:</strong> A professional archaeologist would monitor all ground disturbing activities during construction and would act according to the Special Order and Caltrans policies if archaeological resources are discovered. If buried cultural materials are encountered, work in the area of the resource would be halted and applicable actions under City of Los Angeles and Caltrans policy would be implemented.</td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Build Alternative</td>
<td>The No Build Alternative would not result in new or additional impacts to archeological resources relative to existing conditions.</td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
<td>None Required</td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| Hydrology, Water Quality, Stormwater Runoff |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource Areas and Alternatives</th>
<th>Environmental Impacts</th>
<th>Impact Determination (CEQA/NEPA)</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures (CEQA)</th>
<th>Impact after Minimization or Mitigation (CEQA/NEPA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed Project</strong></td>
<td>Temporary Impacts</td>
<td>CEQA- Not Significant</td>
<td>None Required</td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NEPA- Not Adverse</td>
<td></td>
<td>NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No adverse impacts to water quality would occur due to implementation of the SWPPP and construction of the detention/infiltration basin.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant</td>
<td>None Required</td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
<td></td>
<td>NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Permanent Impacts</td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant</td>
<td>None Required</td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
<td></td>
<td>NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Although the proposed project would slightly widen the Glendale Boulevard bridge structures over the Los Angeles River, no substantial increases in pollutant deposition to the roadway would occur because increased vehicular travel would not occur. The pier extensions for the Glendale Boulevard bridges and the walkway along the north River bank would be designed to not affect channel hydraulics. Although the widening of the Glendale Boulevard bridges over the Los Angeles River represents an increase in paved area, it would not result in the generation of additional storm water runoff as the widened area would capture rainfall that would otherwise fall or be conveyed to the Los Angeles River. None of the other project elements would increase runoff to flow to the Los Angeles River.</td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant</td>
<td>None Required</td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
<td></td>
<td>NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant</td>
<td>None Required</td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
<td></td>
<td>NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant</td>
<td>None Required</td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
<td></td>
<td>NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Build Alternative</td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant</td>
<td>None Required</td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
<td></td>
<td>NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The No Build Alternative would not result in new or additional impacts to hydrology, water quality, and stormwater runoff relative to existing conditions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant</td>
<td>None Required</td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
<td></td>
<td>NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hazardous Waste/Materials</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GLENDALE BOULEVARD-HYPERION AVENUE COMPLEX
OF BRIDGES IMPROVEMENT PROJECT

DECEMBER 2014

S-21
### Table S-2. Summary of Environmental Effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource Areas and Alternatives</th>
<th>Environmental Impacts</th>
<th>Impact Determination (CEQA/NEPA)</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures (CEQA) Minimization Measures (NEPA)</th>
<th>Impact after Minimization or Mitigation (CEQA/NEPA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Proposed Project               | **Temporary Impacts**  
During pile installation, contaminated groundwater could seep into the drilled holes, and when the piles are casted with concrete, the contaminated groundwater would be displaced to the river channel as the concrete fills the bottom of the drilled hole.  
Yellow traffic striping present along the center of Hyperion Avenue and Glendale Boulevard may contain lead chromate pigments, and if removed by sand blasting or grinding, aerial dispersion of the material could occur; therefore, there is a potential for adverse health impacts to workers and the public. | CEQA- Not Significant           | NECPA-Adverse                                                                                                         | CEQA-Not Significant NECPA-Not Adverse         |
|                                |                                                                                                                                                                                                                      | CEQA- Not Significant           | NECPA-Adverse                                                                                                         | CEQA-Not Significant NECPA-Not Adverse         |
| Hazardous Waste/Materials      |                                                                                                                                                                                                                      | Note: HZ-1 through HZ-4 are legal requirements, and are included here for informational purposes only.                                                                                                              | CEQA-Not Significant NECPA-Not Adverse         |
|                                |                                                                                                                                                                                                                      | **HZ-1:** Require the selected contractor to prepare and implement a management plan in the event that hazardous wastes are encountered during construction. All contaminated groundwater, contaminated soil, and hazardous wastes and debris encountered or generated during construction would be properly excavated, stored, tested, treated and/or disposed in accordance with all federal, state, and local laws and regulations. | CEQA-Not Significant NECPA-Not Adverse         |
|                                |                                                                                                                                                                                                                      | **HZ-2:** Perform representative sampling and testing of yellow traffic paint in areas that could be affected by construction. If hazardous materials in the paint exceed standards, abate the traffic paint and properly dispose of the material prior to construction. | CEQA-Not Significant NECPA-Not Adverse         |
### Table S-2. Summary of Environmental Effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource Areas and Alternatives</th>
<th>Environmental Impacts</th>
<th>Impact Determination (CEQA/NEPA)</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures (CEQA) Minimization Measures (NEPA)</th>
<th>Impact after Minimization or Mitigation (CEQA/NEPA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed Project</strong></td>
<td><strong>Temporary Impacts</strong></td>
<td>CEQA- Not Significant NEPA-Adverse</td>
<td>HZ-3: Perform representative sampling and testing of the area ramp alignment area for the presence of ADL. If ADL is present above action levels, abate the ADL-contaminated soil, in accordance with all applicable laws and regulations, prior to construction of the reconfigured ramp. A Health and Safety Plan by Contractor would be required pursuant to GC/GR requirements.</td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The landscaped area currently adjacent to the relocated northbound I-5 off-ramp may contain aerially deposited lead (ADL), which could pose safety hazards to workers or the public.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There is the potential for asbestos-containing material (ACM) to be present in bridge joints and lead-based paint (LBP) to be present on the bridge rails or abutments. If present, the ACM and/or LBP could be disturbed during demolition activities.</td>
<td></td>
<td>HZ-4: Perform a survey (during the design phase or prior to construction) for ACM in the bridge joints and for the presence of LBP in areas of the viaduct complex to be removed. If present, remove the ACM and/or LBP prior to or as part of the demolition process, in accordance with all applicable laws, regulations, and rules. A Health and Safety Plan by Contractor would be required pursuant to GC/GR requirements.</td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Hazardous Waste/Materials**

---
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### Table S-2. Summary of Environmental Effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource Areas and Alternatives</th>
<th>Environmental Impacts</th>
<th>Impact Determination (CEQA/NEPA)</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures (CEQA) Minimization Measures (NEPA)</th>
<th>Impact after Minimization or Mitigation (CEQA/NEPA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed Project</strong></td>
<td><strong>Permanent Impacts</strong></td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
<td>None Required</td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Once roadway improvements are constructed, traffic operations on these roadways would not result in the generation of hazardous wastes that could impact the corridor.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No Build Alternative</strong></td>
<td><strong>The No Build Alternative would result in no new or additional impacts related to hazardous waste/material relative to existing conditions.</strong></td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
<td>None Required</td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Air Quality</strong></td>
<td><strong>Temporary Impacts</strong></td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
<td>None Required</td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed Project</strong></td>
<td>During construction, all the criteria pollutant emissions would not exceed SCAQMD’s daily significance thresholds and, would not result in a temporary adverse impact. None of the criteria pollutant emissions are predicted to exceed localized significance thresholds. Therefore, localized impacts from criteria pollutant emissions would not result in a significant impact to air quality.</td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
<td>None Required</td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Air Quality</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table S-2. Summary of Environmental Effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource Areas and Alternatives</th>
<th>Environmental Impacts</th>
<th>Impact Determination (CEQA/NEPA)</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures (CEQA)</th>
<th>Minimization Measures (NEPA)</th>
<th>Impact after Minimization or Mitigation (CEQA/NEPA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed Project</strong></td>
<td><strong>Permanent Impacts</strong></td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant</td>
<td>None Required</td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant</td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project operation would not result in an incremental increase of greenhouse gases relative to the No Project alternative. The proposed project is included in the 2011 FTIP under project IDs LA0F007, LA0F008, and LA0F009. Because the proposed project would not increase traffic throughput or increase the capacity of the viaduct complex, no increases in criteria pollutants would result that could cause adverse impacts to air quality. In addition, the new signalized intersection at the reconfigured northbound I-5 off-ramp to Glendale Boulevard would save vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and would operate at a free flowing level (LOS B), so no CO or particulate matter hotspots are expected to occur from project operation. Similarly, this new intersection is not expected to result in PM2.5 hotspots due to the free flowing level of service and saved VMT.</td>
<td>NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
<td>None Required</td>
<td>NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No Build Alternative</strong></td>
<td><strong>The No Build Alternative would result in no new or additional impacts related to air quality relative to existing conditions.</strong></td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant</td>
<td>None Required</td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant</td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
<td></td>
<td>NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
<td>NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Noise</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Noise**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource Areas and Alternatives</th>
<th>Environmental Impacts</th>
<th>Impact Determination (CEQA/NEPA)</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures (CEQA) Minimization Measures (NEPA)</th>
<th>Impact after Minimization or Mitigation (CEQA/NEPA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Project</td>
<td>Temporary Impacts</td>
<td>CEQA- Not Significant</td>
<td>None Required</td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construction activities would be noisy but would be conducted in compliance with all applicable laws, including the Los Angeles Municipal Code.</td>
<td>NEPA- Not Adverse</td>
<td></td>
<td>NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Permanent Impacts</strong></td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant</td>
<td>None Required</td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Glendale Boulevard bridges would be widened, but the traffic lanes would not be noticeably moved from their current locations, as road shoulders would be installed. As a result, noticeable changes in traffic noise levels are not expected to occur.</td>
<td>NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
<td></td>
<td>NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The reconfiguration of the northbound I-5 off-ramp to Glendale Boulevard would reduce vehicle miles traveled along Glendale Boulevard, resulting in a slight reduction in traffic noise along Glendale Boulevard.</td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant</td>
<td>None Required</td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>None Required</strong></td>
<td>NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
<td></td>
<td>NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Build Alternative</td>
<td>The No Build Alternative would result in no new or additional impacts related to noise relative to existing conditions.</td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant</td>
<td>None Required</td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
<td></td>
<td>NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetlands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource Areas and Alternatives</th>
<th>Environmental Impacts</th>
<th>Impact Determination (CEQA/NEPA)</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures (CEQA) Minimization Measures (NEPA)</th>
<th>Impact after Minimization or Mitigation (CEQA/NEPA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed Project</strong></td>
<td><strong>Temporary Impacts</strong></td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
<td>None required</td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The in-river work area is completely paved and contains only a small area (approximately 2,000 square feet) of common wetland plants. This vegetation would have to be removed to accommodate the proposed retrofits but would not represent a substantial loss of wetland habitat.</td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
<td>None Required</td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construction activity would be limited to the existing in-river concrete pad and would not encroach into the wetlands present 50 feet upstream and 120 feet downstream of the concrete work area. As a result, no direct loss of this wetland vegetation would occur.</td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
<td>None Required</td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construction related activities occurring within or above the river channel could pollute surface waters in the channel and carry pollutants downstream into wetland habitat.</td>
<td>CEQA-Significant NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
<td>None Required</td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In-river flow diversion structures have the potential to reduce the availability of water to wetlands immediately downstream of construction site.</td>
<td>CEQA-Significant NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
<td>None Required</td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**B-1:** Cofferdams or other approved flow diversions should be erected in the existing concrete channel during project construction.

**B-2:** Maintain the regular flow of the river across the full width of the channel immediately downstream of the construction site, keeping the downstream wetlands watered.
### Table S-2. Summary of Environmental Effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource Areas and Alternatives</th>
<th>Environmental Impacts</th>
<th>Impact Determination (CEQA/NEPA)</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures (CEQA) Minimization Measures (NEPA)</th>
<th>Impact after Minimization or Mitigation (CEQA/NEPA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wetlands</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed Project</strong></td>
<td><strong>Permanent Impacts</strong></td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant</td>
<td>None Required</td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
<td></td>
<td>NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant</td>
<td>None Required</td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
<td></td>
<td>NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CEQA-Significant</td>
<td>Implement Measure B-1.</td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
<td></td>
<td>NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No Build Alternative</strong></td>
<td><strong>The No Build Alternative would not provide seismic or other improvements to the viaduct complex, and as such, would not result in any impacts to wetlands.</strong></td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant</td>
<td>None Required</td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
<td></td>
<td>NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Plant Species</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table S-2. Summary of Environmental Effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource Areas and Alternatives</th>
<th>Environmental Impacts</th>
<th>Impact Determination (CEQA/NEPA)</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures (CEQA) Minimization Measures (NEPA)</th>
<th>Impact after Minimization or Mitigation (CEQA/NEPA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed Project</strong></td>
<td><strong>Temporary Impacts</strong>&lt;br&gt;The in-river work area is completely paved and is therefore unlikely to support special status plant species.&lt;br&gt;In-river flow diversion structures have the potential to reduce the availability of water to wetlands immediately downstream. Therefore, Davidson’s bush mallow, Parish’s gooseberry, and San Bernardino aster could be adversely affected if present and flow is not restored adequately.</td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
<td>None Required</td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Permanent Impacts</strong>&lt;br&gt;The in-river work area is completely paved and is therefore unlikely to support special status plant species.</td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
<td>None Required</td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No Build Alternative</strong></td>
<td><strong>The No Build Alternative would not improve the viaduct complex, and would not result in any impacts to special-status plant species.</strong></td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
<td>None Required</td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Animal Species

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Determination (CEQA/NEPA)</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures (CEQA) Minimization Measures (NEPA)</th>
<th>Impact after Minimization or Mitigation (CEQA/NEPA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
<td>Implement Measure B-2.</td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
<td>None Required</td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
<td>None Required</td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
<td>None Required</td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table S-2. Summary of Environmental Effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource Areas and Alternatives</th>
<th>Environmental Impacts</th>
<th>Impact Determination (CEQA/NEPA)</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures (CEQA) Minimization Measures (NEPA)</th>
<th>Impact after Minimization or Mitigation (CEQA/NEPA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Project</td>
<td>Temporary Impacts</td>
<td>CEQA-Significant, NEPA-Adverse</td>
<td>Implement Measures B-1, B-2, and implement Measure B-3: a Worker Environmental Awareness Program (WEAP) will be presented to all construction personnel on site.</td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant, NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CEQA-Significant, NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
<td>B-4: A qualified biologist should conduct pre-construction nest surveys of riparian habitat and viaduct complex structures to identify any nests within 500 feet of the work area.</td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant, NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CEQA-Significant, NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
<td>B-5: Retain a biological monitor on site for the duration of construction activities during nesting bird season.</td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant, NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CEQA-Significant, NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
<td>B-6: A qualified biologist should conduct a preconstruction survey of the concrete pad immediately below the viaduct complex for arroyo chub. If any arroyo chub are found, they will be collected with seine netting and relocated downstream.</td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant, NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CEQA-Significant, NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
<td>B-7: Install turbidity curtains at the downstream end of the work zone for the duration of in-channel construction. Turbidity curtains will be inspected weekly and prior/following storm events.</td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant, NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Because impacts to wetland vegetation often affect the animals that utilize them as habitat, potential impacts to wetlands and plants also apply to wildlife.

If project construction would occur during the bird nesting season (between February 15th and August 31st) there is potential for construction noise to disrupt breeding activities for Peregrine falcon and migratory birds protected under the MBTA.

Construction-related activities occurring within or above the river channel could pollute surface waters in the channel and carry pollutants downstream into wetland habitat and increase water turbidity which could impact the arroyo chub, a CDFG species of special concern. Pollutants include construction materials, dust, debris, soils and construction related water wastes.
Table S-2. Summary of Environmental Effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource Areas and Alternatives</th>
<th>Environmental Impacts</th>
<th>Impact Determination (CEQA/NEPA)</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures (CEQA) Minimization Measures (NEPA)</th>
<th>Impact after Minimization or Mitigation (CEQA/NEPA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Animal Species</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed Project</strong></td>
<td><strong>Temporary Impacts</strong></td>
<td>CEQA-Significant</td>
<td>B-8: Conduct pre-construction surveys for bats. If they are found, implement further measures defined in B-8.</td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
<td>None Required</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Permanent Impacts</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No Build Alternative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Temporary Impacts</strong></td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Permanent Impacts</strong></td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If project construction occurs during the bat breeding season (April 15th through August 1st), there is potential for construction to disrupt breeding/roosting activities for four special status bat species.

Permanent Impacts

Because no project construction activities would occur in or above an unlined portion of the river channel, no significant permanent adverse impacts to habitat for special status animal species would be expected to occur.

The No Build Alternative would not provide seismic or other improvements to the viaduct complex, and as such, would not result in any impacts to special-status animal species that may occur in the project vicinity.

CEQA-Not Significant NEPA-Not Adverse

None Required
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource Areas and Alternatives</th>
<th>Environmental Impacts</th>
<th>Impact Determination (CEQA/NEPA)</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures (CEQA) Minimization Measures (NEPA)</th>
<th>Impact after Minimization or Mitigation (CEQA/NEPA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed Project</strong></td>
<td><strong>Temporary Impacts</strong></td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
<td>None Required</td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CEQA-Adverse</td>
<td>Implement Measure B-1</td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CEQA-Adverse</td>
<td>Implement Measure B-2</td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CEQA-Adverse</td>
<td>Implement Measure B-3</td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
<td>None Required</td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No Build Alternative</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
<td>None Required</td>
<td>CEQA-Not Significant NEPA-Not Adverse</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Threatened and Endangered Species**

- **Proposed Project**
  - **Temporary Impacts**
    - The in-river work area is completely paved and does not contain suitable habitat for Gambel’s water cress or the Southwestern willow flycatcher. As a result, construction activities would not reduce habitat for these federally listed species.
    - Construction related activities occurring within or above the river channel could pollute surface waters in the channel and carry pollutants downstream into wetland habitat containing Gambel’s water cress and Southwestern willow flycatcher.
    - In-river flow diversion structures have the potential to reduce the availability of water to wetlands immediately downstream which could negatively impact Gambel’s water cress.
    - If project construction would occur during breeding season for the Southwestern willow flycatcher, there is potential for construction noise to disrupt its breeding activities.
  - **Permanent Impacts**
    - The in-river work area is completely paved and does not contain suitable for Gambel’s water cress or the Southwestern willow flycatcher. As a result, construction activities would not reduce habitat for these federally listed species.

- **No Build Alternative**
  - The No Build Alternative would not provide seismic or other improvements to the viaduct complex, and as such, would not result in any impacts to threatened or endangered species that may occur in the project vicinity.
Chapter 1 Proposed Project

1.1 Introduction

The Glendale Boulevard-Hyperion Avenue Viaduct Complex (viaduct complex) is located between Atwater Village in the Northeast Los Angeles Community Planning Area and the Hollywood Community Planning Area of the City of Los Angeles. Figure 1-1 shows the project in its regional context. The viaduct complex, completed in 1929, spans approximately 1,190 feet over the Los Angeles River, Interstate 5 (I-5), and Riverside Drive. Figure 1-2 shows the project location and depicts the viaduct complex and the immediate area.

The viaduct complex consists of the following structures:

- Waverly Drive Bridge (Bridge Number 53C-1179)
- Hyperion Avenue Viaduct over Riverside Drive (53C-1882)
- Hyperion Avenue Viaduct over I-5 (53-1069)
- Hyperion Avenue Viaduct over the Los Angeles River (53C-1881)
- Southbound Glendale Boulevard Bridge over the Los Angeles River (53C-1883)
- Northbound Glendale Boulevard Bridge over the Los Angeles River (53C-1884)

The viaduct complex is generally aligned along a southwest-northeast axis and is bounded by Ettrick Street on the southwest and Glendale Boulevard on the northeast, respectively. Photograph 1 shows the viaduct complex as seen from the hillside to the southeast. The width of the existing roadway on Glendale Boulevard is approximately 34 feet in each direction. The width of the existing roadway on Hyperion Avenue is 54 feet in both directions combined. A portion of the Hyperion Avenue Viaduct (531069) spans I-5 and is under the jurisdiction of the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans). Of the six structures comprising the viaduct complex, this is the only component that is part of the State Highway System. The five other structures are under the jurisdiction of the City of Los Angeles.

The viaduct complex connects Hyperion Avenue in the Griffith Park area of the Hollywood community with Glendale Boulevard in the Atwater area of the Northeast Los Angeles community.

The six structures that comprise the viaduct complex have been determined, in their entirety, to be eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). The viaduct complex is also designated as Los Angeles Historic-Cultural Monument Number 164.¹
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California participated in the “Surface Transportation Project Delivery Pilot Program” (Pilot Program) pursuant to 23 USC 327, for more than five years, beginning July 1, 2007 and ending September 30, 2012. MAP-21 (P.L. 112-141), signed by President Obama on July 6th amended 23 USC 327 to establish a revised and permanent Surface Transportation Project Delivery Program. As a result, Caltrans entered into a memorandum of understanding pursuant to 23 USC 327 (NEPA Assignment MOU) with FHWA. The NEPA Assignment MOU became effective October 1, 2012 and terminates eighteen months from the effective date of FHWA regulations developed to clarify amendments to 23 USC 327 or on January 1, 2017. The NEPA Assignment MOU incorporates by reference the terms and conditions of the Pilot Program MOU. In summary, Caltrans continues to assume FHWA responsibilities under NEPA and other federal environmental laws in the same manner as was assigned under the Pilot Program, with minor changes. With NEPA Assignment, FHWA assigned and Caltrans assumed all of the United States Department of Transportation (USDOT) Secretary's responsibilities under NEPA. This assignment includes projects on the State Highway System and Local Assistance Projects off of the State Highway System within the State of California, except for certain categorical exclusions that FHWA assigned to Caltrans under the 23 USC 326 CE Assignment MOU, projects excluded by definition, and specific project exclusions.
The City, as the CEQA lead agency, proposed to adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) based on the information in this joint environmental document. Further information specific to the CEQA analysis is contained in Chapter 3 and Appendix A.

Following receipt of public comments on this Initial Study/Environmental Assessment, the lead agencies considered the comments and took actions regarding the environmental document and the project. Before making a decision on approval of the project, the City determined whether to adopt an MND or require preparation of an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) under CEQA, and Caltrans decided whether to issue a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) or require preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) under NEPA.
Figure 1-1: Regional Map
Figure 1-2: Project Overview Map
1.2 Project Purpose and Need

1.2.1 Purpose
The purpose of the proposed project is to:

- Reduce vulnerability of the Glendale Boulevard-Hyperion Avenue viaduct complex in major earthquake events
- Resolve design deficiencies of the Glendale Boulevard-Hyperion Avenue viaduct complex
- Improve traffic safety and traffic circulation to increase the operational efficiency of the viaduct complex

1.2.2 Need
A bridge must be geometrically adequate in order to function properly. The determination of geometric adequacy includes the consideration of several components, including the number of travel lanes; roadway width; shoulder width; approach roadway width; vertical clearance over the roadway, underclearances; horizontal clearances; sight distances across the bridge and at the approaches; proximity to intersections; and the functional classification of its associated roadways.

FHWA uses a sufficiency rating (SR) metric to indicate whether a bridge is structurally deficient (SD) or functionally obsolete (FO). These safety ratings are used to establish eligibility for (Highway Bridge Program) HBP funds and are derived from bridge inspection reports prepared in cooperation with Caltrans’ Office of Structure Maintenance and Investigations (OSM&I). Each bridge inspection report includes SR, SD, FO, and other data. Bridges that are SD or FO with an SR under 80 (out of a possible 100) are considered deficient by FHWA and are candidates for placement on the Eligible Bridge List (EBL). The SR of the Glendale-Hyperion Viaduct Complex was determined to be 72, which classifies it as “functionally obsolete” under the FHWA ranking criteria.

With the exception of the Waverly Drive Bridge, each of the bridge structures of the viaduct complex requires seismic retrofitting to meet current design standards of the City of Los Angeles and State of California. In addition, existing geometric configurations of several of the viaduct Complex’s structures do not meet current design standards for operational safety.

The design-related deficiencies of the viaduct complex include the following:

- Inadequate curb-to-curb width to meet major highway design standards.*
- Inadequate lateral clearance beneath the Hyperion Bridge (53C-1881).
- Absence of shoulders.*
- Deteriorated railings. *
- Inadequate pedestrian facilities along Hyperion Avenue and Glendale Boulevard.

* These deficiencies are common to all structures.
In addition to the design deficiencies listed above, there are other nearby circulation system issues that detract from the optimal operational efficiency of the viaduct complex. As an example, the northbound I-5 off-ramp to Glendale Boulevard terminates at Glendale Boulevard and only allows right turns onto northbound Glendale Boulevard. Motorists wishing to travel southbound on Glendale Boulevard must first make a right turn onto Glendale Boulevard, travel over the northbound Glendale Boulevard Bridge (over the Los Angeles River), merge to the far left lane to enter a turning pocket at Glenfeliz Boulevard, make a U-turn at this location, travel south on Glendale Boulevard over the southbound Glendale Boulevard Bridge, and after traveling under the Hyperion Avenue viaduct, continue south on Glendale Boulevard. Furthermore, the existing northbound I-5 off-ramp to Glendale Boulevard is deficient in that the sight distance at this ramp intersection does not meet Caltrans standards for corner sight distance for stop-controlled freeway exit traffic. Traffic volume and Level of Service (LOS) data are presented in Tables 2.4-1 through Tables 2.4-4. In order to improve the operational efficiency of the viaduct complex and related surrounding circulation system, there is also a need to reconfigure the northbound I-5 off-ramp to Glendale Boulevard.

1.2.2.1 Seismic Deficiencies
The current viaduct complex presents a risk to public safety due to the potential for collapse under recently revised maximum credible event (earthquake) design criteria. Each of the viaduct complex’s component structures, except the Waverly Drive Bridge, requires seismic retrofitting to meet current Caltrans and City of Los Angeles design standards. These standards were revised based upon observations following the Loma Prieta and Northridge earthquakes.

In addition to the hazard to users associated with a potential for collapse under earthquake conditions, the viaduct complex extends over a portion of the I-5 freeway, thereby exposing users of that facility to an associated risk. Thus, there is a need to seismically strengthen the viaduct complex to minimize associated seismic risks to public safety and to minimize risks to the public transportation system.

1.2.2.2 Design Deficiencies
Curb-to-Curb Widths
Hyperion Avenue along the viaduct complex has two lanes in each direction, both of which are 12 feet wide. An 8-foot, double-striped median separates the traffic in each direction. Under American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) design standards, a minimum curb-to-curb width of 56 feet is required to remove the deficiency related to deck geometry. This includes 12-foot inner lanes, 14-foot curb lanes (12-foot travel lane and 2-foot shoulder), and a 4-foot median along Hyperion Avenue.

The Northbound Glendale Boulevard Bridge and the Southbound Glendale Boulevard Bridge (both over the Los Angeles River) have two 12-foot-wide travel lanes each, and these bridges do not meet AASHTO standards.

Lateral Clearance
The lateral clearance under Hyperion Avenue between the Abutment No. 4 and the left lane along southbound Glendale Boulevard (as it passes beneath the Hyperion Viaduct) is sub-standard, and there is a need to correct this deficiency.
Shoulders
Both Glendale Boulevard northbound and southbound bridges over the Los Angeles River currently lack shoulders. Since these connect to State Highway System (SHS) facilities (northbound and southbound I-5 ramps), a minimum shoulder width of four feet is required. The curb-to-curb widths of these two structures do not currently meet the design standard.

Railings
The railings along the viaduct complex were originally balustrades, but were covered with gunnite in 1962 as part of a rail repair project (CLA, 1962). The current railings are deteriorating with signs of spalling and cracking, with the covering along some sections showing physical separation. The railings are also considered to be deficient in certain sections due to damage caused by vehicle collisions.

Pedestrian Facilities
The current pedestrian facilities along Hyperion Avenue and Glendale Boulevard viaducts are inadequate and present safety hazards to pedestrians. Currently, 5-foot-wide sidewalks are along both the east and west sides of the viaduct complex’s Hyperion Avenue roadway from the retaining wall near Waverly Drive northward to Hyperion Avenue’s merger with north- and southbound Glendale Boulevard.

On the east side of Hyperion Avenue (southern end), the sidewalk terminates at the retaining wall, which supports the Waverly Drive Bridge (over Hyperion Avenue). However, a 2-foot-wide curb extends along the abutment/retaining wall adjacent to the northbound traffic. Pedestrians using the east sidewalk must walk along this narrow curb after the sidewalk ends and are exposed to vehicular traffic.

On the west side of the viaduct complex’s Hyperion Avenue roadway, the sidewalk also terminates at a 2-foot-wide curb that extends along the retaining wall base. An ascending walkway aligned along the top of the west retaining wall provides an alternative for pedestrian use rather than navigating the 2-foot curb lying adjacent to the southbound traffic lane. However, despite the presence of this safer alternative, many pedestrians elect to use the 2-foot curb, which exposes them to traffic hazards.

The Hyperion Avenue roadway merges with and transitions to Glendale Boulevard at the northern end of the viaduct complex. A landscaped median extends from the merge point almost to Glenfeliz Boulevard to the north. Southbound and northbound Glendale Boulevard roadways extend on either side of both the merge point and the median. The existing sidewalks on either side of Hyperion Avenue terminate at the merge point and force pedestrians to cross either northbound or southbound Glendale Boulevard traffic without benefit of a designated cross walk against Glendale Boulevard traffic, which generally travels at a high rate of speed.

The existing pedestrian facilities on both northbound and southbound Glendale Boulevard viaducts over the Los Angeles River are approximately 3.5 to 4-foot-wide sidewalks. These extremely narrow sidewalks are inadequate, and expose pedestrians travelling this section of either side of Glendale Boulevard to safety hazards caused by high-speed vehicular traffic.

There are two staircases within the project area where pedestrians can access Hyperion Avenue and Glendale Boulevard. One, which connects Glendale Boulevard and Hyperion Avenue, is located on the west side of Hyperion Avenue. A second staircase provides pedestrian access.
between Riverside Drive and Hyperion Avenue, and is also on the west side of Hyperion Avenue.

1.2.2.3 I-5 Ramp Deficiencies

The northbound I-5 off-ramp to Glendale Boulevard is configured for a right turn only onto northbound Glendale Boulevard. Under the current ramp configuration, vehicles exiting I-5 are confronted with a semi-blind right turn onto Glendale Boulevard and are obscured from the view of northbound motorists (approaching from the south). As shown in Table 1-1, the total actual accident rates along southbound I-5 and the northbound I-5 off-ramp to Glendale Boulevard are above the statewide average accident rates for similar facilities. Northbound I-5 and the northbound on-ramp from Glendale Boulevard are both below the statewide average accident rates for similar facilities.

In addition, motorists exiting northbound I-5 at this location wishing to travel south on Glendale Boulevard must first travel north on Glendale Boulevard, weave across up to three lanes of traffic beyond the Hyperion Avenue merge point but before the intersection of Glendale Boulevard with Glenfeliz Boulevard (a distance of approximately 400 feet). The motorists must then execute a U-turn at Glenfeliz Boulevard to connect with southbound Glendale Boulevard. These maneuvers introduce a high level of operational inefficiency throughout the involved segment.

### Table 1-1: Actual and Statewide Average Accident Rates for I-5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Statewide Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fatal</td>
<td>Fatal + Injury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NB Off-Ramp to Glendale Blvd</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Acc/MV)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NB On-Ramp from Glendale Blvd</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Acc/MV)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Acc/MVM: Accidents Per Million Vehicle Miles  
Acc/MV: Accidents Per Million Vehicles  

1.2.3 Independent Utility and Logical Termini

The proposed project is deemed to have independent utility and would meet logical termini requirements. Independent utility refers to the project’s ability to independently function without additional transportation improvements in the area. Logical termini for a project development are defined as (1) rational end points for a transportation improvement, and (2) rational end points for a review of the environmental impacts.

The project would improve a functionally obsolete bridge that traverses a major freeway (I-5) and the Los Angeles River, as well as seismically strengthen the viaduct complex to meet current...
seismic standards. The project would also reconfigure the northbound I-5 off-ramp to Glendale Boulevard and install a new signalized intersection. The new signalized intersection would permit exiting northbound motorists to make left turns directly onto southbound Glendale Boulevard and eliminate the need to first travel north to execute U-turns at Glenfeliz Boulevard. The project has independent utility because it would correct current seismic and design deficiencies, and would improve the operational efficiency of a defined structure along an existing roadway without the need for additional improvements in the area. The defined structure, the viaduct complex, is bounded by Ettrick Street on the southwest and Glenfeliz Boulevard on the northeast. These points serve as logical termini, based on the project features to meet the purpose and need.

1.3 Project Description and Alternatives

This section describes the proposed action and the design alternatives that were developed by the City to achieve the project purpose and need while avoiding or minimizing environmental impacts. The alternatives are the Proposed Action, No-Build Alternative, Transportation System Management/Transportation Demand Management Alternative, and five other Build Alternatives considered but withdrawn from further discussion.

Each alternative was evaluated based on its ability to meet project’s purpose and need objectives, ability to avoid or substantially lessen significant impacts or result in minimum environmental impacts, costs, and implementation feasibility. The Proposed Action is considered most viable after careful evaluation and meets the described criteria for evaluation.

Design Options

In response to public comments received during the review period, the project has been revised to add bicycle lanes\(^2\) to the roadway of the Hyperion Avenue Viaduct (comprising three structures: Caltrans bridge numbers 53C-1882, 53-1069, and 53C-1881) as a design option. The bike lanes would be created by means of striping and symbols painted on the paved roadway. The addition of bicycle lanes will not involve any change to any of the historic features of the viaduct nor affect those features in any way. The viaduct (aka “bridge”) will not be widened. The approaches will not be widened. The space for the bike lanes will be accommodated by adjusting the width (or possibly the number) of the traffic lanes and/or adjusting the width of the median of the roadway. The environmental assessment (Sec. 1.3) describes the proposed roadway of the viaduct as having two 12-foot lanes, two 14-foot lanes, a 7-foot median and a 7-8-foot sidewalk along most of the viaduct length, all narrowing under the Waverly Drive Bridge (Caltrans bridge number 53C-1179). For the design option, various configurations are being considered; no decision has been made on which configuration to adopt. One preliminary, possible configuration could include 5-foot bike lanes, 11-foot traffic lanes, a 5-foot sidewalk and a 4-foot median for most of the bridge length, all narrowing under the Waverly Drive Bridge. Appendix K shows three possible configurations under consideration; other configurations may also be considered.

\(^2\) Bicycle facilities are defined in the City’s 2010 Bicycle Plan, a component of the Transportation Element of the General Plan. A “bicycle lane” (aka “bike lane”) is defined as “a striped lane for one-way bicycle travel on a street or highway.” Caltrans refers to this facility as a “Class II bikeway.” Striping, other pavement markings, and signage on City bike lanes follow the Caltrans Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices.
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While the exact configuration has not yet been decided (the City is collaborating with a citizens’ advisory committee to develop the final configuration), the City has committed to including the bike lanes without any widening of the viaduct or changes to the design of the new barriers (aka “bridge railings”). No change to any historic features would be required under any configuration. The inclusion of bike lanes will not affect the ability of Caltrans to comply with any of the stipulations agreed to by Caltrans and the SHPO in the executed memorandum of agreement (MOA), prepared in compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, for this project.

The addition of bike lanes will not require widening or other structural changes to the viaduct or the approaches. The addition of the bike lanes will not require additional safety features that could affect the historic integrity or significance of the viaduct or the stipulations of the MOA.

The Proposed Action with design options including bicycle lanes is the preferred alternative.

1.3.1 Proposed Action

The viaduct complex spans both I-5 and the Los Angeles River in the Northeast Los Angeles Community Planning Area of the City. The Proposed Action would modify the viaduct complex to address safety and operational deficiencies, pedestrian safety issues, and current seismic deficiencies. These efforts would be sufficient to remove the viaduct complex from the HBP EBL. In addition, the proposed project would restore original design details to the railings, and eliminate an existing sight-line hazard associated with the I-5 off-ramp. The current funding amount scheduled to complete the bridge improvement is approximately $35,595,000. The following descriptions of proposed improvements are organized by the components that comprise the viaduct complex. An overview of the project footprint is provided in Figure 1-3.

1.3.1.1 Hyperion Avenue from south of Waverly Drive to Glendale Boulevard

Modifications to this section of the viaduct complex would occur to the three Hyperion Avenue Bridges (53C-1881, 53C-1882, & 53-1069) and would include the following:

Sidewalk and Curb – East Side. The existing 2-foot curb along the east side of Hyperion Avenue (adjacent to the retaining wall beneath the Waverly Drive Bridge) and the 5-foot sidewalk along the east side of Hyperion Avenue (north of the retaining wall) would be eliminated, and a concrete crash barrier would be placed along the rails. Figure 1-4 below shows a typical cross-section for this portion of Hyperion Avenue.

Sidewalk and Curb – West Side. The existing 5-foot-wide sidewalk along the west side of the Hyperion Avenue Bridge and the 2-foot-wide curb adjacent to the retaining wall beneath Waverly Drive would be replaced with a new 8-foot-wide sidewalk (north of the retaining wall) that tapers from eight feet to four feet adjacent to the retaining wall (at approximately the point where the staircase from Riverside Drive meets Hyperion Avenue). This 4-foot-wide section of the sidewalk against the retaining wall would be about 1 foot high (above the roadway). North of the retaining wall, tubular railing atop a concrete safety barrier would be constructed between the widened sidewalk and the southbound traffic lanes to provide a physical barrier between vehicular traffic and the sidewalk for increased pedestrian safety (see Figure 1-4 for the cross sectional drawing).
Pedestrian Crossing. At the north end of the viaduct complex, a pedestrian crosswalk extended from the improved sidewalk along the west side of Hyperion Avenue to the west side of Glendale Boulevard (across southbound traffic on Glendale Boulevard) would be constructed (see Figure 3B above).

Hyperion Avenue Center Divider. The existing striped center divider along Hyperion Avenue on the viaduct complex would be replaced with a median barrier to physically separate northbound and southbound travel lanes in order to prevent cross-over accidents.

Traffic Lane Restriping. The proposed project would not include the addition of traffic lanes along the Hyperion Avenue segment of the viaduct complex. Rather, the existing four travel lanes would be retained and restriped to provide a new configuration of 12-foot-wide inner lanes and 14-foot-wide curb lanes along both travel directions of Hyperion Avenue.

Bridge Rail Replacement. The existing railings along the Hyperion Avenue and Glendale Boulevard viaducts, as well as the Waverly Bridge, were originally balustrades, but were covered with gunnite in 1962 and now have a solid appearance. There have been several accidents along Hyperion Avenue on the viaduct complex whereby vehicles have collided into the rails and have damaged the rails and covering. At one location, a loose original baluster can be seen through a hole in the concrete rail cover (Photograph 2).

The existing concrete coverings also make it more difficult to assess the integrity of the balustrade structures. The City identified an as-built plan sheet (from a 1962 repair project), which provides the detail for how the rail coverings were applied. According to this plan sheet, the sides of the top rails were broken away, presumably to provide better bonding of the reinforced gunnite covering. Inset 1 below shows the applicable portion of the as-built plan sheet for the repair project. The railings were also considered to be partially deficient due to deterioration and damage caused by collisions with vehicles.

Inset 1: Balustrade Structures As-Built
The proposed project would restore the viaduct complex’s railings to their original design, including the open balustrades, similar to those along the median at the north end. (see Photograph 3).

Street Lighting. Construction of the replica balustrades would require work on the current pedestals on which lamp posts are mounted, which would necessitate the temporary removal of the existing lighting along the bridge. The existing posts would be carefully removed, stored, refurbished, and reused. Lighting fixtures would most likely be replaced with new LED Fixtures that meet the City’s currently adopted lighting standards (the Illuminating Engineering Society of North America RP-8-00) (D. Nguyen, personal communication, October 5, 2007). Additional replica posts and fixtures could be added, if necessary, to meet the City’s lighting standards.
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1.3.1.2 Waverly Drive Bridge
Bridge Rail Replacement. The existing covered railings along the Waverly Drive Bridge over Hyperion Avenue would be replaced with new balustrades that more closely follow the original design (Photograph 3).

1.3.1.3 Northbound Glendale Boulevard Bridge over the Los Angeles River
Bridge Widening. The Northbound Glendale Boulevard Bridge (53C-1884) over the Los Angeles River would be widened by eight feet by extending the deck and pier supports to the southeast. This would provide room for a widened sidewalk and curb lane, as well as the addition of a curbside shoulder. The shoulder would facilitate a bicycle route as a transportation element in the 2010 Bicycle Plan. No additional travel lanes would be added. The existing abutments would be removed and reconstructed approximately eight feet to the east. Photograph 4 shows the existing piers and abutments (including the northern-most pylon), as well as the bicycle path along the Los Angeles River. As part of the bridge widening, the existing decorative pylons at either end of the bridge would be carefully removed and repositioned (CLA, 2007b). The bridge widening would require tapering of the new bridge width to the current roadway width just north of the bridge. This would utilize a small portion (approximately 90 square feet) of a landscaped median in the Glendale Boulevard right-of-way.

Bridge Rail Replacement. The existing covered railing system (shown in Photograph 4) would be removed and replaced with railings that replicate the original design. The bronze, pedestal-mounted light poles would be carefully removed, stored, and re-mounted on restored pedestals as part of the restored railing system. The replacement replica balustrade along northbound Glendale Boulevard would utilize the original balustrade design (see Photograph 3 above) but with spacing adjustments between the balusters to reflect current safety requirements. (The

Photograph 4: Northbound Glendale Boulevard over the Los Angeles River

2 The landscaped median has been named “Red Car River Park” by the Friends of Atwater Village, but it is not an official park or recreation area, being entirely within the street right-of-way.
maximum center-to-center balustrade spacing would be up to 11.5 inches and would not allow a 6-inch diameter sphere to pass through.)

**New Bike Path Access.** A portion of the Los Angeles River Bikeway passes beneath the viaduct complex. Access to the bikeway is available from southbound Glendale Boulevard but not northbound Glendale Boulevard. The proposed project would construct a new access to the Los Angeles River bike path from northbound Glendale Boulevard, just south of the widened bridge.

**Traffic Lane Restriping.** The travel lanes would be restriped to accommodate a 6-foot shoulder and 5-foot 5-inch clear sidewalk.

### 1.3.1.4 Southbound Glendale Boulevard Bridge over the Los Angeles River

**Bridge Widening.** The southbound Glendale Boulevard Bridge (53C-1883) over the Los Angeles River would be widened by eight feet by extending the deck and supports to the northwest. This would provide room for a widened sidewalk and curb lane plus the addition of a curbside shoulder. The shoulder would facilitate a bicycle route as a transportation element in the 2010 Bicycle Plan. No additional travel lanes would be added. Figure 1-5 shows a cross section of southbound Glendale Boulevard. The existing piers would be extended northwestward to support the widened deck. The existing abutments would be extended approximately eight feet to the northwest. Photograph 5 below shows the existing piers and abutments (including the northern-most pylon), as well as the Los Angeles River. As part of the bridge widening, the existing pylons at either end of the bridge would be carefully removed and repositioned at the end of the new railing. Pylons would be reinstalled in the same configuration the railing and roadway as they currently exist.

**Bridge Rail Replacement.** The existing covered railing system (shown in Photograph 5) would be removed and replaced with railings that replicate the original design. The bronze, pedestal-mounted light poles would be carefully removed, stored, and re-mounted on restored pedestals as part of the restored railing system. The replacement replica balustrades along the southbound Glendale Boulevard Bridge (see Photograph 5) would utilize the original design (see Photograph 3 above) but with spacing adjustments between the balusters to reflect current safety requirements (the maximum center-to-center balustrade spacing would be up to 11.5 inches and would not allow a 6-inch diameter sphere to pass through).

**Southbound to Northbound Turn-Around.** The turn-around beneath the Hyperion Bridge that allows cars traveling southbound on Glendale Boulevard to turn around and travel northbound on Glendale Boulevard would remain in its current configuration.

**Traffic Lane Restriping.** The southbound Glendale Boulevard viaduct would be restriped to accommodate a 6-foot shoulder and 5-foot 5-inch clear sidewalk.
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1-5 On-Ramp Modifications. The existing northbound on-ramp approach to the I-5 from southbound Glendale Boulevard would be slightly realigned southward (see Figure 1-3B) to correspond with the traffic lane restriping along the widened southbound Glendale Boulevard bridge (over the Los Angeles River). Photograph 6 below shows the existing on-ramp.

1.3.1.5 Seismic Improvements
Seismic improvements would primarily involve strengthening improvements to the substructure elements of the viaduct complex. Four categories of seismic retrofits would occur, and are described below. Figure 1-6 illustrates the overall proposed seismic retrofit plan that shows the location and type of seismic retrofit along the viaduct complex.

**Abutment Transverse Wall Shear Friction Retrofit.** This work would involve the addition of concrete bolsters between the abutment walls and abutment footing, which is below ground. This retrofit would require excavation along one side of each abutment to provide access to the footing. The bolster would then be installed along the base of the abutment and footing to strengthen the connection. Inset 2 shows typical details for this work and illustrates the strengthened wall-footing connection. Once the concrete bolsters are constructed, the excavation would be filled and the retrofit would be entirely buried.

Inset 2: Abutment Transverse Wall Retrofit Details
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Spandrel Column Ductility Retrofit. The section of the viaduct complex over I-5 is supported by two arched spans with an open spandrel design (see Figure 1-6). The deck above is supported by both spandrel columns and spandrel walls. Seismic strengthening of the spandrel columns would involve wrapping the existing spandrel columns with a carbon-epoxy fiber wrap. Once the columns have been wrapped, a layer of concrete, similar in texture and color, would be applied. Inset 3 shows typical details for this work.

Inset 3: Spandrel Column Ductility Retrofit Details
Interior Spandrel Wall Strengthening. For the two arched spans over I-5, spandrel walls instead of columns are used to support the deck (above the arches). The seismic retrofit of the spandrel walls would involve the addition of concrete bolsters along one side of each spandrel wall (between the top of the arch and the deck) to increase the strength of the deck-arch connection. The bolsters would be constructed only on the interior faces of the walls so they would be mostly hidden from view. Inset 4 shows typical details for this work.

Inset 4: Spandrel Wall Retrofit (Bolster) Details
Pier Wall Channel Lining Retrofit. This work would involve cutting the existing channel lining so that the piers would be free to move during an earthquake, which would prevent damage to the base of the piers. An inclined saw cut would be placed parallel to the pier wall so that when the pier wall moves back and forth the channel lining would not restrict the movement. Inset 5 shows typical details for this work.

Inset 5: Pier Wall Channel Lining Retrofit
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1.3.1.7 I-5 Off-Ramp Reconfiguration
The existing I-5 northbound off-ramp to Glendale Boulevard would be realigned southward to connect with northbound Glendale Boulevard south of its current terminus (see Figure 1-3B). This realignment would improve the sight distance and operational safety issues faced by motorists exiting northbound I-5 at this location. In addition, the realigned off-ramp would be signalized and permit exiting northbound motorists to make left turns directly onto southbound Glendale Boulevard, eliminating the need to first travel north to execute U-turns at Glenfeliz Boulevard. The exact signal configuration has not been determined but would be designed and implemented in accordance with City and Caltrans requirements. After the ramp reconfiguration, the former ramp area would be landscaped. The signalized intersection would also provide a controlled pedestrian crossing across Glendale Boulevard, which would facilitate pedestrian access to Hyperion Avenue via the staircase (Photograph 7) from Glendale Boulevard (along the west side of the viaduct complex).
1.3.1.8 Infiltration/Detention Basin
A detention/infiltration basin will be constructed just northwest of the viaduct complex as a permanent water quality best management practice (BMP) for purposes of controlling runoff from the viaduct complex. This area is currently part of the Caltrans I-5 Right-of-Way. Under agreement with Caltrans, the Contractor will utilize this area as a staging area prior to construction of the permanent basin. Hyperion Avenue storm water and a portion of the Glendale Boulevard (northbound and southbound) storm water in the vicinity of the basin will be directed into the basin in order to detain, infiltrate and treat a portion of it. The basin would provide detention and infiltration as a pre-treatment of stormwater prior to river discharge. It would be provided with metered drainage to prevent insect vector issues as well as provide for emergency overflow into the river as protection for adjacent transportation. This BMP will meet the City goals of not increasing net discharge and provide for improved treatment associated with the first flush of storm water. Several trees would be removed to construct the basin, and new trees and ground cover would be planted after contractor demobilization.

The basin will also be integrated into the proposed Sunnynook Park, which is scheduled for construction in 2012 west of Glendale Boulevard, east of I-5, west of the Los Angeles River and south of the Sunnynook Pedestrian Bridge upstream of the project site. A perimeter path leads up to the basin, which has been shown as part of the Sunnynook Park project.

1.3.1.9 Project Construction

The Sunnynook River Park is a separate proposed project located in the vicinity of the proposed project. Refer to Table 1-4: Related Projects, for more information.
Project construction is expected to start in the summer of 2014 or later and occur over 2.5 years. Project components would be constructed in a phased manner that would maintain vehicular traffic and access on Hyperion Avenue and Glendale Boulevard (northbound and southbound) at all times (CLA, 2007b). The contractor would utilize staging areas to store equipment and supplies either within the construction work zone or at a nearby area such as the Caltrans right-of-way between I-5 and the Los Angeles River just northwest of the viaduct complex. Towards the end of construction, when that area is no longer required as a staging area, it would be excavated and the detention/infiltration basin, as described in Section 1.3.1.8, would be installed.

The contractor would be required to comply with all applicable rules, regulations, and standard specifications. Imported fill would not be required. In addition, construction would occur with an exemption from the Bureau’s Special Order #01-0406 for implementing the Mayor’s Executive Directive No. 2 (BOE, 2006) that sets requirements for rush hour construction on City streets. Further information on this directive is provided in Section 2.4.3.

In addition to the overall construction descriptions below, further construction phasing details are provided in the discussion of temporary traffic effects in Section 2.4.3.

**Construction along Hyperion Avenue**

Prior to construction and demolition work along the Hyperion Avenue structures, protective barriers would be constructed along the exterior of the viaduct complex to contain any debris, tools, or other materials that could fall on sidewalks, roadways, the river, or other property below. The protective barriers would be constructed of timber and plywood (similar to falsework), or other equally effective material. The protective barriers could require placement at night for up to two days at each location to minimize disruptions along thoroughfares such as Riverside Drive and I-5. Once the protective barriers are in place, construction of the improvements would begin.

While the railing replacement and the sidewalk work are occurring along Hyperion Avenue, temporary pedestrian detours around work zones would be established. In addition, a center work zone would be phased for median construction in Hyperion Avenue. At least one travel lane in each direction would be maintained at all times. K-rails would be utilized to protect the temporary pedestrian walkways and work zones from traffic.

**Construction along the Glendale Boulevard Bridges**

Prior to construction and demolition work along the Glendale Boulevard bridges, protective barriers would be constructed along the bridge exteriors to contain any debris, tools, or other materials that could fall into the river below or into the work zone established in the river channel.

During widening of the northbound and southbound Glendale Boulevard bridges, one of the two travel lanes on each structure would be converted to work zones, which would be physically separated from the remaining travel lane (most likely with K-rails). At least one travel lane along each bridge would be maintained at all times. Pedestrian access along both bridges during construction would likely have to be temporarily prohibited, and detoured around the work area.

During pier and abutment construction, a work zone would also be established in the river in the immediate area of the piers or abutments. This section of the river bottom is concrete-covered, and the work area would be confined to the concrete pad so as to not physically disturb the unlined portions of the river upstream or downstream of the viaduct complex. Flow within the river would be diverted around the work area. Piles would be installed by augering holes, inserting support sleeves and/or reinforcing cages, and filling the drilled holes with concrete.
Appropriate BMPs would be utilized. The bridge work would require intermittent closure of the existing bikeway underneath the bridge for the safety of bicyclists.

**Construction of the Northbound I-5 Off-Ramp Realignment**

The reconfiguration of the northbound I-5 off-ramp at Glendale Boulevard would be prioritized to occur in the first phase to allow left-turns to southbound Glendale Boulevard, which would minimize vehicular travel on Glendale Boulevard during construction of the other project components.

During construction of the realigned northbound I-5 off-ramp approach to northbound Glendale Boulevard, the existing off-ramp would be kept operational. The realigned portion of the off-ramp would first be constructed and then connected to the freeway exit during off-peak hours. A short-term overnight ramp closure may be required during the actual connection process. Realignment of the I-5 off-ramp would be phased with widening of the northbound Glendale Boulevard Bridge. Following the off-ramp realignment, the former off-ramp would be removed. A new access to the Los Angeles River bike path from northbound Glendale Boulevard would also be constructed and the area would be landscaped.

**Construction of Seismic Retrofits**

Seismic retrofit work involving the bridge abutments, columns, and piers would also be accomplished in a staged manner within established work zones to ensure that vehicular traffic (i.e. along Riverside Drive and I-5), pedestrian traffic, and bikeway traffic (along the Los Angeles River) would be safely maintained.

**1.3.1.10 Pedestrian Overcrossing across the Los Angeles River**

In the interest of reducing construction duration to minimize impacts and due to width restrictions during the widening construction phase, it is anticipated that both the NB and SB Glendale Boulevard bridges would be widened in a single phase. To provide adequate construction area for the contractor to perform the widening, pedestrian traffic would be excluded from both sides of both bridges. As a mitigation measure for this impact upon pedestrian transportation, the City would construct an alternate pedestrian crossing over the Los Angeles River across the existing Red Car piers (downstream of the viaduct complex) to connect the bike path along the southwest side of the Los Angeles River with Glendale Boulevard on the southeast side of the river. The pedestrian crossing, in conjunction with the new access to the Los Angeles River bikeway from northbound Glendale Boulevard, would provide a detour route around the Glendale Boulevard bridges during construction. In order for this measure to serve as an effective detour for pedestrians, the pedestrian crossing and the new access to the bike path would have to be fully constructed and operational before commencing the widening of the Glendale Boulevard bridges.

The Atwater Village and Silver Lake neighborhood councils have requested a pedestrian crossing over the Los Angeles River at this location during meetings and hearings on this Project. This crossing would provide an alternate, motorized-vehicle free access to the River, and encourage people from the residential community on the northeast side of the River to come to the existing bike path on the west bank and to the new Sunnynook River Park. It would also encourage environmental education of the public by bringing non-motorized users to the river resources.
As a result, the City has committed to an upgrade from a temporary pedestrian bridge, as required for construction mitigation, to a permanent pedestrian facility, including meeting City lighting criteria. A pedestrian path would be installed to join the northeast touchdown of the crossing and the northbound Glendale Boulevard sidewalk.

1.3.2 No Build Alternative

Under the No Build Alternative, no improvements to the viaduct complex would be undertaken, including seismic retrofit/rehabilitation. The existing viaduct complex would remain seismically deficient and remain vulnerable to earthquake-induced forces, deformations, and possible failures. In the event of an earthquake, the existing structures would continue to pose a level of hazard to the public using the viaduct complex that is greater than would be the case for a structure rehabilitated to current seismic performance standards. The No Build Alternative would not meet the project purpose and need, as discussed in Section 1.2. Although the No Build Alternative would not meet the project objectives, it is being evaluated in this joint environmental document because it is required under CEQA and NEPA. Under CEQA, the No Build Alternative is equivalent to the No Project Alternative. Under NEPA, the No Build Alternative reflects the No Federal Action alternative.

1.3.3 Alternatives Considered but Eliminated from Further Discussion

In addition to the project alternatives described above, other alternatives were considered and withdrawn from further consideration because they would:

- Fail to meet the project’s purpose and need objectives.
- Result in greater environmental impacts than the proposed project.
- Fail to avoid or substantially lessen the significant impacts of the proposed project.

These alternatives are summarized in Table 1-2, Summary and Comparison of Alternatives. These other alternatives were withdrawn from further consideration. Table 1-2 also includes the Build Alternatives and the No Build Alternative for comparison purposes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1-2: Summary and Comparison of Alternatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alternative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build Alternative 1:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build Alternative 2:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build Alternative 3:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build Alternative 4:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build Alternative 5:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Build Alternative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation System Management</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 1-2: Summary and Comparison of Alternatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Meets Purpose and Need?</th>
<th>Impacts?</th>
<th>Advantages and Disadvantages</th>
<th>Cost?</th>
<th>Carried Forward?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Build Alternative 1 – Seismic Retrofit Only</td>
<td>not remove the viaduct complex from the EBL.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build Alternative 2 – Viaduct Widening by 44 Feet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The No Build Alternative is being carried forward for further consideration as required by the California Environmental Quality Act (No Project alternative) and the National Environmental Policy Act (No Federal Action alternative).*

#### 1.3.3.1 Build Alternative 1 – Seismic Retrofit Only

Build Alternative 1 – Seismic Retrofit Only would sufficiently strengthen the existing viaduct complex to meet current seismic performance standards. This alternative would not remove the complex from the HBP EBL, but would only implement the seismic retrofit improvements previously described in Section 1.3.1.1.5 (the proposed project’s seismic improvements). Aside from seismic improvement, no other improvements would be provided. The seismically retrofitted bridge structures would retain their current geometric configuration.

The widening of the Glendale Boulevard bridges over the Los Angeles River, enhanced pedestrian and traffic safety improvements, replacement replica balustrades, and new access to the Los Angeles River bike path from northbound Glendale Boulevard would not be implemented. Under this alternative, existing covered rails and other altered architectural design features would not be restored. Moreover, existing traffic hazards to pedestrians that walk along the 2-foot curbs adjacent to the retaining walls near Waverly Drive (along Hyperion Avenue) would remain.

Build Alternative 1 would not meet the project goal of removing the viaduct complex from the EBL under the HBP, but would bring the viaduct complex up to current seismic standards. In addition, Build Alternative 1 would not include the reconfiguration of the northbound I-5 off-ramp to Glendale Boulevard and would not improve the operational efficiency of the viaduct complex.

Construction would require approximately one-year. The total cost for Build Alternative 1 is estimated to be approximately $5.5 million. The funding source for Build Alternative 1 would be State Seismic Retrofit funds.

#### 1.3.3.2 Build Alternative 2 – Viaduct Widening by 44 Feet

Build Alternative 2 – Viaduct Widening by 44 Feet would widen the viaduct structures along Hyperion Avenue by 44 feet and the Glendale Boulevard bridges by 24 feet. This alternative would add four lanes to Hyperion Avenue (two lanes in each direction) and one additional lane each along the southbound Glendale Boulevard Bridge (over the Los Angeles River) and the northbound Glendale Boulevard Bridge.

Build Alternative 2 would require the acquisition of right-of-way on either side of the existing viaduct complex, including a strip of the greenscape to the east of the viaduct complex’s northern end, which is now designated as Red Car River Park. In addition, this alternative would require...
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The Waverly Diver Bridge to be removed and replaced with a wider bridge. This alternative would cost an estimated $95 million dollars (2005 dollars) and require approximately four years for construction.

This alternative would also result in substantial loss of the viaduct complex’s historic fabric.

As part of the public coordination process, Build Alternative 2 was presented to Atwater Village, Silver Lake, and other stakeholders in 2002, and the stakeholders expressed opposition to it. Due to the high level of potential impacts during construction, the extent of potential loss of historic fabric, the high cost, and lack of community support, Build Alternative 2 was withdrawn from further consideration as a viable project alternative.

1.3.3.3 Build Alternative 3 - Viaduct Widening by 24 Feet

Build Alternative 3 – Viaduct Widening by 24 Feet would widen the viaduct structures along Hyperion Avenue by 24 feet and the Glendale Boulevard bridges by 16 feet. This alternative would include full standard shoulders and full standard sidewalks on both sides, and full standard median in the center of the Hyperion Avenue structure. No lanes would be added as part of this alternative. Standard shoulders and sidewalk would also be added to both Glendale Boulevard Bridges.

Build Alternative 3 would also require the acquisition of right-of-way on either side of the existing viaduct complex, including the greenscape to the east of the viaduct complex, which was designated as Red Car River Park. This alternative would also require demolition and replacement of the Waverly Bridge structure with a wider structure. This alternative would cost an estimated $60 million dollars (2005 dollars) and be constructed over approximately four years.

This alternative would also result in substantial loss of the viaduct complex’s historic fabric.

As part of the public coordination process, Build Alternative 3 was presented to Atwater Village, Silver Lake, and other stakeholders in 2002, and, as with Build Alternative 2, the stakeholders were decisively opposed to it. Opponents cited the high level of potential impacts during construction, and the associated loss of historic fabric. In consideration of this proposal’s high cost and lack of community support, Build Alternative 3 was eliminated from further consideration as a viable project alternative.

1.3.3.4 Build Alternative 4 – New Bridge at Existing Location

Build Alternative 4 – New Bridge at the Existing Location would require complete demolition of the existing viaduct complex and construction of an entirely a new bridge at the same location. The new bridge provided by Build Alternative 4 would meet current standards for seismic performance and geometric design. Build Alternative 4 would result in construction-related impacts substantially greater than those of the other Build Alternatives because the viaduct complex is one of four key thoroughfares that cross the Los Angeles River in the extended project vicinity (the other three are Fletcher Drive, SR-2 or the Glendale Freeway, and Los Feliz Boulevard). This alternative would require the complete closure of the viaduct complex for an extended period of time, which would result in substantial impacts to commuters and the local circulation system during construction. In addition, this alternative would result in substantial economic impact to local businesses along Glendale Boulevard and Hyperion Avenue. Furthermore, Build Alternative 4 would result in the complete demolition of the historic viaduct complex, which is eligible for listing in the NRHP and is a City Historic-Cultural Monument.
The total cost for Build Alternative 4 is estimated to be in excess of $140 million (2005 dollars). Build Alternative 4 was withdrawn from further consideration because it would have the greatest adverse effect on the historic resource, resulting from the demolition of the entire viaduct complex, and because the costs and other environmental impacts for this alternative would be substantially greater that other build alternatives.

1.3.3.5 Build Alternative 5 – New Bridge at New Location

Build Alternative 5 – New Bridge at a New Location would provide a replacement bridge for the existing viaduct complex, on either side of the viaduct complex. The existing viaduct complex would remain in place and retain its historic fabric, but would not be seismically improved. Moreover, Build alternative 5 would not cure the design or seismic defects of the existing viaduct complex.

Build Alternative 5 was briefly considered but withdrawn from further consideration because it was not considered to be a prudent and feasible alternative. Moreover, this alternative would require extensive right-of-way acquisition and reconfiguration of the entire street system at both ends of the viaduct complex, because there are other more viable and realistic alternatives that could be implemented, because the existing seismic concerns with the existing viaduct complex would not be addressed, and because of the high the level of anticipated environmental impacts and cost.

1.3.3.6 Transportation Systems Management (TSM) and Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Alternative

Because the Project is intended to bring the existing viaduct complex into compliance with current design and seismic performance/safety standards, rather than increase the volumetric flow of traffic by capacity enhancement or operational efficiency, implementation of a TSM and TDM Alternative would not address the purpose and need of the proposed project. TSM and TDM are not considered viable because they cannot resolve the current physical design or geometric deficiencies and reduce the vulnerability of the viaduct complex in case of major earthquake events.
### 1.4 Permits and Approvals Needed

Table 1-3 below contains a list of agency approvals that will be required for the proposed project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Permit/Approval</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cal. Department of Transportation</td>
<td>Encroachment Permit for viaduct construction (seismic) over I-5, construction of BMP infiltration basin in I-5 Right-of-Way, new bike path access ramp utilizing existing northbound I-5 off-ramp and permit/design/construction approval for reconfiguration of the northbound I-5 off-ramp at Glendale Boulevard.</td>
<td>To be implemented during design and construction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cal. Department of Fish and Wildlife</td>
<td>Streambed Alteration Agreement</td>
<td>To be obtained prior to construction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LARWQCB</td>
<td>Permit approval under the General Construction Activities Stormwater Permit. Clean Water Act water quality certification.</td>
<td>To be obtained prior to construction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Army Corps of Engineers</td>
<td>Clean Water Act Permit for discharge of dredged or fill material, Permit to construct access ramp(s) in the Los Angeles River channel, Permit to construct pedestrian bridge over Los Angeles River, Approval of water diversion plan.</td>
<td>To be obtained prior to construction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHPO/ACHP</td>
<td>Concurrence with HPSR and Findings of Effect documents; Approval of the Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) MOA between Caltrans and SHPO was executed October 30, 2012.</td>
<td>MOA between Caltrans and SHPO was executed October 30, 2012.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of Los Angeles, Department of Public Works</td>
<td>Approval to enter and work in the Los Angeles River. Permit to construct pedestrian bridge over Los Angeles River and easement in the Flood Control District.</td>
<td>To be obtained prior to construction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Los Angeles, Department of Transportation</td>
<td>Approval of work area traffic control plan (traffic management plan), lane closures, and establishment of traffic control and safety measures</td>
<td>To be established during project design or prior to construction, and implemented during construction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Los Angeles, Bureau of Sanitation</td>
<td>Permit to discharge treated extracted groundwater to the sewer system.</td>
<td>To be implemented during construction, if necessary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Los Angeles, Board of Public Works</td>
<td>Permit to perform work or affect a traffic lane closure during peak traffic hours, including possible exemption from related prohibitions (Mayor’s Directive No. 2).</td>
<td>To be implemented prior to construction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Los Angeles, Police Commission</td>
<td>Permit to perform limited night construction</td>
<td>To be obtained prior to construction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Los Angeles, Department of Water and Power</td>
<td>Approval of temporary easement for off-ramp realignment construction</td>
<td>To be obtained prior to construction.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.5 Related Projects

The City has identified several approved or proposed projects within the vicinity of the proposed project that could contribute to cumulative impacts. These projects are listed in Table 1-4. Other development projects are planned for the project area; however, these projects would occur on private parcels and would not physically affect the street system in the project vicinity. Traffic from the development projects is accounted for in the traffic growth factor used to project future traffic in the project area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project &amp; Location</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Project Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Silver Lake Reservoir Complex Storage Replacement Project</td>
<td>The Silver Lake Reservoir Complex Storage Replacement Project would remove Silver Lake and Ivanhoe reservoirs from direct service to the LADWP water distribution system. Water storage currently provided by the Silver Lake Reservoir Complex (SLRC) would be replaced by a 110-million-gallon (MG) buried storage reservoir at the former Headworks Spreading Grounds (HWSG site). The new storage reservoir would be accompanied by water conveyance facilities and a 4-megawatt (MW) hydroelectric power generating facility at the HWSG site to capture energy from the water pressure coming into the reservoir. A regulating station at the SLRC and a new bypass pipeline around the reservoir complex would convey water delivery flow to existing service areas, and Silver Lake and Ivanhoe reservoirs would cease to be operated as drinking water storage facilities. The bypass pipeline is the portion of this project that would be located in the vicinity of the proposed project. The bypass pipeline will extend along West Silver Lake Drive from Armstrong to below the reservoir. It will be jacked from the following 3 pits: 1) Ivanhoe/Armstrong, 2) West Silver Lake near the curve, and 3) terminus at the south end of the SLRC. (R. Pendergrass, personal communication, March 22, 2007)</td>
<td>Construction of the Bypass pipeline is currently scheduled to start on 1/2012 and end by 11/29/2013.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles River Revitalization Master Plan</td>
<td>The Los Angeles River Revitalization Master Plan is a 20-year blueprint for development and management of the Los Angeles River. Objectives of the plan include the establishment of environmentally sensitive urban design guidelines, land use guidelines, and development guidelines for the river zone that will create economic development opportunities to enhance and improve river-adjacent communities by providing open space, housing, retail spaces such as restaurants and cafes, educational facilities, and places for other public institutions.</td>
<td>The plan was adopted by City Council in 2007.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunnynook River Park</td>
<td>The Sunnynook River Park is a priority project of the Los Angeles River Revitalization Master Plan. It is a multi-benefit project that will create a greenway/infiltration park in a 5-acre area along the existing bike path on the west side of the Los Angeles River. The area will serve as a rest area for pedestrians and cyclists, be landscaped with native vegetation and include picnic areas, benches, educational signage and art.</td>
<td>Construction is scheduled to begin in May 2012 and will last 6 months.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As part of the scoping and environmental analysis conducted for the project, the following environmental issues were considered but no adverse impacts were identified. Consequently, there is no further discussion regarding these issues in this document.

- **Sole Source Aquifers** – No sole source aquifers are located in the project area.
- **Coastal Zone** – The project site is inland near the Los Angeles civic center, and is not located in an area covered by the California Coastal Zone Management Plan.
- **Wild and Scenic Rivers** – No wild or scenic rivers are located in the vicinity of the project site.
- **Agricultural Wetlands** – The project area does not contain agricultural fields or agricultural wetlands.
- **Farmlands/Timberlands** – The project site is in an urban area, and no farmland/agricultural or timberlands are on or adjacent to the project site.
- **Parking** – The project would not change the parking prohibition on the viaduct or adversely affect parking.
- **Growth** – The proposed project would not provide additional capacity, and consequently it would not generate increases in traffic or promote more intensive uses of land or growth in the project area.
- **Geology/Soils** – The project area was previously disturbed to construct the freeway, river channel and past facilities, such as the Red Car Line and the original Glendale Boulevard.
- **Paleontology** – Work associated with the proposed project would occur in an area previously disturbed for the building of complex components that is not known to contain paleontological materials.

The analysis in this environmental document assumes that, unless otherwise stated, the project will be designed, constructed, and operated following all applicable laws, regulations, ordinances, and formally adopted city standards (for example, *Los Angeles Municipal Code* and Bureau of Engineering *Standard Plans*) or Caltrans standards, as applicable. Also, this analysis assumes that construction will follow the uniform practices established by the Southern California Chapter of the American Public Works Association (for example, *Standard Specifications for Public Works Construction* and the *Work Area Traffic Control Handbook*) as specifically adapted by the City of Los Angeles (for example, City of Los Angeles Department of Public Works *Additions and Amendments to the Standard Specifications for Public Works Construction* [a/k/a “The Brown Book,” formerly Standard Plan S-610]), and applicable Caltrans construction requirements.
Human Environment

2.1 Land Use and Planning

This section addresses potential impacts to existing and planned land uses within the project area that could result from implementation of the proposed project alternatives.

2.1.1 Regulatory Setting

California state law (Government Code Section 65300) requires that each city prepare and adopt a comprehensive, long-term general plan for its development. It must contain seven elements: land use, circulation, housing, conservation, open space, noise, and safety.

The City’s General Plan contains a Framework Element, which addresses each of the State-mandated requirements and establishes overall planning policies for a city. The General Plan also contains citywide elements for all of the required topics, except land use. Other optional citywide elements include such topics as Service Systems, Circulation, and Air Quality. The Land Use Element comprises 36 Community Plans, each of which contains the land use policies and standards for a geographically distinct area.

The Land Use Element has the broadest scope of the General Plan elements required by the State. Since it regulates how land is to be utilized, many of the issues and policies contained in other plan elements are affected and/or have an effect on this element. California law requires that the Transportation Element be correlated with the Land Use Element and zoning. A component of the City’s Transportation Element, the 2010 Bicycle Plan, designates the City’s bikeway system and introduces a comprehensive collection of programs and policies.

Government Code Section 65302(a) requires that land use elements designate the proposed general distribution and general location and extent of uses of the land for housing; business and industry; open space, including agriculture, natural resources, recreation, and enjoyment of scenic beauty; education; public buildings and grounds; solid and liquid waste disposal facilities; and other categories of public and private uses of land.

2.1.2 Affected Environment

2.1.2.1 Existing and Future Land Use

The immediate project area includes residential and commercial land uses in the vicinity of Hyperion Avenue, Glendale Boulevard, and Riverside Drive, as well as I-5 and the Los Angeles River. The southern portion of the project area includes the Silver Lake and Los Feliz communities, and the northern portion of the project area includes Atwater Village. The viaduct complex serves as a key connecting roadway between these communities and other outlying neighborhoods. Glendale Boulevard has historically served as the main thoroughfare between Los Angeles and Glendale. These areas are generally built out, but have opportunities for use intensification and revitalization. Communities along the Los Angeles River have been proposed for revitalization by providing open space, housing, retail spaces such as restaurants and cafes, educational facilities, and places for other public institutions.

Adjacent land use through the Hyperion Avenue segment of the project area is predominantly commercial interspersed with some residential uses; particularly along the southern portion of the viaduct complex. Residential land uses are present along Waverly Drive to the east and west of the viaduct complex, with some of the residences situated along the top of a bluff that
overlooks the viaduct complex. Residential uses are also present along the Hyperion Avenue frontage roads connecting Waverly Drive with Hyperion Avenue.

There are few land uses along Glendale Boulevard south of I-5 due to the unique configuration of the surrounding area and the confluence of the Los Angeles River, I-5, and the roadway system. The west side of Glendale Boulevard north of the Los Angeles River is predominantly lined with commercial uses, with residential uses (predominantly single family homes) behind the commercial uses. There are some single and multi-family residences located along the frontage road opposite the landscaped median separating northbound Glendale Boulevard traffic from two-directional traffic on the frontage road to the east side of the north end of the viaduct complex (between the Los Angeles River and Greenward Road).

Riverside Drive crosses beneath the main viaduct complex (Hyperion Avenue) and is lined with commercial and industrial uses.

The bike path along the Los Angeles River forms an important commuter use in the project area. The bike path generally runs along the top of the river’s southwest bank, but slants from the bank top, to go around an abutment, as it passes beneath the viaduct complex. This bike path is accessible via an access gate and ramp along southbound Glendale Boulevard near the northbound I-5 on-ramp.

The Northeast Los Angeles Community Plan identifies an equestrian trail along the east side of the Los Angeles River that extends from just north of Los Feliz Boulevard south to the confluence of the Arroyo Seco, where it extends north along the Arroyo Seco. In the project area, this designated equestrian trail has not yet been implemented, and the steep left bank of the river at the viaduct complex effectively prevents the use of the left bank of the Los Angeles River as an equestrian trail.

There are also several concurrent planning and development projects within the vicinity of the project area. These projects include the Los Angeles River Revitalization Master Plan, Silver Lake Reservoir Complex Storage Replacement Project, and Sunnynook River Park. Detailed discussion of these concurrent projects can be found in Table 1-4 Related Projects of Chapter 1. Other planned development projects would occur on private parcels and would not physically affect the street system of the project vicinity.

See Figure 2-1 for the existing zoning in the project area, and Figure 2-2 for a land use map.
Figure 2-1: Zoning Designation of the Project Area

Source: ZIMAS, 2011
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2.1.2.2 Consistency with State, Regional Local Plans and Programs

*Transportation Element of the City of Los Angeles General Plan*

Under the City’s General Plan, Hyperion Avenue is designated as a secondary highway, and Glendale Boulevard as a Class II major highway. The element also designates Glendale Boulevard from the LA River north to the City of Glendale as a scenic highway. The proposed project will not affect these designations and is consistent with the Transportation Element.

*Silver Lake-Echo Park-Elysian Valley Community Plan*

The project site is located within the Silver Lake subarea of this community plan. The plan calls for improvement to pedestrian-oriented areas, which include the Los Angeles River channel, and enhance gateways to the community. The proposed project will not conflict with land use designations specified in the community plan. It will bring sidewalk improvements and pedestrian facility improvements as well as new balustrades that replicate the original balustrades to beautify the streetscape.

*Hollywood Community Plan*

The project is located in the southern part of the Hollywood Community Plan, which is currently in the process of being updated by the City of Los Angeles. The proposed project will improve traffic circulation and provide seismic upgrade, which is consistent with the Hollywood Community Plan.

*Northeast Los Angeles Community Plan*

The northern portion of the viaduct complex is located in the Northeast Los Angeles Community Plan area. The proposed project is consistent with this plan, which aims to coordinate development among various areas with compatible infrastructure and service levels. It encourages streetscape improvements and emphasizes that “bridges should be surveyed to determine where sidewalks are deficient to provide needed access and public safety.”

*Los Angeles River Revitalization Master Plan (LARRMP)*

This plan (see Section 2.5.1.3 for more details) is a conceptual framework to guide the revival of the Los Angeles River corridor. The plan area spans all 32 miles of the Los Angeles River and stretches one-mile-wide to include the project site. The proposed project will complement this plan and improve connection between walkways and increase accessibility in the area. The Los Angeles River Revitalization Master Plan was adopted by the Los Angeles City Council in 2007.

*City of Los Angeles 2010 Bicycle Plan*

The 2010 City of Los Angeles Bicycle Plan is a long-range planning tool to guide future development of bicycle facilities in the City to the year 2045. The plan envisions programming future facilities in five-year increments for environmental evaluation and funding. There are no existing bicycle facilities on Glendale Boulevard and Hyperion Avenue. In the plan, which is a component of the Transportation Element of the General Plan, Hyperion Avenue is listed as a future bicycle lane (dedicated bicycle-only lane) pending environmental studies, and Glendale Boulevard is listed as a future bicycle route (in-road bicycle and vehicle shared roadway).

In response to comments received on the IS/EA, bicycle lanes on Hyperion Avenue, as a design option described in Chapter 1, will be implemented with the project instead of at a later date.
Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)
The RTP, which is prepared by the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG), is a long-range plan that identifies multi-modal regional transportation needs and investments over the next 25 years. It provides a vision for transportation investments throughout the region. Since the proposed project does not increase traffic capacity, and because it would be classified as an intersection signalization project, it is exempt from regional air emissions analysis. No additional travel lanes, or total vehicle miles traveled (VMT) would occur as a result of this project. More details about project conformity are discussed in Section 2.10.3.1.

2.1.3 Environmental Consequences

2.1.3.1 Temporary Impacts

Construction of the proposed project would occur within the existing right-of-way of the viaduct complex and Glendale Boulevard to the immediate northeast, including a narrow sliver of the landscaped median, which would be utilized to transition the widened bridge to the existing roadway. However, the majority of the landscaped median would remain unaffected during construction. Much of the seismic strengthening work would occur beneath the bridge and could be accomplished in phases. Some construction work would be staged to maintain the flow of vehicular, bicycle, and pedestrian traffic. Roadway construction along Riverside Drive, Glendale Boulevard, and Hyperion Avenue would require the temporary closure of one or more travel lanes; however, at least one lane in each direction would always be maintained, as would access to adjacent properties and land uses along Glendale Boulevard and Riverside Drive. Pedestrian access across the Glendale Boulevard Bridges over the Los Angeles River during construction would be prohibited, but access to nearby structures would not be prohibited. Because access to local streets would be maintained during construction, residential and commercial land uses would not be adversely affected.

The seismic upgrades to the viaduct complex would require work on Abutment No.1 and Abutment No. 2. Abutment No. 1 is located approximately 150 feet southwest of Riverside Drive, and Abutment No. 2 is located adjacent to the northeast side of Riverside Drive. The area beneath the viaduct complex next to Abutment No. 1 is owned by City, but is currently being used as automobile storage by Classic Collision Center, which is located at 3020 Riverside Drive. This area is being used under the terms of a revocable permit issued by the City of Los Angeles to the business. Similarly, the area under the viaduct complex adjacent to Abutment No. 2 is being used by L & R Construction (3061 Riverside Drive) under the terms of a revocable permit. The purpose of the revocable permit (“R” Permit) under LAMC 62.118.2 is to grant conditional encroachment of the public right-of-way by private parties normally not authorized to occupy it.

During the seismic upgrades, the abutment work would occur from the area beneath the viaduct complex, which would require the temporary suspension of the revocable permit to these two businesses. The revocable permits may be revoked by the City with advance notice for any reason. The revocable permit is not a lease and would be terminated 30 days from date of notice to vacate. The City would have full control of both areas prior to construction. The permittees will be compensated with the relocation assistance if allowed by the Uniform Relocation Act.
2.1.3.2 Permanent Impacts
Land use impacts are effects that would conflict with General Plan (Community Plan) land use designations or zoning, conflict with environmental plans and policies, or physically divide a community or neighborhood.

The proposed project includes seismic and other improvements to the existing viaduct complex, including widening both the northbound and southbound Glendale Boulevard bridges (over the Los Angeles River) by approximately eight feet. The improvements along the Hyperion Avenue portion of the viaduct complex include seismic upgrades, new balustrades that replicate the original balustrades, sidewalk improvements, and pedestrian facility improvements. These improvements would not conflict with existing land use designations or the zoning designations of parcels in the project area. The widening of the Glendale Boulevard bridges over the Los Angeles River would occur within the public right-of-way and would not affect the land use designations for the surrounding area.

The realigned off-ramp from northbound I-5 to Glendale Boulevard would use existing public right-of-way and would not affect zoning or designated land uses. As part of this ramp reconfiguration, a small open-space area would be created adjacent to the new access ramp to the Los Angeles River bike path from northbound Glendale Boulevard (see Figure 1-3B). This open space area would be landscaped as part of the proposed project and could be used for other beneficial uses in the future.

The proposed project would not affect the Community Plan designation of the east bank of the Los Angeles River as a future equestrian trail because it would not change or block access along the top of the bank.

Because the proposed project would occur within existing right-of-way, it would not result in changes to adjacent land uses. The proposed project represents improvements to the existing viaduct complex and would not physically divide an established community or conflict with any land use plan, redevelopment plan, policy, or regulation. Because the proposed project would not provide additional capacity, it would not generate increases in traffic or promote more intensive uses of land in the project area.

2.1.3.3 Cumulative Impacts
The proposed project does not require significant additional right-of-way or change in existing adjacent land use. Therefore, the proposed project is not anticipated to result in adverse impacts to existing land uses, land use patterns, from land use plan conflicts in the project vicinity. As such, the proposed project is not expected to contribute to cumulative impacts to land use.

2.1.3.4 Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures
No avoidance or mitigation measures are required or proposed.

2.1.4 No Build Alternative Impacts
The No Build Alternative would not result in improvements to the viaduct complex, and therefore would not result in impacts to land use.
2.1.5 Parks and Recreational Facilities

2.1.5.1 Affected Environment

Griffith Park

Griffith Park is the only official park and recreational facility located within 0.5 mile of the project site. It encompasses 4,210 acres, and is situated just west of the Golden State Freeway (I-5), roughly between Los Feliz Boulevard on the south and the Ventura Freeway (SR 134) on the north. Griffith Park provides recreational opportunities and activities throughout the park. Griffith Park is a Section 4(f) resource not affected by the project, and is discussed in Appendix B2: Resources Evaluated Relative to the Requirements of Section 4(f).

Red Car River Park

Immediately north of the Glendale Boulevard northbound bridge is a triangular-shaped, landscaped median separating the northbound lanes from the two-directional frontage road within the Glendale Boulevard right-of-way. A community group, the “Friends of Atwater Village,” has unofficially designated this median “Red Car River Park.” It is not an actual park, and is maintained, as are all other landscaped medians in street rights-of-way, by the City’s Bureau of Street Services. Since this area is within the Glendale Boulevard right-of-way, Section 4(f) does not apply. The area is discussed in Appendix B2: Resources Evaluated Relative to the Requirements of Section 4(f).

Sunnynook River Park

An undeveloped Caltrans parcel, located west of the viaduct complex and east of I-5, is the site of the proposed “Sunnynook River Park.” Under Section 104.15 of the Streets and Highways Code, Caltrans is authorized to lease land to local agencies for park purposes. Pursuant to the lease agreement, the City of Los Angeles and Caltrans entered into 30-year agreement to maintain the land with certain conditions in place. One of these conditions stipulates that if Caltrans should need to aquire the land back for highway purposes the lease would terminate upon a three-month notice.

Los Angeles River Bike Path

The bike path along the Los Angeles River forms an important recreational and commuter use in the project area. The bike path generally runs along the top of the river’s southwest bank, but slants from the bank top, to go around an abutment, as it passes beneath the viaduct complex. This bike path is accessible via an access gate and ramp along southbound Glendale Boulevard near the northbound I-5 on-ramp.

The Los Angeles River Revitalization Master Plan area comprises the 32 miles of the River within the City of Los Angeles that extends from Owensmouth Avenue, in the upper reaches of the northwest San Fernando Valley, to the border of the City of Vernon, at the southern end of downtown Los Angeles. The Plan proposes to consider a range of activities to restore riparian and aquatic habitat, and related habitat functions, in and adjacent to the Los Angeles River. Compatible activities to conserve cultural resources, and to provide recreational, open space, and interpretive amenities, will also be considered. In addition, redevelopment would be encouraged to bring economic and residential vitality along the river banks and utilization of the river as a natural scenic feature. Recreational features such as additional green space and a continuous trail along the river are features of the project. In 2007 The LA City Council adopted the Los
Angeles River Revitalization Master Plan. In 2012 the U.S. Department of the Interior prioritized the Los Angeles River Trail System in the President’s America’s Great Outdoors Initiative.

**Equestrian Trail**

The equestrian trail, located within the City of Los Angeles right-of-way, is located along the top of the left (north) bank of the Los Angeles River, and ends at the Glendale Boulevard Bridges. It is identified in the Citywide Major Equestrian and Hiking Trails Plan. The segment of the equestrian trail within the project area is undeveloped and not implemented. As specified in the Northeast Los Angeles Community Plan, the equestrian trail is proposed for future completion and connection to trails to serve recreational needs and improve accessibility to other open space resources.

### 2.1.5.2 Environmental Consequences

The project would not change or alter the use of, and does not have the potential to affect Griffith Park. Additionally, since Sunnynook Park is within Caltrans right-of-way, it does not qualify as a 4(f) resource, as discussed in Appendix B2: Resources Evaluated Relative to the Requirements of Section 4(f).

The proposed project would result in a temporary occupancy of the bike path, and would not alter the alignment or impair the continuity or use of the bike path. The bike path would temporarily be rerouted, utilizing existing roadways, for a short duration during construction. The bike path would be restored to its original condition following construction.

As described in Appendix B2, the equestrian trail is a Section 4(f) resource, but the project would not result in a use of the resource. The project would not alter the alignment of the equestrian trail, and would not interfere with the City’s plan to develop the equestrian trail in the future.

Therefore, there would be no impacts to parks and recreational facilities with implementation of the proposed project, or the no-build alternative.

### 2.1.5.3 Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures

Because impacts are not anticipated, avoidance or mitigation measures are neither required nor proposed.
2.2 Community Impacts and Environmental Justice

This section discusses community cohesion, relocations, and environmental justice impacts that could result from the proposed project or alternatives.

2.2.1 Community Character and Cohesion

2.2.1.1 Regulatory Setting

The National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, as amended (NEPA), established that the Federal Government use all practicable means to ensure for all Americans safe, healthful, productive, and aesthetically and culturally pleasing surroundings [42 U.S.C. 4331(b)(2)]. The Federal Highway Administration in its implementation of NEPA [23 U.S.C. 109(h)] directs that final decisions regarding projects are to be made in the best overall public interest. This requires taking into account adverse environmental impacts, such as destruction or disruption of human-made resources, community cohesion and the availability of public facilities and services.

Under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), an economic or social change is not to be considered a significant effect on the environment. However, if a social or economic change is caused by a physical change, then social or economic change may be considered in determining whether the physical change is significant. Since this project would result in physical change to the environment, it is appropriate to consider changes to community character and cohesion in assessing the significance of the project’s effects.

2.2.1.2 Affected Environment

The proposed project would include modifications to an existing structure along its existing alignment and would not involve acquisition of new right-of-way. The northern portion of the viaduct complex is in the Northeast Los Angeles Community Plan area while the southern portion is in the Hollywood Community Plan area. The project area and its vicinity are developed with a mix of residential, commercial, and industrial uses. The two primary neighborhoods are Silver Lake and Atwater Village. The Silver Lake neighborhood south of the project site is located at higher elevations than the Atwater Village neighborhood, which is north of the existing viaduct complex. Interstate-5 and the Los Angeles River, which act as physical barriers, divide the adjacent two neighborhoods. However, the viaduct complex serves to tie the two neighborhoods together and allow vehicular and pedestrian travel between them. Section 2.1.2 above describes the land use setting of the proposed project area, including general development within the project vicinity, the City’s land use planning framework, and important community infrastructure in the project area.

Although pedestrians use the viaduct complex to travel between the two neighborhoods, the pedestrian facilities along Hyperion Avenue on the Complex present issues. Section 2.4.1 below provides more details about key transportation infrastructure present in the project area.

The proposed project would extend along roadways (Glendale Boulevard and Hyperion Avenue), which are designated by the City’s classification system as Class II Major Highways. Commercial uses are generally located along the major highways in the project area, with residential uses in surrounding areas. One church, the Silver Lake Presbyterian Church, is located along Hyperion Avenue just south of the project limits. Aside from this facility, there are no community or public service facilities in the immediate project vicinity.
2.2.1.3 Environmental Consequences

The proposed project would make permanent changes to the viaduct complex, consisting primarily of seismic strengthening, replacement railings, widened Glendale Boulevard bridges over the Los Angeles River, sidewalk consolidation and improvements along Hyperion Avenue. In addition, the proposed project includes the reconfiguration of the existing northbound I-5 off ramp to Glendale Boulevard, and a new bicycle access path to the existing Los Angeles River Bike Path.

2.2.1.3.1 Temporary Impacts

Construction of the proposed project would occur in three primary phases: in Phase I, the reconfiguration of the northbound I-5 off-ramp would be constructed (the latter dependent on available funding); in Phase II, Hyperion Avenue along the viaduct complex would be improved; and in Phase III, the Glendale Boulevard bridges would be constructed. There could be construction overlap of the phases.
Traffic

As discussed in detail in Section 2.4 (Traffic), construction of the proposed improvements would require temporary lane closures; however, a minimum of one lane of traffic would be maintained along all thoroughfares. The temporary lane closures are not expected to substantially affect community character or cohesion because land uses and land use patterns would not be affected.

Pedestrian Access

During construction, the Glendale Boulevard bridges over the Los Angeles River would be closed off to pedestrians due to space limitations. Pedestrians wishing to cross the river on Glendale Boulevard would be able to access the existing Hyperion Avenue sidewalk by traversing Glendale Boulevard southbound travel lanes on a temporary crosswalk at the north end of the viaduct or by using the staircase that connects Glendale Boulevard and Hyperion Avenue just south of the I-5 northbound on-ramp. This detour route requires pedestrians to use the staircase to the Hyperion Avenue bridges to travel between Silver Lake and Atwater Village neighborhoods. Some people, such as those in wheelchairs or pushing strollers, would not be able to use the pedestrian detour route because of the staircase to the Hyperion Avenue bridges. Consequently, construction activities for the widening of the Glendale Boulevard bridges could temporarily eliminate a major pedestrian route in the project area, thereby creating a de facto barrier between the two neighborhoods, which is considered an adverse effect. See Section 2.4 for more details on pedestrian flow and pedestrian travel routes.

This elimination of the pedestrian route on northbound Glendale Boulevard and the unfriendly pedestrian detour on southbound Glendale Boulevard eliminates a smooth, continuous pedestrian path connecting the Atwater Village and Silver Lake neighborhoods. The lack of adequate pedestrian facilities during construction not only disrupts existing pedestrian travel behavior but discourages residents from walking between the two neighborhoods via the viaduct complex. It presents a physical barrier for pedestrians and ground-level interaction between the two neighborhoods.

Bicycle

Construction of the proposed project would maintain bicycle access to the Los Angeles River bike path from southbound Glendale Boulevard. Construction of the proposed project would require the temporary rerouting of the Los Angeles River bike path, which would occur prior to construction so that bike path use can be maintained. Because of this, construction of the proposed project would not disrupt bike path access or use, and would therefore not substantially affect community cohesion or character related to the Los Angeles River bike path.

Schools

Construction activities would occur along Hyperion Avenue, Glendale Boulevard and Riverside Drive along or close to the viaduct complex. Access to local streets would be maintained. The following public schools are located in the project vicinity (see Inset 2-1 below for school locations):

- John Marshall High School (approximately 0.25 mile southwest of the project site),
- Ivanhoe Elementary School (approximately 0.25 mile southeast of the project site), and
• Glenfeliz Elementary School (approximately 0.5 mile northwest of the project site).

Construction of the proposed project is not expected to substantially affect access to these schools, as they are located outside of the anticipated construction work area. Even though the temporary lane closure may increase travel time for students and school staff who commute by car, a minimum of one lane of traffic would be maintained along all thoroughfares. Students and school staff who travel between Atwater Village and Silver Lake neighborhood by foot may experience greater impacts than those who travel by car. Potential impacts to student pedestrians are discussed above under Pedestrian Access and in the Traffic and Transportation section below.

Inset 2-1: Schools in Vicinity
Source: UltraSystems Environmental, Inc. 2012

2.2.1.3.2 Permanent Impacts

The proposed project would be considered to have an adverse community impact if it would result in the destruction or disruption of human-made resources, or substantially affect community cohesion and/or the availability of public facilities and services.

The proposed project would seismically strengthen and improve the viaduct complex. The proposed project would have no effect on population growth in the project area because it would
neither increase the capacity of the viaduct complex structure nor remove constrictions from the associated roadway. The proposed project would neither result in the need to relocate any existing housing or businesses nor substantially change or restrict access to adjacent and surrounding land uses.

**Traffic and Pedestrian**

The proposed project would implement seismic strengthening improvements along the viaduct complex to improve its ability to withstand a maximum credible earthquake. Over the long term, the seismic improvements would result in the continued cohesion of the Silver Lake and Atwater Village neighborhoods through the maintenance of vehicular and pedestrian access between the two neighborhoods, which is a long-term benefit.

The proposed project would reconfigure the existing off-ramp from northbound I-5, which would allow motorists exiting this off-ramp the option of turning left on Glendale Boulevard (southbound) rather than having to travel north, weave to the far left turn lane, and make a U-turn at (Glenfeliz Boulevard) to then travel south on Glendale Boulevard. The elimination of this latter traffic movement would be an improvement over the current situation that would slightly reduce total vehicle miles traveled and reduce weaving from merging northbound traffic from Hyperion Avenue and Glendale Boulevard.

The proposed project would consolidate the sidewalks along Hyperion Avenue (on the viaduct complex) to a new wider sidewalk along the west side of Hyperion Avenue and would provide other pedestrian-friendly features, such as a designated crosswalk at the north end of the viaduct complex from the wider sidewalk along the west side of Hyperion Avenue to the sidewalk along the west side of Glendale Boulevard. The sidewalk improvements beneath the Waverly Drive Bridge represent a substantial safety improvement over current conditions, in which pedestrians often walk along a 2-foot-wide curb adjacent to traffic.

The construction of a pedestrian overcrossing over the Los Angeles River (across Red Car piers), which has been previously requested by the local community councils, would further strengthen this connectivity and yield positive community effects. Construction of the pedestrian overcrossing over the Los Angeles River utilizing the existing Red Car piers would require that the piers be cut down to approximately the elevation of the River banks. This would directly affect the "Revisit the Red Car" Mural, located on a wall surface on one of existing Red Car piers. Permitted by the Flood Control District and painted in 2005, the "Revisit the Red Car" Mural serves two purposes for the community. It aims to educate future generations about the transportation history of Los Angeles, and to visually mark where the Red Cars once crossed over the Los Angeles River in Atwater Village. The bottom of the mural also provides a pictorial of the different bird species that live or migrate through the Los Angeles River. The mural would be replaced at a nearby location upon consultation with community members, and would continue to serve its purpose to educate the community within the vicinity of the bridge.
Bicycle
The proposed project would increase access to the Los Angeles River bike path through the provision of a new access path from northbound Glendale Boulevard, which would improve community cohesion or character through increased community access to commuter resources.

Visual and Aesthetics
The proposed project would provide replacement railings along the viaduct complex based on the original balustrade design, which would improve community character through the provision of more ornate and detailed historic bridge.

2.2.1.3.3 Cumulative Impacts
There are no overlapping construction projects that would occur during the construction of the proposed project. The proposed project would not result in physical changes in development or development patterns in the project area. Therefore, substantial cumulative impacts to community cohesion and character would not occur.

The proposed project, in conjunction with the Los Angeles River Revitalization Master Plan, would result in improvements in community character and cohesion through improvements in community access to the Los Angeles River.

2.2.1.3.4 Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures
To mitigate for the temporary removal of pedestrian access on Glendale Boulevard Bridges over the Los Angeles River, and to ensure proper pedestrian detours while the Glendale Boulevard Bridges are closed to pedestrians during construction, mitigation measure T-2 described below in Section 2.4, Traffic and Transportation, would be implemented.

Furthermore, City staff should take the initiative to notify schools, local communities, and other public institutions about temporary lane closures, elimination of the pedestrian route over the Glendale Boulevard Bridges, and viable detour routes. Proper notification to schools and local communities about the construction can reduce unnecessary confusion and avoid travel frustration.

2.2.1.4 No Build Alternative Impacts
The No Build Alternative would not change or improve the existing viaduct complex.

2.2.1.4.1 Temporary Impacts
Because no changes to the viaduct complex would occur under the No Build Alternative, no temporary effects to community character or cohesion would occur.
2.2.1.4.2 Permanent Impacts
The No Build Alternative would not result in long-term benefit to community cohesion and character, as described below.

Traffic and Pedestrian
Under the No Build Alternative, the existing seismic deficiencies of the viaduct complex would remain and the viaduct complex would remain susceptible to future earthquakes, which could affect future vehicular and/or pedestrian use of the viaduct complex.

Bicycle
The No Build Alternative would not affect access to the Los Angeles River bike path and would therefore not affect community cohesion or character related to the Los Angeles River bike path. However, the complex would remain susceptible to earthquakes, in the event of which the viaduct could suffer damage necessitating closure of the bike path.

Schools
The No Build Alternative would not require construction and would therefore not affect access to schools. However, the complex would remain susceptible to earthquakes, which could affect future vehicular and/or pedestrian use of the complex and thereby indirectly affect access to schools.

Relocations
Neither the proposed project, nor the No Build Alternative, would result in any relocation.

2.2.2 Environmental Justice
2.2.2.1 Regulatory Setting
All projects involving a federal action (funding, permit, or land) must comply with Executive Order (EO) 12898, Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations, signed by President Clinton on February 11, 1994. This Executive Order directs federal agencies to take the appropriate and necessary steps to identify and address disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects of federal projects and programs on minority and low-income populations to the greatest extent practicable and permitted by law. Low income is defined according to the Department of Health and Human Services poverty guidelines. For 2010, this level was $22,050 for a family of four.

All considerations under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and related statutes have also been included in this project. Caltrans’ commitment to upholding the mandates of Title VI is evidenced by its Title VI Policy Statement, signed by the Director, which can be found in Appendix C of this document.

The term “minority” includes persons who identify themselves as Black/African American, Asian/Pacific Islander, Native American, or of Hispanic/Latino origin. The term “low income” includes persons whose household income is at or below the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) poverty guidelines. A different threshold (e.g. U.S. Census Bureau poverty threshold) may be utilized as long as it is not selectively implemented and is inclusive of all persons at or below the HHS poverty guidelines. For purposes of this environmental document, a minority population is defined as a population or group residing in a geographical area where more than 50% of the individuals are minority, and a low-income population is
defined as a population group residing in a geographically affected area where the percentage of individuals at or below the poverty line exceeds that of the City of Los Angeles, as a whole.

In support of EO 12898, the United States Department of Transportation (DOT) issued an Order on Environmental Justice (DOT Order 5610.2) in 1997. This was followed by an FHWA Order on Environmental Justice (FHWA Order 6640.23), which was issued in 1998. The DOT Order declares the Agency’s policy to promote the principles of environmental justice through the incorporation of those principles (as embodied in the EO) in all DOT programs, policies, and activities. The Order further states that this policy shall be realized by fully considering environmental justice principles throughout the planning and decision-making process using principles of NEPA, Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Uniform Relocation Assistance Act and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 as amended, the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991, and other DOT statutes, regulations, and guidance that addresses infrastructure planning and decisions-making (CEQ, 1997).

2.2.2.2 Affected Environment

The proposed project is located entirely within four census tracts, 1871, 1873, 1882, and 1883 (CLA, 2007e), which are shown in Figure 2-3. According to 2010 U.S. Census data, the minority population of the City of Los Angeles was approximately 70.3% of the City’s total population, and the low income population was approximately 19.1% of the City’s population (see Table 2.2-1). Table 2.2-1 compares the distribution of the population by race/ethnicity and poverty level for the four census tracts against the same distribution for the City as a whole between the 2000 and 2010 census data.

The four census tracts extend considerable distances beyond the project site. In addition, the portion of Census Tract 1873 adjacent to the project site does not contain land uses that could be occupied by residents or employees. Therefore, census tract block groups adjacent to the project site were identified and represent a more localized composition of the population likely to be affected by the construction of the proposed project. These block groups include:

- 1871, Block Group 1
- 1882, Block Group 1
- 1882, Block Group 2
- 1883, Block Group 3

Minority population in the four block groups adjacent to the project site comprise approximately 52.6% of the total population, and 2.8% of families are below poverty level. The affected population is not considered a low-income population for Environmental Justice evaluation purposes because current poverty levels in the four block groups are low. The minority population percentage of Census Tract 1871 Block Group 1 and Census Tract 1883 Block Group 3 are approximately 71.1% and 53.6% respectively, and are considered minority populations for Environmental Justice evaluation purposes.
Figure 2-3: Census Tracts within Project Area
### Table 2.2-1: 2000 and 2010 Population, Ethnicity, and Income Characteristics for Census Tracts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2010*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>Total Minority Population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Los Angeles City</strong></td>
<td>3,694,820</td>
<td>1,803,462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Census Tract 1871</strong></td>
<td>6,849</td>
<td>3,871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>56.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Census Tract 1873</strong></td>
<td>3,390</td>
<td>1,151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>44.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Census Tract 1882</strong></td>
<td>5,767</td>
<td>1,659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>28.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Census Tract 1883</strong></td>
<td>3,694</td>
<td>1,755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>47.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


* Some census tracts may have grown enough in population size to qualify as more than one census tract. As a result, the 2000 Census Tract 1871 is split into Census Tracts 1871.01 and 1871.02 and Census Tract 1882 is split into 1882.01 and 1882.02 in the 2010 census data. For the purpose of consistency, the data of the split tracts are aggregated in this table.

** The total population by census tract for race/ethnicity data differs slightly from that of the poverty data due to estimation differences. The number before the parenthesis () is the total population in the census tract for the race/ethnicity data, and the number inside () is the total population in the Census Tract for the poverty data. The respective total population is used to calculate the percent of the minority and low-income populations (defined as at or below the poverty level).

### Table 2.2-2: Population, Ethnicity, and Income Characteristics for Block Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block Group</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Minority Population</th>
<th>% of Families below Poverty Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1871, Block Group 1</td>
<td>1,869</td>
<td>1,013 (54.2%)</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1882, Block Group 1</td>
<td>911</td>
<td>297 (32.6%)</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1882, Block Group 2</td>
<td>1,550</td>
<td>562 (36.3%)</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1883, Block Group 3</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>439 (43.9%)</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aggregate Block Group Population</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Minority Population in Block Groups</td>
<td>2,501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Families Below the Poverty Level in Block Groups</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Year 2012 Estimates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block Group</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Minority Population</th>
<th>% of Families below Poverty Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1871, Block Group 1</td>
<td>1,740</td>
<td>1,238 (71.1%)</td>
<td>2.1 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1882, Block Group 1</td>
<td>849</td>
<td>300 (35.3 %)</td>
<td>4.4 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2.2-2 shows the race/ethnicity and income characteristics of the population comprising these block groups. The minority and low income compositions of the census tract block groups that encompass the project site can differ substantially from the compositions of the overall census tract areas. The poverty levels of the block groups are generally lower than those for the overall census tract areas.

2.2.2.3 Environmental Consequences

Aside from the widening of the Glendale Boulevard bridges over the Los Angeles River, minor improvements to the viaduct complex, and reconfiguration of the freeway on and off-ramps, there would be no permanent physical changes.

Project construction would result in temporary physical changes to the environment, primarily increased noise levels, traffic lane reductions, and the emission of air pollutants during construction.

2.2.2.3.1 Temporary Impacts

Construction of the proposed project would not result in adverse air, traffic or noise impacts, as discussed in Sections 2.4, 2.10, and 2.11. Construction along northbound and southbound Glendale Boulevard Bridges over the Los Angeles River would prohibit access across the bridges. As a mitigation measure for this impact, an alternate pedestrian crossing would be constructed over the Los Angeles River across the existing Red Car piers (downstream of the viaduct complex). The pedestrian crossing would provide a detour route around the Glendale Boulevard Bridges during construction. With implementation of this mitigation measure, the impact is not considered adverse. Since construction of the proposed project would not result in adverse impacts there would be no significant adverse impacts to disproportionately affect minority populations.

2.2.2.3.2 Permanent Impacts

The proposed project would result in an environmental justice impact if permanent high and adverse impacts from the proposed project would disproportionately affect a minority or low income population.

Visual resources in the project area include the existing viaduct complex, which is eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). The visual changes to the viaduct complex resulting from the proposed project are expected to improve the memorability of views of the viaduct complex. Consequently, the proposed project would not result in adverse aesthetic
impacts from changes to the overall visual character and quality of a landscape. The proposed project would result in moderate losses of historic fabric from both Glendale Boulevard bridges over the Los Angeles River. The impacts to these resources relate to the structures’ eligibility for listing in the NHRP and do not result in direct impacts to humans. Although the loss of historic fabric from the Glendale Boulevard bridges are not likely to affect the structure’s continued eligibility for listing by the NRHP, the loss of historic fabric itself is considered to be a permanent adverse impact. However, because the adverse impact is related to the loss of historic fabric and no adverse aesthetic impacts were identified, the adverse impact does not have the capacity to disproportionately and adversely affect either minority or low income populations.

As discussed above, an environmental justice impact would occur only if high and adverse impacts would disproportionately affect a minority and/or low income population. High and adverse impacts, in the context of an environmental justice evaluation, are generally defined as significant unavoidable adverse impacts to humans after mitigation. As the analysis in this report demonstrates, the proposed project would not have any significant effects that cannot be mitigated below the level of significance. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in adverse impacts that permanently and disproportionately affect either minority or low-income populations.

2.2.2.3.3 **Cumulative Construction Impacts**
The construction of the proposed project would result in construction-related effects (primarily increased traffic congestion, noise, and construction emissions). The construction effects would be experienced by adjacent residents, commercial building occupants, and motorists who travel through the project area. The affected populations do not constitute a minority or low income population, and no disproportionately high and adverse impacts would occur to a minority or low income population.

The exposure of motorists to construction effects would be temporary. Traffic congestion from project construction along Glendale Boulevard and Hyperion Avenue, while being inconvenient to motorists, is not considered to be a high and adverse impact. In addition, motorists have the ability to utilize alternative routes to reach their destinations, and there are no indications that the motorists who would travel through the project area would be predominantly minority or low income.

As a consequence, no high and adverse cumulative impacts to environmental justice populations would occur.

2.2.2.4 **Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures**
Based on the above discussion and analysis, the proposed action would not cause disproportionately high and adverse effects on any minority or low-income populations as per EO 12898 regarding environmental justice.

2.2.2.4 **No Build Alternative Impacts**
The No Build Alternative would not result in new or additional impacts to the community (social, economic) or environmental justice issues relative to existing conditions.
2.3 Utilities/Emergency Services

2.3.1 Regulatory Setting

The City of Los Angeles is an incorporated municipality that maintains all powers possible for a charter city to have under the constitution and laws of the State of California. The provision of services by the City of Los Angeles originates from the charter or code.

Regarding the provision of services, the Charter specifically states that

“... every City office and department, and every City official and employee, is expected to perform their functions with diligence and dedication on behalf of the people of the City of Los Angeles. In the delivery of City services and in the performance of its tasks, the government shall endeavor to perform at the highest levels of achievement, including efficiency, accessibility, accountability, quality, use of technologically advanced methods, and responsiveness to public concerns within budgetary limitations.”

Article 5 of the Charter creates various city departments, including the Fire and Police Departments, establishes a Board of Commissioners over each department so-created, and specifies the powers of the boards and heads of each city department.

Under its authority, the City issues permits to utility companies and other organizations that allow them to place electrical lines, telephone lines, cables, fiber optic lines, pipelines, and other utilities in the public right-of-way within its jurisdiction.

2.3.2 Affected Environment

The project site is located within the service area of Fire Station 56, which is located on Rowena Avenue near Glendale Boulevard. Fire Station 50, located along Fletcher Drive just east of San Fernando Road, provides fire protection services to the project vicinity north of Larga Avenue. Fire Station 56 is located approximately 0.5 mile southeast of the project site and Fire Station 50 is located about 1.5 miles to the east. The nearest police station to the project is the Northeast Division Police Station, located about one mile to the northeast of the project site (CLA, 2007e).

In addition, various sewer lines, storm drain pipelines and structures, water lines, electrical lines, natural gas lines, telephone lines, street lights, and fire hydrants and other utility lines are located in or along Glendale Boulevard, Riverside Drive, Waverly Drive, and Hyperion Avenue.

2.3.3 Environmental Consequences

2.3.3.1 Temporary Impacts

Underground Utilities

Construction of the proposed project would not result in substantial disruptions in utility services because underground utilities are identified and planned for during the project design process. During the design process, utilities that could conflict with project elements or that could be affected during construction are identified as a standard practice, and the utilities would be required to be relocated by the utility company before Project construction begins.

In addition, construction of the proposed project would follow the underground service alert (DigAlert) program, as required by standard contract specifications, for construction activities. This program requires the contractor to coordinate with DigAlert before construction. All utility companies, including those responsible for natural gas, water, wastewater, electrical, telephone,
or cable television lines would be contacted by DigAlert to identify and mark utility line locations in the field prior to construction, as a precaution.

In the event of an accidental utility disruption during construction, repairs would be made immediately to ensure that the utility service interruption is minimized. No other temporary impacts to utilities are expected. Because of established utility management procedures during both the design and construction phases, the proposed project is not expected to adversely affect underground utilities.

**Aboveground Utilities**

Various aboveground electrical lines are located along portions of Hyperion Avenue, Riverside Drive, and Glendale Boulevard. In addition, high powered electrical lines that extend along the Los Angeles River cross the viaduct complex. As part of the standard construction specifications, the contractor would be required to avoid disruptions to overhead utilities and employ proper safety practices. Because of this, no impacts related to overhead utilities would occur.

**Fire and Police Protection**

During construction, traffic flow on Hyperion Avenue, Glendale Boulevard, and Riverside Drive in the project area could be restricted or reduced to one lane in each direction. However, construction is not expected to substantially affect the accessibility or response time of fire protection or police protection response units as an existing network of local streets provide alternative routes. In addition, fire stations are located on either side of the viaduct complex. As a standard practice, the Contractor would be required to prepare a Work Area Traffic Control Plan based on the construction phasing plans that would be provided by the City. The final plan would be subject to review and approval of the Los Angeles Department of Transportation (LADOT). The approved Plan would include protocols for informing emergency response providers of construction schedules and identification of alternative routes through and around the active construction zone.

**Solid Waste**

Construction of the proposed project would result in generation of some demolition debris and construction debris, consisting primarily of concrete, steel, and timber. Some of this material is appropriate for landfill disposal; however, a high fraction of construction debris is typically recycled or reused because of its economic advantage over new materials. The fraction of debris deemed not suitable for recycling or reuse and chiefly consisting of inert materials could be disposed of in an inert landfill, thereby saving valuable sanitary landfill capacity in municipal landfills. Once construction in complete, the proposed project would not generate solid waste. The disposal of all solid waste material generated by the proposed project would comply with all federal, state, and local statutes and regulations.

**2.3.3.2 Permanent Impacts**

A project would be considered to have an adverse impact on utilities if it would result in substantial demand for utilities, such that new supplies or management capacity would be required, or if the project would result in growth not accounted for in service provider adopted plans. A project would be considered to have an adverse impact on public services such as fire, or police, if it would result in demand for such services that exceed existing or planned capacities, or require the construction of new or additional facilities.

The proposed project would not result in additional demands for utilities or public services, or substantially affect the availability of or access to public facilities and services because it is a
bridge improvement project that would not increase the demand for new water or wastewater conveyance or treatment facilities, new electricity or gas supplies or infrastructure.

**Fire Protection** – The proposed project site would not increase the demand for fire protection services because it is an infrastructure improvement project that would not result in increased housing or commercial/industrial development. Because of this, the need to add additional or new fire-fighting facilities would not occur as a result of the proposed project.

**Police Protection** – The proposed project site would not increase the demand for police protection services because it is an infrastructure improvement project that would not result in increased housing or commercial/industrial development. As a consequence, the need to add additional or new police protection facilities would not occur as a result of the proposed project.

2.3.3.3 Cumulative Impacts

Construction of the proposed project would not generate a substantial amount of construction debris given that a large fraction of the anticipated debris would be recyclable, reusable, or suitable for disposal in inert landfills. As a consequence, construction waste would not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to a cumulatively significant impact to landfill capacity.

The proposed project would not result in permanent adverse impacts to the utilities or emergency services providers. As a consequence, no cumulative impacts to utilities are anticipated.

Operation of the proposed project would improve the ability of the viaduct complex to withstand an earthquake and remain operational following such an event. None of the other related projects would result in operational impacts on the provision of emergency services, and as such, the proposed project would not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to a cumulatively significant impact to emergency services.

2.3.3.4 Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures

Because impacts are not anticipated, avoidance or mitigation measures are neither required nor proposed.

2.3.4 No Build Alternative Impacts

The No Build Alternative would not result in new or additional impacts to utilities or emergency service providers relative to existing conditions because no construction would occur. However, the No Build Alternative would not provide needed seismic improvements to the viaduct complex. Under the No Build Alternative, the risk that the viaduct complex could become damaged or unusable as a result of a major earthquake would remain. Earthquake related damage could adversely affect the response of emergency services providers until repairs to the structure were accomplished.
2.4 Traffic and Transportation/Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities

2.4.1 Regulatory Setting

Caltrans, as assigned by FHWA, directs that full consideration should be given to the safe accommodation of pedestrians and bicyclists during the development of federal-aid highway projects (see 23 CFR 652). It further directs that the special needs of the elderly and the disabled must be considered in all federal-aid projects that include pedestrian facilities. When current or anticipated pedestrian and/or bicycle traffic presents a potential conflict with motor vehicle traffic, every effort must be made to minimize the detrimental effects on all highway uses that share the facility (Caltrans, 2011).

Caltrans and FHWA are committed to carrying out the 1990 Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) by building transportation facilities that provide equal access for all persons. The same degree of convenience, accessibility, and safety available to the general public would be provided to persons with disabilities.

The City of Los Angeles’ Department of Transportation (LADOT) is responsible for traffic management, including pedestrian and bicycle facilities, in the City. For street improvement projects, and other projects that require construction in the public right-of-way, LADOT provides review, oversight, and approval of work area traffic control plans and detour plans; and establishes traffic lane and parking requirements and restrictions. The Mayor of the City of Los Angeles issued Executive Directive No. 2 (October 20, 2005), which formalizes a general prohibition of rush hour construction by City Departments and agencies. Rush hour work is defined as actual construction, including equipment and material staging, on major roads from 6:00 a.m. to 9:00 a.m., and 3:30 p.m. to 7:00 p.m. This generally implies that all normally available traffic lanes would be available during rush hours. The Executive Directive also contains exemptions to the rush hour prohibition for emergency work, and for major public works projects with traffic mitigation plans. Major public works projects are improvements to public infrastructure in the public right-of-way initiated as either a capital project by the City or as allowed under the permitting jurisdiction of City’s Bureau of Engineering. The Bureau of Engineering has issued Special Order No. 001-0406, which governs the process of complying with Executive Directive No. 2 (BOE, 2006).

2.4.2 Affected Environment

The viaduct complex is comprised of six separate bridges. Hyperion Avenue extends along three of the Complex’s bridges (over Riverside Drive, I-5, and the Los Angeles River). The remaining three bridges are the northbound and southbound Glendale Boulevard bridges (both over the Los Angeles River) and the Waverly Drive Bridge over Hyperion Avenue. The viaduct complex serves as a key connecting roadway between nearby communities and other outlying neighborhoods, especially the Silver Lake and Atwater Village communities.

The Major Highway – Class II classification standard includes 104 feet of right of way, 12 foot sidewalk/parkway, 13-foot curb lane, four full-time through lanes, two part-time parking lanes, and one median/left-turn lane. The viaduct complex does not meet the City’s current design standard for a major highway – Class II facility because of its width constraints, which do not...
provide adequate facilities for motorist, bicyclist and pedestrians. The viaduct complex was constructed between 1927 and 1929. The I-5 freeway was completed in 1956.

The viaduct complex spans approximately 1,190 feet over the Los Angeles River, Interstate 5 (I-5), and Riverside Drive. The complex is generally aligned along a southwest-northeast axis and is bounded by Ettrick Street on the southwest and Glenfeliz Boulevard on the northeast, respectively.

Descriptions of the Viaduct Complex’s six structures and their Bridge Identification Numbers are included below.

**Waverly Drive Bridge (Bridge Number 53C1179)** – Spans over Hyperion Boulevard in an east-west direction. It has a two-lane roadway and has no sidewalks through the neighborhood of Silverlake. The 65-feet-long earth-filled reinforced concrete arch structure is two lanes wide, with a flush roadway and pedestrian walkways on both sides of the bridge. Enclosing the bridge are railings which have solid concrete finish with inset panels that covered the original balusters. Cast bronze lanterns with glass globes are set at each corner of the bridge.

**Hyperion Avenue Viaduct over Riverside Drive (Bridge Number 53C1882)** – This portion of the Glendale-Hyperion Viaduct Complex spans Hyperion Avenue over Riverside Drive in a north-south direction through the communities of Silverlake and Atwater Village. It includes three arch spans with a total length of 429 feet as a reinforced concrete arch bridge. The Hyperion Avenue structure accommodates four traffic lanes (two lanes in each direction) and is 63 feet wide. This portion is a secondary highway. The width of the existing roadway on Hyperion Avenue is 56 feet in both directions combined. It has two 12-foot lanes in each direction with an 8-foot double striped median.

Currently 5-foot-wide sidewalks are along both the east and west sides of the complex’s Hyperion Avenue roadway from the retaining wall near Waverly Drive northward to Hyperion Avenue’s merger with north- and southbound Glendale Boulevard. On the east side of Hyperion Avenue (southern end), the sidewalk terminates at the retaining wall, which supports the Waverly Drive Bridge (over Hyperion Avenue). However, a 2-foot-wide curb extends along the abutment/retaining wall adjacent to the northbound traffic. Pedestrians using the east sidewalk must walk along this narrow curb after the sidewalk ends. On the west side of the complex’s Hyperion Avenue roadway, the sidewalk also terminates at a 2-foot-wide curb that extends along the retaining wall base. An ascending walkway aligned along the top of the west retaining wall provides an alternative for pedestrian use.

**Hyperion Avenue Viaduct over I-5 (Bridge Number 531069)** – The segment of the viaduct complex that carries Hyperion Avenue over I-5 (Golden State Freeway) is a single span, reinforced concrete, open spandrel arch that is 135 feet long. It carries four lanes of traffic (two lanes in each direction) and is 71 feet wide with cantilevered 5-foot walkways flanking the roadway.

**Hyperion Avenue Viaduct over the Los Angeles River (Bridge Number 53C1881)** – Comprising nine spans with a total length of 518 feet, the Hyperion Avenue Bridge over the Los Angeles River is composed of reinforced concrete filled spandrel arches. The bridge carries four lanes (two lanes in each direction) of traffic and is 68 feet wide. Five-foot cantilevered walkways flank the roadway. The Hyperion Avenue roadway merges with and transitions to Glendale Boulevard at the northern end of the viaduct complex. This bridge is flanked by the
structures that carry northbound and southbound Glendale Boulevard over the Los Angeles River and becomes a major highway.

The existing sidewalks on either side of Hyperion Avenue terminate at the merge point and force pedestrians to cross either northbound or southbound Glendale Boulevard. There are two staircases within the project area where pedestrians can access Hyperion Avenue and Glendale Boulevard. One, which connects Glendale Boulevard and Hyperion Avenue, is located on the west side of Hyperion Avenue. A second staircase provides pedestrian access between Riverside Drive and Hyperion Avenue, and is also on the west side Hyperion Avenue.

**Southbound Glendale Boulevard Bridge over the Los Angeles River (Bridge Number 53C1883)** – The southbound Glendale Boulevard Bridge over the Los Angeles River segment of the Glendale-Hyperion Viaduct Complex consists of six reinforced concrete arch spans with a total length of 316 feet. Each is a filled spandrel arch measuring 48 feet long. Reinforced concrete abutments and piers support the bridge. The bridge supports two 12-foot traffic lanes within a total width of 38 feet and is flanked by 4-ft walkways on one side that are situated next to solid reinforced concrete railings with inset panels and a smooth concrete finish. Glendale Boulevard south of the viaduct complex is designated as a secondary highway. Both Glendale northbound and southbound bridges over the Los Angeles River currently lack shoulders.

**Northbound Glendale Boulevard Bridge over the Los Angeles River (Bridge Number 53C1884)** – The northbound Glendale Boulevard Bridge over the Los Angeles River segment of the viaduct complex is identical to the southbound structure just discussed, except Glendale Boulevard between the Los Angeles River and the boundary with the City of Glendale is designated as a Scenic Highway (CLA, 1999), with the scenic resource being the wide landscaped median.

The northbound I-5 off-ramp exit to Glendale Boulevard is controlled by a stop sign and only right turns onto northbound Glendale Boulevard are allowed at this approach. Motorists exiting this off-ramp who wish to travel on southbound Glendale Boulevard must travel an extra half mile by first traveling north on Glendale Boulevard to Glenfeliz Boulevard, where they make a U-turn and travel south on Glendale Boulevard. The signalized controlled intersection currently operates at a Level of Service (LOS) A in both the AM and PM Peak hours (MGE, 2012). Figure 2-4 shows the travel path (overlaid on an aerial photograph) that vehicles must travel to head south on Glendale Boulevard. As shown in Table 2.4-1, the stop-controlled intersection currently operates at a Level of Service (LOS) B and C in the AM and PM Peak hours.

---

2 City of Los Angeles Transportation Element of the General Plan, Appendix E – Inventory of Designated Scenic Highways
Figure 2-4: Traffic Movement – Ramp to SB Glendale
Source: ACT, 2004
Current operating conditions of the I-5, the I-5 northbound off-ramp, Glendale Boulevard, and Hyperion Avenue, are shown in Table 2.4-1.

### Table 2.4-1: Existing (2011) Levels of Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>A.M. Peak Hour</th>
<th>P.M. Peak Hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I-5 Mainline, NB</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-5 Mainline, SB</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-5 NB Off-Ramp/NB Glendale Blvd Intersection, unsignalized</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glendale Boulevard, NB</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glendale Boulevard, SB</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyperion Avenue, NB</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyperion Avenue, SB</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


#### 2.4.2.1 Bikeways

The bike path along the Los Angeles River forms an important recreational and commuter use in the project area. The bike path generally runs along the top of the river’s southwest bank, but slants from the bank top, to go around an abutment, as it passes beneath the viaduct complex. This bike path is accessible via an access gate and ramp along southbound Glendale Boulevard near the northbound I-5 on-ramp.

The 2010 City of Los Angeles Bicycle Plan is a long-range planning tool to guide future development of bicycle facilities in the City to the year 2045. According to the plan, as a transportation element, Hyperion Avenue is listed as a future bicycle lane (dedicated bicycle-only lane), and Glendale Boulevard is listed as a future bicycle route (in-road bicycle and vehicle shared roadway). Currently, Hyperion Avenue does not have a bicycle lane and Glendale Boulevard does not have a bicycle route. Bicycle use on the roadway is primarily used for transportation as a commuter route of the local transportation system.

Riverside Drive in the project area is listed as a bicycle route (CLA, 2011), which is a shared roadway that is identified as a bike route on signs. In addition, there is a bike path along the right bank of the Los Angeles River, which is currently only accessible from southbound Glendale Boulevard near the on-ramp to northbound I-5 in the project area. The viaduct complex traverses both the bike route along Riverside Drive and the bike path along the Los Angeles River.

#### 2.4.2.2 Street Lights

Various street lights are located along the viaduct complex. These original street lights have bronze posts and original globes, and are situated on bases that are incorporated into the railing system. The lumen output of these street lights does not meet current City’s standards for city streets.
2.4.2.3 Pedestrian Flow

The viaduct complex includes sidewalk and staircase pedestrian facilities; however, the configuration of the sidewalks is not standard. South of viaduct complex, Hyperion Avenue includes 5-foot sidewalks along both sides of the roadway. However, the sidewalks along Hyperion Avenue near the Waverly Drive overcrossing transition into 2-foot-wide curbs adjacent to the retaining walls and Waverly Drive Bridge abutments. There is an elevated pedestrian walkway that allows pedestrians using the west sidewalk to avoid having to walk along the 2-foot-wide curb beneath the Waverly Bridge, but no such pedestrian bypass exists along the east side of Hyperion Avenue. Pedestrians using the west sidewalk often bypass the safer (and steeper) walkway and instead walk along the narrow curb, exposing themselves to traffic hazards. Pedestrians using the east sidewalk have no option and must use the narrow curb along the retaining wall.

At the northern viaduct complex terminus, the sidewalks end where Hyperion Avenue merges with Glendale Boulevard (between the northbound and southbound Glendale Boulevard traffic lanes), and pedestrians using the Hyperion Avenue sidewalks must then cross traffic lanes to reach the sidewalks on Glendale Boulevard.

Pedestrians who live in or travel to and from North Atwater Village can access the existing Hyperion Avenue sidewalks at the north end of the viaduct complex by traversing Glendale Boulevard travel lanes or by using the staircase that connects Glendale Boulevard and Hyperion Avenue. A second staircase provides pedestrian access between Riverside Drive and Hyperion Avenue along the viaduct complex.

2.4.2.4 Transit and Parking

Three Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro) bus lines operate in the immediate project area: Lines 92, 96, and 201 (CLA, 2007e). Line 92 and Line 201 both operate through the project area along Glendale Boulevard with the nearest bus stop to the viaduct complex located along Glendale Boulevard on the I-5 overcrossing. Line 96 operates in both directions through the project area along Riverside Drive, and the nearest stops to the viaduct complex are on Riverside Drive near Glendale Boulevard.

On-street parking is not allowed on the viaduct complex, but is allowed on Glendale Boulevard north of viaduct complex and south of the viaduct complex on Hyperion Avenue. On-street parking is also permitted on Riverside Drive.

2.4.3 Environmental Consequences

2.4.3.1 Temporary Impacts

Construction of the proposed project would be phased over 2.5 years, in order to keep the viaduct complex open to traffic while construction occurs. Occasional construction-related traffic effects are anticipated and are likely to include delays and extended travel times through active construction zones.

Voluntary Traffic Detours

Construction of the proposed project would not increase traffic, but would temporarily reduce the capacity of the affected streets because there would be some lane closures. During the construction of the Hyperion Avenue improvements, traffic flow would be limited to one lane in each direction for at least 11 months. The affected segment of Hyperion Avenue would be approximately 1,800 feet long. Table 2.4-2 shows the critical existing hourly volumes occurring
during the morning peak hour in the southbound direction (1,295 vehicles per hour) and evening peak hour in the northbound direction (1,325 vehicles per hour) (MGE, 2012). With these peak-hour traffic volumes and the standard traffic requirements, one lane in each direction would be able to adequately accommodate this traffic flow.

- There are no cross streets or driveways along the segment of Hyperion Avenue under construction, which means that interruption to through traffic would be minimal.

- Construction site traffic would be regulated at 25 miles per hour. At this speed, the capacity of one uninterrupted lane could be as high as 1,500 vehicles per hour with an average gap of 65 feet between vehicles. This would provide operating conditions of LOS D or better.

- Actively promoted Transportation Management Program elements would be able to reduce peak hour vehicular traffic by at least 5%; therefore reducing the demand to about 1,260 vehicles per hour in the peak direction.

A study of the existing roadway circulation pattern and traffic conditions near the project area concluded that voluntary diversion of Hyperion Avenue traffic to other routes during construction would not be substantial. There are two routes for potential voluntary diversions: 1) Fletcher Drive, located approximately 0.75 mile to the south; and 2) Los Feliz Boulevard, located approximately 0.6 mile to the northwest. Factors that would minimize voluntary diversion to these two parallel streets include:

- During the retrofit of the Hyperion Avenue structures when only one lane in each direction is provided, the peak hour operating condition could be maintained at LOS D or better.

- The proposed new alignment of the I-5 northbound off-ramp terminus at Glendale Boulevard would be constructed prior to retrofitting the Hyperion Avenue structures, which would improve traffic operations along portions of the Glendale Boulevard segment.

- The likelihood of voluntary diversion of I-5 northbound off ramp traffic to utilize the Los Feliz Boulevard off-ramp instead would be minimal or low because the intersections of Los Feliz Boulevard with I-5 ramps are already congested during peak hours, as is the intersection of Los Feliz Boulevard and Riverside Drive and Los Feliz Boulevard south of Riverside Drive.

The likelihood of voluntary diversion of Hyperion Avenue through traffic between San Fernando Road and Rowena Avenue utilizing Fletcher Drive would be minimal because the alternative route would involve approximately 1.5 miles of additional travel distance and four additional signalized intersections that are fairly congested during peak hours. Because of the factors discussed above, one lane in each direction would be able to adequately accommodate peak hour traffic flow. Therefore, there would be no impacts to local streets due to voluntary traffic detours. As a result, the impact of voluntary traffic detours is not adverse, and no planned vehicular detours are necessary.
Table 2.4-2: Existing (2011) Traffic Volumes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>A.M. Peak Hour</th>
<th>P.M. Peak Hour</th>
<th>ADT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I-5 Mainline (NB+SB)</td>
<td>14,060</td>
<td>15,060</td>
<td>240,740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-5 NB Off-Ramp</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>7,390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-5 NB On-Ramp</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>4,055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glendale Boulevard, NB</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>5,890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glendale Boulevard, SB</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>655</td>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyperion Avenue, NB</td>
<td>805</td>
<td>1,325</td>
<td>14,130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyperion Avenue, SB</td>
<td>1,295</td>
<td>1,070</td>
<td>13,900</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Construction along Hyperion Avenue, northbound Glendale Boulevard, and southbound Glendale Boulevard would be staged to keep traffic flowing at all times. The reconfiguration of the northbound off-ramp from I-5 to Glendale Boulevard and construction of the new approach intersection is expected to occur in the first construction phase before other viaduct complex improvements are constructed. The reconfiguration of the off-ramp would reduce northbound traffic on Glendale Boulevard and U-turn traffic at Glendale Boulevard at Glenfeliz Boulevard because the reconfigured off-ramp would allow some motorists to make a left turn onto southbound Glendale Boulevard rather than making a right on Glendale Boulevard and a U-turn at Glenfeliz Boulevard, as currently occurs. Because the proposed off-ramp signalization and reconfiguration would reduce the amount of vehicles travelling northbound, no traffic impacts would occur at the Glendale Boulevard and Glenfeliz Boulevard intersection.

Following reconfiguration of the off-ramp, construction along Hyperion Avenue and Glendale Boulevard would commence. Construction of the proposed project would require temporary lane closures along Hyperion Avenue and Glendale Boulevard, which are considered major roads under Special Order 001-0406 (Guidelines regarding Executive Directive No. 2) (BOE, 2006). Construction of the proposed project would affect travel lanes during the rush hour and would require an exemption from the Directive. All public works projects that require construction in streets are required by standard specifications to obtain a work area traffic control plan, also known as a Traffic Management plan (TMP). Because of this, the project would meet the requirements for an exemption from the prohibition of construction during rush hours. The exemption to the Executive Directive would allow the temporary loss of travel lanes during peak hours (for the establishment of work zones to perform the improvements) and to allow construction during peak traffic hours within the established work zones. The exemption for the latter would allow longer daily construction hours, which would shorten the overall construction period. Construction activities would be confined to the established work zone, which would be separated from travel lanes with K-rails.

During construction, temporary on-street parking restrictions along southbound Glendale Boulevard between Valleybrink Road and the viaduct complex and along the frontage roads that connect Waverly Drive to Ettrick Street are also required. While temporary losses in on-street
parking are inconvenient, adequate on-street parking is available in the project vicinity to offset the temporary localized loss of parking during construction.

Although the exact nature of the construction phasing cannot be determined at this time, the construction phases that are described below are considered to be a typical representation of actual construction phasing that could occur in order to maintain at least one travel lane in each direction (ACT, 2007b). Deviations from the phasing may occur related to the selected contractor’s methods of construction, but the general requirement to maintain through lanes of traffic during construction would remain.

**Hyperion Avenue**
The primary seismic retrofits and other improvements such as railing replication, new sidewalk, and roadway banking to Hyperion Avenue along the viaduct complex that would affect traffic during construction are as follows:

A. **Construct East Segment Improvements.**

   During this phase, construction of improvements along the east side of Hyperion Avenue from about Ettrick Avenue to the northern terminus of the viaduct complex (just north of the Los Angeles River) would occur. One 12-foot-wide travel lane, an 11-foot-wide travel lane, and a 4-foot shoulder would remain operational, as would one 12-foot-wide northbound lane with a 4-foot shoulder. The work zone would be about approximately 12 feet wide and separated from traffic with K-rails. This phase would take approximately five months to complete.

B. **Construct Center Segment Improvements**

   Following completion of the improvements to the east side segment, improvements along the roadway center segment would be constructed. One southbound lane and one northbound lane (both approximately 12 feet wide with a 4-foot shoulder) would remain open for traffic. K-rails would separate the work area from the traffic lanes. This phase would take approximately two months to complete.

C. **Construct West Segment Improvements**

   The third phase to be constructed along Hyperion Avenue would be the west segment improvements from Ettrick Avenue to the northern terminus of the viaduct complex. During this phase, one 12-foot-wide lane (with a 4-foot shoulder) in each direction would remain open to through traffic along the eastern half of the viaduct complex. A 5-foot-wide temporary pedestrian walkway would be placed adjacent to the traffic southbound traffic lane but would be separated by K-rails. The approximately 21-foot-wide work area would be located along the west side of the temporary walkway and separated with K-rails. Temporary pedestrian access ways would be established through the work zone to the pedestrian walkway at the Glendale Boulevard and Riverside Drive staircases. This phase would take approximately six months to complete.

**Glendale Boulevard Bridge (southbound)**
The southbound Glendale Boulevard Bridge over the Los Angeles River would be widened by approximately eight feet. During construction, one travel lane (about 12 feet wide with a 4-foot shoulder) would remain open. This phase would take approximately six months to complete.
During the construction, pedestrians will not be able to access the bridge due to space limitations associated with the contractor’s work zones and the need to keep at least one travel lane open. Pedestrians could be detoured to the Hyperion Avenue sidewalk between the northern end of the viaduct complex and the staircase that connects Glendale Boulevard with Hyperion Avenue. However, this detour would not be readily accessible to and usable by individuals with disabilities, including individuals who use wheelchairs. The path of travel would not be continuous and unobstructed, and would not meet ADA standards. Inaccessibility to the Glendale Boulevard Bridge would eliminate a major pedestrian route that connects the Atwater Village and Silver Lake communities. Therefore, a temporary elimination of pedestrian access across the Southbound Glendale Boulevard Bridge during construction is considered an adverse effect.

**Glendale Boulevard Bridge (northbound)**
The northbound Glendale Boulevard Bridge over the Los Angeles River would be widened by approximately eight feet. During construction, one travel lane (about 12 feet wide with 4-foot shoulder) would remain open. This phase would take approximately six months to complete.

Due to the need to maintain one lane of through traffic and to provide the contractor with an adequate work zone, pedestrian access along the bridge would be prohibited during construction. Inaccessibility to the Glendale Boulevard Bridge would eliminate a major pedestrian route that connects the Atwater Village and Silver Lake communities. Because no viable detour routes to the northbound bridge exist, a temporary elimination of pedestrian access across the Northbound Glendale Boulevard Bridge during construction is considered an adverse effect.

**Seismic Retrofit of Abutments and Piers**
Seismic improvements to various viaduct complex abutments could affect traffic during construction. They are as follows:

**A. Abutment Northeast Side of Riverside Drive**
Construction of the seismic improvements to this abutment would be performed from the right-of-way beneath the viaduct complex. During construction of seismic improvements to the abutment along the northeast side of Riverside Drive, all travel lanes and sidewalks would remain open. However, localized on-street parking on the northeast side of Riverside Drive beneath the viaduct could be eliminated for short durations to facilitate access to the underside of the viaduct complex from where work would be performed. This phase would take approximately one month to complete.

**B. Abutment Southwest Side of Riverside Drive**
Construction of the seismic improvements to this abutment would be performed from the right-of-way beneath the viaduct. During construction of seismic improvements to the viaduct complex abutment along the west side of Riverside Drive, all travel lanes, including the left turn lane to northbound I-5, and sidewalks would remain open. However, localized on-street parking on the southwest side of Riverside Drive beneath the viaduct could be eliminated for short durations to facilitate access to the underside of the viaduct complex from where work would be performed. This phase would take approximately one month to complete.
C. Abutment West of Southbound Glendale Boulevard

During construction of seismic improvements to the viaduct complex abutment along the west side of southbound Glendale Boulevard (under Hyperion Avenue), one southbound lane would remain open. A temporary pedestrian walkway protected by K-rails would be established adjacent to the work area. The existing U-turn beneath the viaduct complex would be temporarily closed during construction. This phase would take approximately one month to complete.

D. Abutment East of Southbound Glendale Boulevard

During construction of seismic improvements to the viaduct complex abutment along the east side of southbound Glendale Boulevard (under Hyperion Avenue), one southbound lane would remain open, but the existing U-turn beneath the viaduct complex would be temporarily closed. This phase would take approximately one month to complete.

E. Abutment at Southbound to Northbound U-turn

During construction of seismic improvements to the viaduct complex abutments along both sides of the U-turn (connecting southbound to northbound Glendale Boulevard), the U-turn would be temporarily closed. This phase would take approximately one month to complete.

F. Abutment at Los Angeles River

During construction of seismic improvements to the viaduct complex abutment along the south side of the Los Angeles River, the bike path would be temporarily relocated (using temporary timber support structures) away from the abutment to the area next to the first support pier in the Los Angeles River channel. This phase would take approximately one to two months to complete.

G. Waverly Drive Bridge Rails

During construction of the replacement balustrades along the Waverly Bridge, one lane along Waverly Drive would remain open and would be controlled by flagmen. This phase would take approximately two months to complete.

Construction Phasing

The phases described above are distinct phases along a given viaduct structure or roadway that would occur at different times in the overall construction schedule to ensure that vehicular traffic and pedestrian access are maintained. Construction phasing is expected to take up to 2.5 years (30 months).

Construction of the proposed project and the phasing would be the subject of a traffic management plan (TMP). The TMP would provide details regarding lane configurations, work zones, phase durations, other phasing limits or requirements, and lane and turning requirements or restrictions, and could contain other requirements such as work hour limitations, and traffic control measures. Prior to construction, an approval from LADOT must be obtained in order to construct during rush hour, as described in Section 2.4.1 (Regulatory Setting) above. LADOT would review the TMP and must approve it prior to construction and issuance of the exemption to Executive Directive No. 2.

Staged construction in accordance with the approved TMP would be implemented with LADOT oversight and coordination. Vehicular traffic would remain open during the widening of the
Glendale Boulevard bridges over the Los Angeles River. The number of lanes along the viaduct complex could be reduced to two (one in each direction) during construction. Local access to adjacent neighborhoods and streets would be maintained, and the selected contractor would, as a standard practice, be required to notify and coordinate with emergency access providers to minimize impacts to the provision of emergency services. Contractors are required through standard contract provisions to coordinate with LADOT and prepare work area traffic control plans that meet LADOT requirements, including compliance with minimum traffic lane requirements, signage, striping, and other traffic control measures. Due to the complexity of the viaduct complex, a preliminary traffic-phasing plan has been prepared and reviewed by LADOT. This plan would be circulated with the bid documents and become part of the construction contract.

Some on-street parking along the frontage roads or main streets within the project work zone may be temporarily eliminated during construction, but on-street parking in the surrounding area would remain available. In particular, some on-street parking restrictions and access restrictions to through traffic may be required along the frontage roads (connecting Hyperion Avenue to Waverly Drive) during construction of the replica balustrades on the retaining walls.

The bus stops along Riverside Drive at Glendale Boulevard (Route 96) and along Glendale Boulevard along the I-5 overcrossing (Routes 92 and 201) would not require temporary relocation and would remain operational during construction.

Construction of Protective Barriers
As discussed in Chapter 1, prior to construction and demolition work along the Hyperion Avenue and Glendale Boulevard structures, protective barriers would be constructed along the exteriors of the structures to contain any debris, tools, or materials that could fall on sidewalks, roadways, property, or the Los Angeles River below. The placement of the protective barriers could require temporary detours or traffic lane restrictions during the evenings for one to two days at each location. The placement of the barriers during evening hours would minimize disruptions along key thoroughfares such as Riverside Drive and I-5. Any detours or traffic lane restrictions would require either LADOT or Caltrans approval and would be part of the TMP. Due to the short-term nature of related traffic restrictions, compliance with the TMP, compliance with Caltrans permits and the non-peak hour nature of the restrictions, construction of the protective barriers would not result in adverse impacts.

Due to their temporary nature, LADOT does not consider construction-related traffic impacts to be significant, as all work in streets requires LADOT approval and of necessity, would comply with traffic lane requirements, detour requirements, work area control plans, and other traffic requirements established by Caltrans.

2.4.3.2 Permanent Impacts
Traffic Congestion
The proposed project would have an adverse impact on traffic if it would result in substantial permanent reduction in the level of service of an intersection. For the purposes of this evaluation, LADOT’s criteria (as applied to project operations) for acceptable reductions in operating conditions of intersections (increased congestion) within the City of Los Angeles are as follows:

- Volume/Capacity (V/C) ratio increase greater than or equal to 0.040 if final LOS is C,
• V/C ratio increase greater than or equal to 0.020 if final LOS is D,
• V/C ratio increase greater than or equal to 0.010 if final LOS is E or F.

The proposed project would involve seismic retrofitting and improvements of the viaduct complex. Although the proposed project would widen the Glendale Boulevard bridges (over the Los Angeles River) by approximately eight feet on each side, additional traffic lanes would not be added. The capacity of the existing roadway through the project area would not be changed and vehicle operations through nearby intersections would likewise not be affected. The proposed project would widen the existing Glendale Boulevard bridges to provide shoulders and slightly increased curb lane widths.

Project related activities involving the Hyperion Avenue portion of the viaduct complex would be limited to substructure seismic rehabilitation and the provision of replica balustrades, wider curb lanes, and median improvements, which would not result in increased capacity. The proposed project would install a K-rail type median along Hyperion Avenue on the viaduct complex to physically separate northbound and southbound traffic. This is a safety improvement that would prevent vehicles from crossing over into opposing traffic lanes.

In addition, the proposed project would reconfigure the northbound I-5 off-ramp to Glendale Boulevard and install a new signalized intersection at the terminus of the reconfigured off-ramp. This improvement would allow northbound I-5 motorists exiting at Glendale Boulevard to make left hand turns onto southbound Glendale Boulevard. This new turn movement would be an improvement over current conditions, which requires all exiting traffic to make a right turn onto northbound Glendale Boulevard. The reconfigured off-ramp is not expected to result in increased traffic on southbound Glendale Boulevard beyond what would normally occur because the off-ramp is not expected to result in increased off-ramp traffic. Table 2.4-3 shows the anticipated LOS at the reconfigured northbound I-5 off-ramp to Glendale Boulevard and nearby roadways that would occur by 2036. It should be noted that the proposed improvements to the viaduct complex and the I-5 ramps would not affect the amount of future traffic because the viaduct complex is not a traffic generator. (See Table 2.4-4, which shows future (2036) traffic volumes). Instead, the reconfigured off-ramp is expected to incrementally reduce traffic volumes on Glendale Boulevard due to the provision of a left turn signal at the intersection with Glendale Boulevard.
Table 2.4-3: Future (2036) Levels of Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>A.M. Peak Hour</th>
<th>P.M. Peak Hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I-5 Mainline, NB</td>
<td>F (3)</td>
<td>F (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-5 Mainline, SB</td>
<td>F (3)</td>
<td>F (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-5 NB Off-Ramp / Glendale Blvd Intersection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No-Build, Unsignalized</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W/ Project, Signalized (1 Left Turn + 1 Right Turn)</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W/ Project, Signalized (1 Shared Left/Right + 1 Right Turn)</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glendale Boulevard, NB</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glendale Boulevard, SB</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyperion Avenue, NB</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyperion Avenue, SB</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 2.4-4: Future (2036) Traffic Volumes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>A.M. Peak Hour</th>
<th>P.M. Peak Hour</th>
<th>ADT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I-5 Mainline (NB+SB)</td>
<td>23,205</td>
<td>23,205</td>
<td>328,830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-5 NB Off-Ramp</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>930</td>
<td>9,470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-5 NB On- Ramp</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>5,205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glendale Boulevard, NB</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>7,555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glendale Boulevard, SB</td>
<td>970</td>
<td>995</td>
<td>10,260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyperion Avenue, NB</td>
<td>1,030</td>
<td>1,695</td>
<td>18,125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyperion Avenue, SB</td>
<td>1,660</td>
<td>1,375</td>
<td>17,825</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The forecasted future traffic in Table 2.4-4 includes a traffic growth rate of 1% per year, which is typical for traffic growth in a city and is acceptable to LADOT. As can be seen by looking at Tables 2.4-1 and 2.4-3, the reconfigured northbound I-5 off-ramp to Glendale Boulevard would operate at an improved level of service in the future. Both Glendale Boulevard and Hyperion Avenue would operate at a lower level of service (LOS B and C, respectively) than they currently operate at (both LOS B), but this is due to background traffic growth, not the proposed project. The proposed project would have the beneficial effect of reducing future traffic through this intersection by allowing direct left turns onto southbound Glendale Boulevard from the northbound I-5 off-ramp onto southbound Glendale Boulevard. Therefore, the impacts on traffic are not adverse.

Proposed I-5 Northbound Off-Ramp Realignment and Signalization

The proposed traffic signal for the I-5 northbound off-ramp terminus would be located approximately 160 feet south of the center of the Hyperion Bridge. This new intersection at the reconfigured off-ramp would also control southbound traffic on Glendale Boulevard. Existing sight distance on southbound Glendale Boulevard in the vicinity of the Hyperion Avenue overcrossing bridge is limited due to the presence of bridge abutments.
For southbound traffic on Glendale Boulevard approaching the new intersection at the reconfigured northbound I-5 off-ramp approach to Glendale Boulevard, the visual constraint of existing viaduct abutments adjacent to the left edge of southbound Glendale Boulevard would limit the sight distance to 230 feet (between the center of left lane and the right side signal pole). Based on the criterion of stopping sight distance, the resulting safe travel speed is 33 mph. This speed exceeds the safe speed (20 mph) recommended for the existing curve radius.

In addition to the potentially limited stopping distance for southbound traffic on Glendale Boulevard, motorists could have to come to a stop over a shorter distance after the blind left-turning curve beneath the Hyperion Avenue structure if there are traffic queues extending back from the intersection. These potential traffic hazards are considered adverse.

Because the proposed project would not permanently affect traffic volume/capacity relationships along the viaduct or surrounding area, would not increase operational congestion at intersections, would not be a traffic generator, and would not affect local or regional traffic service standards or congestion management requirements, impacts would be less than significant.

**Bicycle Access**

Currently, there are no bicycle facilities on Glendale Boulevard or Hyperion Avenue through the project. Bicycle use of the roadways is primarily as commuter routes of the local transportation system. Adhering to the 2010 City of Los Angeles Bicycle Plan (refer to Section 2.4.2.1), the new shoulder on Glendale Boulevard would facilitate implementation of a bicycle route. In response to comments received on the IS/EA, bicycle lanes on Hyperion Avenue, as a design option, will be implemented as part of the project instead of at a later date. (See Ch. 1.3.)

The proposed project would also include a new bicycle access ramp from northbound Glendale Boulevard, just south of the bridge, to the bike path along the Los Angeles River. Currently, bicyclists south of the viaduct complex who wish to access the bike path must travel north on Hyperion Avenue or Glendale Boulevard, make a U-turn at Glenfeliz Boulevard, then head south on Glendale Boulevard to the bike path entrance just north of the I-5 on-ramp. With the new bicycle access ramp, bicyclists on northbound Glendale Boulevard would be able to access the bike path from northbound Glendale Boulevard. Additionally, bicyclists can access the bike path from southbound Glendale Boulevard using the existing bike ramp. Overall, the new bike path access from northbound Glendale Boulevard would allow bicyclists in the surrounding area an optional way to access the bike path. Therefore adverse impacts to bicycle access would not occur.

**Pedestrians**

Improvements to the viaduct complex would be in compliance with ADA requirements. The proposed project would consolidate the sidewalks along both sides of the Hyperion Avenue roadway on the viaduct complex into a single, wider sidewalk along the northwest side of Hyperion Avenue. The new sidewalk would be approximately one foot above the roadway as it extends along the retaining wall beneath the Waverly Drive Bridge. Hyperion Avenue is curved at this location, and the roadway would be banked to improve vehicle turning and to minimize drifting through the turn.

The existing staircases from Glendale Boulevard and Riverside Drive to Hyperion Avenue would remain operational and would continue to provide access to the new sidewalk from those streets. North of the point where the Riverside Drive staircase connects with Hyperion Avenue, the new sidewalk would be separated from southbound Hyperion Avenue traffic by a protective crash
barrier to minimize safety hazards to pedestrians and I-5 below (see the cross section in Figure 1-4 in Chapter 1).

At the north end of the consolidated sidewalk along the west side of Hyperion Avenue, a new pedestrian crosswalk would be added across southbound Glendale Boulevard. This crosswalk could be synchronized with the signal at Glenfeliz Boulevard to allow pedestrians to cross when traffic on Glendale Boulevard is minimized.

A weekday pedestrian count was conducted at the Hyperion Bridge in the vicinity of the Los Angeles River in May 2007 between 6:30 AM and 4:00 PM (ACT, 2007a). The purpose of the count was to determine the amount of pedestrian traffic along Hyperion Avenue. The count was performed at the westerly sidewalk in the vicinity of its end point where Hyperion Avenue southbound lanes split into the Glendale southbound viaduct and the Hyperion Avenue bridge crossing over the I-5 Freeway. Table 2.4-5 provides a summary of pedestrian activity on Hyperion Avenue. Pedestrian flow was concentrated in the afternoon, with 73% of the pedestrian traffic occurring between 2:30 PM and 4:00 PM. One possible explanation for the higher northbound pedestrian flow in the afternoon is that students who live in the Atwater Village area and attend Marshall High School are dropped off in the morning but must walk home in the afternoon. The proposed project would replace the existing 2-foot curbs along the retaining wall beneath the Waverly Drive Bridge with a wider consolidated sidewalk (on the west side), provide roadway banking along Hyperion Avenue beneath Waverly Drive (thereby decreasing the potential for vehicular drifting), and provide designated pedestrian crossings along Glendale Boulevard.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2.4-5: Pedestrian Activity on Hyperion Avenue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Count:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northbound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southbound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:30AM - 4:00 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Hourly Volume Both Directions (2:45 PM – 3:45 PM):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The proposed project would provide replica railings along the staircase that extends from Hyperion Avenue to Glendale Boulevard. The open balustrade design would visually open the staircase from Glendale Boulevard and Hyperion Avenue. In addition, new lighting would be added to the vicinity of the staircase to increase pedestrian safety.

The proposed project’s sidewalk consolidation and new pedestrian crosswalk would eliminate the need for pedestrians to jaywalk across Glendale Boulevard to and from Hyperion Avenue (at the north end of the viaduct), and would provide a protective barrier between pedestrians along Hyperion Avenue and adjacent traffic.

The Project would improve roadway banking beneath the Waverly Drive Bridge, which would lessen the potential for vehicular drifting as the Hyperion Avenue curves (beneath the Waverly Bridge). The railing restoration portion of the project (balustrade replication) would improve visual lines of sight to and from the staircase between Hyperion Avenue and Glendale Boulevard (the existing solid railing limits visual access to the staircase). The proposed project would represent an improvement in overall pedestrian safety over existing conditions. In addition, the
walkway along the LA River bank beneath the viaduct complex would provide additional pedestrian access, which is considered an improvement to the current pedestrian conditions. The improvements, as described above, would be beneficial to pedestrians, and no adverse impacts to pedestrian traffic would occur.

**Transit and Parking**

The proposed project would not result in permanent elimination or relocation of bus stops, including the stops for Lines 92 and 201 along Glendale Boulevard at the I-5 overcrossing.

In addition, the proposed project would not require or result in the permanent elimination of on-street parking along Riverside Drive, Glendale Boulevard, or Hyperion Avenue.

**2.4.3.3 Cumulative Impacts**

Construction of the proposed project is would begin in summer 2014 and extend for up to 2.5 years (30 months) through the end of 2016. Potential development projects in the periphery would be constructed on private off-street parcels and would therefore not directly or physically affect the street systems in the project vicinity.

**2.4.3.4 Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures**

The City’s standard practices and contract specifications require the preparation of work area traffic control plans subject to approval by LADOT for in-street construction. This standard practice would also ensure pedestrian safety during construction.

The proposed project would result in adverse traffic impacts related to the limited sight and stopping distance along southbound Glendale Boulevard and the stop-controlled intersection at the reconfigured northbound I-5 off-ramp to Glendale Boulevard. Avoidance Measure T-1 will avoid this impact.

**T-1:** The signalization for the realigned offramp intersection will include traffic control for southbound Glendale Boulevard traffic, north of the Hyperion Bridge overcrossing. Traffic control will include, but not limited to, signalization to allow traffic to stop north of Hyperion Bridge overcrossing rather than at the new realigned off-ramp intersection. The design, placement, and operation of the device would meet LADOT and Caltrans requirements.

Additionally, the proposed project would result in adverse pedestrian impacts during the concurrent construction of the southbound and northbound Glendale Boulevard bridges. Pedestrians would be prohibited access to the Glendale Boulevard bridges during construction. Pedestrians travelling along southbound Glendale Boulevard must take a detour that requires climbing a staircase connecting Glendale Boulevard with Hyperion Avenue, while pedestrians travelling along northbound Glendale Boulevard have no viable detour routes. The detour on southbound Glendale Boulevard would not be readily accessible to and usable by individuals with disabilities, including individuals who use wheelchairs. The path of travel would not be continuous and unobstructed, and does not meet ADA standards. Inaccessibility to the Glendale Boulevard bridges would eliminate a major pedestrian route that connects the Atwater Village and Silver Lake communities. However, Mitigation Measure T-2 would mitigate this impact to pedestrian access:

**T-2:** Construct an alternate pedestrian crossing over the Los Angeles River across the existing Red Car piers (downstream of the viaduct complex) to connect the bike
path along the southwest side of the Los Angeles River with Glendale Boulevard on the northeast side of the river. The pedestrian crossing, in conjunction with the new access to the LA River bikeway from northbound Glendale Boulevard, would provide a detour route around the Glendale Boulevard bridges during construction. In order for this measure to serve as an effective detour for pedestrians, the pedestrian crossing and the new access to the bike path would have to be fully constructed and operational before commencing the widening of Glendale Boulevard Bridges.

2.4.4 No Build Alternative Impacts

Under the No Build Alternative, neither changes to the viaduct complex, nor other improvement such as the reconfiguration of the I-5 off-ramp to Glendale Boulevard would occur. As the No Build Alternative will not increase the traffic capacity, current and predicted LOS and volumes will be unaffected. Additionally, the No Build Alternative would not result in permanent impacts to traffic transportation/pedestrian and bicycle facilities; however, the No Build Alternative would not minimize the potential for damage to the viaduct complex from seismic events, and its indirect impacts to transportation through the closure of the viaduct complex.
2.5 Visual/Aesthetics

This section evaluates potential effects of the proposed project on the visual and aesthetic characteristics of visual resources in the project vicinity. The analysis is consistent with FHWA’s Guidance on Visual Impact Assessment for Highway Projects (FHWA, 1981). Under these guidelines, the existing visual setting is characterized using the criteria of physical, historical, and cultural contexts, community attitudes, and perceptions of viewers and then analyzed for potential changes attributable to the proposed project. The characterization and analysis is accomplished using key viewpoints both from and encompassing the proposed project immediate impact zone.

2.5.1 Regulatory Setting

Applicable policies that provide aesthetic guidelines within the project area are described herein.

2.5.1.1 Federal

*National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA)*

NEPA as amended establishes that the federal government use all practicable means to ensure all Americans safe, healthful, productive, and aesthetically [emphasis added] and culturally pleasing surroundings (42 U.S.C. 4331[b][2]). To further emphasize this point, the Federal Highway administration in its implementation of NEPA (23 U.S.C. 109[h]) directs that final decisions regarding projects are to be made in the best overall public interest taking into account adverse environmental impacts, including among others, the destruction or disruption of aesthetic values.

*Other Federal Regulations*

Other federal regulations that could apply to the proposed project include:

- Title 23 U.S.C. Section 109 requires that possible adverse economic, social, and environmental effects relating to any proposed project in any federal-aid system be fully considered. Included among the factors to be considered are destruction or disruption of man-made and natural resources, aesthetic value, community cohesion, and the availability of public facilities and services.

The applicable federal and state statutes governing public artwork include:

- California Art Preservation Act (Civil Code Sections 987 _et. seq._)

These laws require that an artist be given a 90-day written notice prior to the alteration, destruction, or removal of this artwork.

2.5.1.2 State

*California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)*

CEQA establishes that it is the policy of the state to take all action necessary to provide the people of the state “with…enjoyment of aesthetic, natural, scenic and historic environmental qualities.” (CA Public Resources Code Section 21001[b]) CEQA includes requirements for the consideration of project impacts to scenic resources, and requires that appropriate mitigation measures be included in a project with potential to adversely affect scenic resources, including within a scenic highway.
2.5.1.3 Local

City of Los Angeles General Plan Framework
The General Plan Framework is a comprehensive, long-range document containing purposes, policies, and programs for the development of Los Angeles. The plan is a strategy for long-term growth that sets a citywide context to guide the subsequent amendments of the City of Los Angeles’ (City) community plans, zoning ordinances, and other pertinent programs. It responds to state and federal mandates to plan for the City’s future. The Framework Element supersedes the citywide elements of the City’s General Plan. The document contains seven mandated elements and several optional elements, including air quality, conservation, cultural resources, housing, infrastructure, noise, open space, public facilities and services, safety, and transportation. The framework also includes a land use element or plan for each of the 35 community plan areas within the City.

City of Los Angeles Community Plans
Community plans have been adopted as the City's Land Use Element to guide growth and development in each of its 35 community planning areas. The project area is located within the Northeast Los Angeles, Silver Lake-Echo Park-Elysian Valley, and Hollywood Community Plan areas. These Community Plans are intended to guide land use, circulation, and services within their respective communities. The community plans include recommendations for circulation, recreational/open space, and other public facility improvements to meet City policies and community goals.

Los Angeles River Revitalization Master Plan
Devastating floods during the first part of the 20th century prompted the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the Los Angeles County Flood Control District to construct the concrete-lined channel that now conveys the Los Angeles River for 47.9 miles of its 51-mile length. Over recent years, the City has coordinated with a number of agencies and interest groups in efforts to revitalize the river and its watershed.

In 2007, the City adopted the Los Angeles River Revitalization Master Plan (LARRMP), which provides a framework for restoring the river’s ecological function and for transforming it into an amenity for residents and visitors. The LARRMP includes recommendations for improvements to the river corridor, recommendations at a policy level for managing public access and ensuring public health and safety, recommendations for a river governance and management structure, and recommendations for a short- and long-term priority projects and potential funding strategies.

City of Los Angeles Street Lighting Policy, Specifications, and Procedures
The City’s Bureau of Street Lighting has developed policy, specifications, and procedures for installation and maintenance of street lighting in Los Angeles. The Bureau’s standards are based on those of the Illuminating Engineering Society of North America RP-8-00. For historic bridges, the Bureau recognizes the importance of maintaining their historic character, including the light poles, bases and luminaires. Because of this, the Bureau reviews project plans to maximize compliance with roadway lighting standards, explore equipment options for meeting lighting requirements, and explore options for adding poles and luminaires where feasible (D. Nguyen, personal communication, October 5, 2007). These policies include aesthetic requirements for color, spacing, and installation of communications equipment on lighting poles.
2.5.2 Affected Environment

The project area is generally urban residential in character with commercial uses scattered along the primary streets. The project site is located within the Los Angeles Narrows, which is a steep sided valley that connects the San Fernando Valley with the Los Angeles Basin. The viaduct complex spans a portion of this valley, which includes the Los Angeles River, I-5, and Riverside Drive. The viaduct complex is an important feature within the visual viewshed of the project area, and can be observed from the residences along the bluff to the east and west of the Complex, by motorists traveling along Riverside Drive, I-5, and Glendale Boulevard, and from numerous vantage points along the Los Angeles River.

At the north end of the viaduct complex, the landscaped median provides access to the left bank of the Complex and is a transitory open space providing access to the left bank of the Los Angeles River. As indicated on the Transportation Element of the City of Los Angeles General Plan, Glendale Boulevard from the Los Angeles River north to the City of Glendale is designated as a Scenic Highway. Riverside Drive is also designated as a scenic highway from Los Feliz Drive south to Stadium Way.

In addition to the visual experience of the viaduct complex itself, the structure also provides a corridor to view the visual features of the surrounding geography. As an example, motorists and pedestrians traveling north near the south end of the Complex can view the San Gabriel Mountains in the background, Forest Lawn (Glendale) and Atwater Village in the middle ground, rows of the abutment Pylons along Hyperion Avenue in the foreground.

2.5.2.1 Viewshed and Viewer Sensitivity

The viewshed includes all areas where physical changes associated with the proposed project can be seen from a sensitive viewpoint, or where other sensitive views could be affected. For purposes of this visual analysis, the viaduct complex can be viewed from points along the Los Angeles River (east and west of the structure) and from locations along the bluff near the south end of the Complex. In addition, portions of the viaduct complex can be viewed by both pedestrians and motorists on Hyperion Avenue and both northbound and southbound Glendale Boulevard.

The sensitivities of different types of viewers vary depending upon their activity, duration of viewing opportunity, and their awareness of and familiarity with the surrounding environment. The following describes the comparative sensitivity of various types of viewers in decreasing order of sensitivity.

Residents
Residents, particular those with views of the viaduct complex from their homes, would be most sensitive to changes due to the relative permanency of their viewing experience and their prolonged duration of viewing opportunity.

Workers
Employees in the project area would be considered sensitive viewers because they may have frequent opportunities to experience views of the viaduct complex from their workplaces, and may routinely enjoy the view corridors in the project area.

Pedestrians
Pedestrians would be considered sensitive viewers, as they would be directly within the viewshed and would have lengthy exposure to views.
**Bicyclists**
Bicyclists may be those who either live in the project vicinity or recreate or commute through the view corridors in the project area on a regular basis. The sensitivities of bicyclists to views would be less than those of pedestrians because passage through the project area would be quicker and the attention of bicyclists would be primarily focused on road conditions, especially while on the viaduct complex.

**Regular Motorists**
Regular motorists may be those who either live in the project vicinity or commute through the view corridors in the project area on a regular basis. The sensitivities of regular motorists to views would be less than those of pedestrians because passage through the project area would be quicker and the attention of motorists would be primarily focused on road conditions.

**Occasional Motorists**
Occasional motorists are typically non-local or non-commuter tourists or visitors, and are considered less sensitive than regular motorists due to the infrequent nature of their visits.

### 2.5.2.2 Visual Resources and Quality at Key Viewpoints

The viewshed is comprised of visual resources upon which the visual experience is based. For purposes of this study, visual resources were identified based on visual prominence within the viewshed, and upon whether they could affect or be affected by the proposed project.

Visual resources in the project area include the existing viaduct complex, which is eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places, and is a City Cultural Monument.

As mentioned earlier, the existing viaduct complex is visible from various points in the viewshed, including the residences along the bluff on either side of the south end of the viaduct complex, from the Los Angeles River, and from various streets in the project area. Viewpoints of the identified visual resources were established within the viewshed and were selected to be representative of the visual resources likely to be viewed by the viewer types described above. To best assess the change in visual quality of the identified visual resources, the existing visual quality of the viewpoints was rated using a scale (low, low to moderate, moderate, moderate to high, and high) to assess three criteria: **vividness, intactness, and unity** (FHWA, 1981). These criteria are described below.

- **Vividness** is the visual power or memorability of landscape components as they combine in striking or distinctive patterns. For example, the landscape as it appears to contrast with the surrounding development can contribute to the vividness of the view. However, vividness also depends on whether either element can be considered striking or distinctive.

- **Intactness** is the integrity of the visual environment and its freedom from encroaching elements. It is measured by the concentration of development within an area. For example, scattered development marked by parcels of vacant unmaintained land would have a low intactness rating and compromise visual integrity.

- **Unity** is visual coherence and compositional harmony of the landscape when considered as a whole. The mixture of natural elements and human-made alterations is considered together in assessing unity.
Figure 2-5: Key View Map
**Viewpoint 1**
The same rating scale and criteria are used to assess potential changes to views or resources resulting from the proposed project. Changes are assessed in terms of the sensitivity of the viewer groups. Figure 2-5 shows the locations and directions of the key viewpoints analyzed.

Viewpoint 1 is a view looking north at the existing viaduct complex from a bluff to the southeast of the viaduct complex. This view, shown in Figure 2-6, is typical of what is afforded from residences situated along the bluff in this area. However, this viewpoint also represents a view accessible by all viewer groups. This view is composed of residential backdrop elements, with the viaduct complex extending from the foreground and merging with the background. Other foreground elements include vegetation. The Los Angeles River is also a prominent element of this view. The vividness of this view is considered high, as the viaduct complex’s architectural features such as the abutment pylons and curvature stand out visually as the Complex spans I-5 and the Los Angeles River. The intactness of this view is considered high, as it is comprised of distinct visual elements (residences, the Los Angeles River, I-5, and the viaduct complex itself) that are relatively free of encroaching features.

Lastly, the unity of this view is considered high as the viaduct complex ties the linear elements (Los Angeles River and I-5) together into a single coherent composition that balances urban structures and natural features such as vegetation.

**Viewpoint 2**
Viewpoint 2 is a northeastern view of the viaduct complex from the bluff just west of the Complex. This view, shown in Figure 2-7, is representative of views available from the back of residences along the bluff west of the Complex. The primary visual elements in this view are a short section of the viaduct, several abutment pylons, and portions of the Los Angeles River. The vividness of this view is considered moderate to high, because although the view of the viaduct complex is rather limited, the abutment pylons are striking. The intactness of this view is considered moderate rather than high due to the presence of standard and high voltage power lines that encroach into the views of the viaduct. Lastly, the unity of this view is considered low to moderate because it lacks harmonious compositional unity.

**Viewpoint 3**
Viewpoint 3, depicted in the top photograph in Figure 2-8, is along a corridor looking northwest toward the existing viaduct complex from the west bank of the Los Angeles River (east of Glendale Boulevard). This view is typical of what is afforded by pedestrians and bicyclists travelling on either banks of the Los Angeles River. In addition, this view also represents the view that motorists see when travelling on the northbound I-5 off-ramp. The dominating element in this view is the northbound Glendale Boulevard portion of the viaduct complex and the hydraulic structures that channel the high water flows in the Los Angeles River. The vividness of this view is considered high, as the design features of the viaduct are distinct and memorable, with minimal distracting elements. The intactness of this view is considered high because the view of the viaduct is free of encroaching elements. Lastly, the unity of this view is considered high, as the design elements of the viaduct (arches and piers, abutments, and lampposts) are visually coherent and compositionally harmonious.

**Viewpoint 4**
Viewpoint 4, shown in the top photograph in Figure 2-9, looks south along the Hyperion Avenue roadway existing viaduct complex towards the Waverly Drive Bridge from approximately the
Riverside Drive overcrossing. The primary elements in this view are the hillsides that taper down to the Waverly Bridge, the abutment pylons, and the lampposts. The vividness of this view is considered moderate, because although the hillside and viaduct complex features are pleasant, they are not striking or overly memorable. The intactness of this view is considered moderate because the view of the viaduct complex as it approaches the low point in the hillside is slightly disrupted by the encroaching elements of overhead power lines and power poles to the right of the viaduct. The unity of this view is considered moderate, as these encroaching elements break up the compositional harmony of the viaduct complex – hillside relationship.

**Viewpoint 5**

Viewpoint 5, shown in Figure 2-10, is a view looking north at the southeast corner of the existing viaduct complex. This view is typical of what is afforded from residences situated along the bluff in this area. This view is composed of residential backdrop elements, with the viaduct complex extending from the foreground and merging with the background. Other foreground elements include vegetation. The Los Angeles River is also a prominent element of this view. The vividness of this view is considered high, as the viaduct complex’s architectural features such as the abutment pylons and curvature stand out visually as the complex spans I-5 and the Los Angeles River. The intactness of this view is considered low-to-moderate, as it is comprised of distinct visual elements (residences, the Los Angeles River, I-5, and the viaduct complex itself), but the power lines encroach onto the otherwise scenic area. Lastly, the unity of this view is considered moderate as the viaduct complex ties the linear elements (Los Angeles River and I-5) together into a single coherent composition that balances urban structures and natural features such as vegetation.

**Viewpoint 6**

Viewpoint 6, as shown in Figure 2-11, is a view looking west at the southeast corner of the viaduct complex from the Los Angeles River Greenway Trail. This view is typical of what is afforded by pedestrians, bicyclists and other users of either bank of the Los Angeles River. In addition, some residences located east of Hyperion Avenue and north of the Los Angeles River may also have some views of this prospect. The viaduct complex and Los Angeles River, including the bike path and trail along the banks of the river, as well as the various plants and piers, are the dominant components, and make up the foreground and extends to the middle ground of this view. The sporadic residences nestled into the hills of Griffith Park frames the backdrop of this view. The vividness of this view is considered high, as the viaduct complex’s architectural features such as the abutment pylons and curvature stand out visually as the complex spans the Los Angeles River. The intactness of this view is considered low-to-moderate, as it is comprised of distinct visual elements (residences, Griffith Park, the Los Angeles River, and the viaduct complex itself), but the power lines encroach onto the otherwise scenic area. Lastly, the unity of this view is considered moderate as the viaduct complex ties the river and hillside together harmoniously.

**2.5.3 Environmental Consequences**

**2.5.3.1 Temporary Impacts**

Temporary minor degradation of viaduct complex views would accompany project construction resulting from the presence of construction equipment within the work zones. These effects
would vary in intensity throughout the construction duration (up to 2.5 years). These effects would be temporary in nature as the construction would occur in a staged manner. Since construction in urbanized areas is a common and necessary occurrence, these effects are not considered significant.

In addition, although construction would occur along the viaduct complex along Glendale Boulevard and at the abutments adjacent to Riverside Drive, construction would not affect the resources that form the basis for their designation as scenic highways. No other temporary visual impacts other than those associated with construction are anticipated.

2.5.3.2 Permanent Impacts

In evaluating the existing aesthetic conditions in each of the areas from which views of the proposed project might be important, the evaluative framework developed by the Federal Highway Administration and published as Guidelines on Visual Impact Assessment for Highway Projects (VIA) (FHWA, 1988) was used. Under these guidelines, aspects of the visual experience of proposed physical changes to the environment are considered. Such aspects include physical, historic, and cultural contexts; attitudes and perceptions of viewers; and key points of view where visual impacts are most applicable.

As described above, some of the specialized terms that the VIA approach uses to characterize existing visual conditions include vividness, intactness, and unity. For the purposes of this analysis, aesthetic impacts are evaluated based on changes to the overall visual character and quality of a landscape and the likely effect of the project on viewer response. Considerations include impact to views, shade and shadow effects, and nighttime illumination.

The proposed project would provide or modify the following visual elements of the viaduct complex and its surroundings:

- Consolidate the sidewalks along both sides of the Hyperion Avenue roadway into a single, wider sidewalk on the west side of Hyperion Avenue,
- Add a dividing barrier along the roadway center between opposing traffic on Hyperion Avenue,
- Provide crash barriers along the east and west sides of Hyperion Avenue,
- Replace the existing covered rails along Hyperion Avenue with new rails that replicate the original balustrade design
- Widen the Glendale Boulevard bridges over the Los Angeles River (including new replica balustrades),
- Replace the existing railing system along the Waverly Drive Bridge with new balustrades that replicate the original balustrades, and
- Reconfigure the northbound I-5 off-ramp to Glendale Boulevard and add a new signalized intersection.
- As a mitigation measure, construct an alternate pedestrian crossing over the Los Angeles River across the existing Red Car piers to connect the bike path along the southwest side of the Los Angeles River with Glendale Boulevard on the northeast side of the River.
Views
The proposed project would provide new rails that replicate the original balustrade design. This is seen as an improvement over the existing covered railing system. The existing covered rails are damaged and in a state of disrepair. Although the proposed project would also include crash-resistant protective barriers between the travel lanes and restored balustrades along Hyperion Avenue, as well as a center divider which would partially conceal the restored railing system, the overall effect would be an improvement in the overall visual character of the viaduct complex because portions of the new balustrades would be visible from Hyperion Avenue, and fully visible from external viewpoints. Figures 2-6 through 2-9 show the existing viaduct complex from six different viewpoints and photo simulations of the same views following implementation of the proposed project. As can be seen in Figures 2-6 and 2-7, which represent views of the viaduct complex from residences overlooking the complex, the new balustrades restore an historic detail that adds vividness and complexity to the current view characteristics of the viaduct complex. Figure 2-8 shows a view of the exterior of the northbound Glendale Boulevard Bridge (over the Los Angeles River) from the bike path along the west bank of the river. Again, the new replica balustrades clearly provide an improvement to this view of the bridge. In addition, although the abutment pylons have been relocated approximately eight feet to the east, that relocation does not appreciably alter the view of bridge or the view composition.

Figure 2-9 illustrates a future view of a pedestrian walking south on Hyperion Avenue. A median barrier will be constructed along Hyperion Avenue to facilitate the safety improvements associated with modification to the roadway superelevation. The barrier design will utilize a standard barrier such as type 60S or Type 60SC. A Type 60S is approximately 24 inches at the base, and 32 inches high, and a Type 60SC barrier varies in size. A Type 732 concrete barrier, with a modified tubular hand railing mounted to the top would be constructed between the widened sidewalk and the southbound traffic lanes on Hyperion Avenue. The barrier will be 2 feet-8 inches (32 inches) above the pavement edge of traffic, and the tubular hand railing will be 42 inches above the sidewalk. Although the crash barrier would extend along the east side of Hyperion Avenue and would partially block observation of the new replica balustrades when viewed from Hyperion Avenue, portions of the balustrades would still be visible. In addition, the new balustrades would improve the views experienced by pedestrians walking along Hyperion Avenue by adding historic detail where none currently exists (the existing rails are covered). One of the key aesthetic benefits of the new replica balustrades would be that the open spaces between the balustrades makes the railing less suitable as a canvas for graffiti, and the patchwork of painted-over graffiti on the existing rails would likely be reduced by the proposed project.

Figures 2-10 and 2-11 illustrates pedestrian crossing that would connect from the existing bike path along the right bank of the Los Angeles River, cross the river utilizing the existing Red Car piers, and connect to northbound Glendale Boulevard. This pedestrian crossing is desired by the community, and acts as a mitigation measure to maintain pedestrian access across either bank of the Los Angeles River during construction. The crossing will be constructed of high-strength galvanized steel. Steel checker plate deck can be paved with asphalt or covered with an anti-skid surface. The visual appearance of the steel pedestrian bridge does not demonstrate optimal compatibility with the concrete viaduct complex, and slightly lessens the compositional harmony between the landscape elements. However, non-reflective neutral colors of paint will be used on the crossing to blend with its setting. The pedestrian crossing is functionally consistent with the
landscape unit, and does not intrude onto the aesthetic features of the viaduct complex. The architectural elements of the pedestrian crossing blend harmoniously with the viaduct complex. Likewise, the intactness of the landscape unit is unaffected by the pedestrian crossing. Therefore, the pedestrian crossing would not result in significant visual impacts of the project area. Construction of the pedestrian overcrossing over the Los Angeles River utilizing the existing Red Car piers would require that the piers to cut down to approximately the elevation of the River banks. Permitted by the Flood Control District and painted in 2005, the "Revisit the Red Car" Mural is currently situated on the wall surface of a pier on the left bank of the LA River. It would be removed to accommodate the pedestrian overcrossing and replaced in a nearby location, as approved by the community. Therefore, the community would still have visual access to this mural and the purpose of the mural could still be maintained.

The proposed project would strengthen the spandrel columns by reinforcing them with fiber wrap and covering them with shotcrete. These improvements would add approximately four inches of thickness to the spandrel columns (between 11-19 percent thicker) but are not expected to appreciably change the appearance of the columns or side views of the complex’s arch support structures because all spandrel columns would be reinforced and because the general form and appearance would not be altered. Although the Secretary of the Interior Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties require that the added material be distinguished from the original fabric to facilitate identification of new material, the color of the reinforcing wrapping would be matched to the existing concrete to maintain the original appearance, and another non-visible marking would be utilized to identify the new material.

The visual changes to the viaduct complex resulting from the proposed project are expected to improve the memorability of views of the viaduct complex (restoration of the original balustrade railing characteristics). As a mitigation measure to accommodate the community’s desire to maintain pedestrian access across the Los Angeles River during construction, the proposed project would install a steel-construction pedestrian bridge. The pedestrian bridge would not significantly impact the integrity of the visual environment, and would not significantly disrupt the visual coherence of the landscapes. Consequently, the proposed project would not result in adverse aesthetic impacts from changes to the overall visual character and quality of a landscape.
Figure 2-6: Viewpoint 1
Source: CH2M Hill, 2006
Figure 2-7: Viewpoint 2

Source: CH2M Hill, 2006
Figure 2-8: Viewpoint 3

Source: CH2M Hill, 2006
Figure 2-9: Viewpoint 4
Source: CH2M Hill, 2006
Figure 2-10: Viewpoint 5
Source: UltraSystems Environmental, 2011
CHAPTER 2: AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT, ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Figure 2-11: Viewpoint 6

Existing View – Glendale Viaduct looking south

Proposed View (Pedestrian Crossing Only)

Source: UltraSystems Environmental, 2011
**Shade and Shadows**
The proposed project would not change existing shade or shadow characteristics of the viaduct complex, as the size and scale of the complex’s structural elements and architectural features would not be substantially changed.

**Lighting**
The proposed project would refurbish and reuse the light poles currently present on the viaduct complex. Additional electroliers (light poles) may be added to meet the City’s currently adopted lighting standards at the roadway, as required by the City’s Bureau of Street Lighting. In addition, existing high pressure sodium fixtures shall be upgraded to LED fixtures to reduce energy usage and carbon emissions. Existing high voltage series circuits shall be converted to low voltage multiple circuits. New conduits and wires shall also be installed.

**Scenic Highways**
The proposed improvements to the viaduct complex would not affect the landscaped median along Glendale Boulevard and would therefore not affect its scenic highway status. Similarly, the proposed improvements would not affect Riverside Drive or its scenic highway designation, as no physical changes to Riverside Drive would occur and Riverside Drive would continue to serve as a linkage between Griffith Park and Elysian Park.

**2.5.3.3 Cumulative Impacts**
There are no related projects that could result in significant cumulative impacts in the project area, and therefore, no cumulative impacts related to visual aesthetics are anticipated to occur as a result of the proposed project.

**2.5.3.4 Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures**
Neither avoidance nor mitigation measures are required or proposed.

**2.5.4 No Build Alternative Impacts**
The No Build Alternative would result in no new or additional impacts to visual/aesthetic quality relative to existing conditions.
2.6 Cultural Resources

This section evaluates potential effects of the proposed project on cultural resources.

2.6.1 Regulatory Setting

“Cultural resources” as used in this document refers to all “built environment” resources (structures, bridges, railroads, water conveyance systems, etc.), culturally important resources, and archaeological resources (both prehistoric and historic), regardless of significance. Laws and regulations dealing with cultural resources include:

The National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) of 1966, as amended, sets forth national policy and procedures regarding historic properties, defined as districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects included in or eligible for the National Register of Historic Places. Section 106 of NHPA requires federal agencies to take into account the effects of their undertakings on such properties and to allow the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation the opportunity to comment on those undertakings, following regulations issued by the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (36 CFR 800). On January 1, 2004, a Section 106 Programmatic Agreement (PA) between the Advisory Council, the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO), and Caltrans went into effect for Caltrans projects, both state and local, with FHWA involvement. The PA implements the Advisory Council’s regulations, 36 CFR 800, streamlining the Section 106 process and delegating certain responsibilities to Caltrans. The FHWA’s responsibilities under the PA have been assigned to Caltrans as part of the Surface Transportation Project Delivery Pilot Program (23 CFR 327) (July 1, 2007).

The Archaeological Resources Protection Act (ARPA) applies when a project may involve archaeological resources located on federal or tribal land. ARPA requires that a permit be obtained before excavation of an archaeological resource on such land can take place.

Historic properties may also be covered under Section 4(f) of the U.S. Department of Transportation Act, which regulates the “use” of land from historic properties. See Appendices B1 and B2 for specific information regarding Section 4(f).

Historical resources are considered under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), as well as California Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 5024.1, which established the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR). PRC Section 5024 requires state agencies to identify and protect state-owned resources that meet National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) listing criteria. It further specifically requires Caltrans to inventory state-owned structures in its rights-of-way. Sections 5024(f) and 5024.5 require state agencies to provide notice to and consult with the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) before altering, transferring, relocating, or demolishing state-owned historical resources that are listed on or are eligible for inclusion in the National Register or are registered or eligible for registration as California Historical Landmarks.

2.6.2 Affected Environment

The viaduct complex, comprised of six structures, was designed and constructed by the City of Los Angeles under the direction of bridge engineer Merrill Butler and bridge designer A.L. Enger. The complex was preceded by a single Glendale Boulevard bridge, which was the main access across the Los Angeles River until, by 1924, its limitations created a bottleneck of traffic. To fix this problem, the designers created a three part viaduct that carried traffic of both
Glendale Boulevard and Hyperion Avenue over the river, provided a junction of the two streets to minimize cross traffic, and eliminated the street railway crossing. All this was accomplished with a structure that is notable for its restrained use of neo-classical forms. The multi-structure complex consists of:

1. Waverly Drive Bridge (Bridge Number 53C-1179)
2. Hyperion Avenue Bridge over Riverside Drive (53C-1882)
3. Hyperion Avenue Bridge over I-5 (53-1069)
4. Hyperion Avenue viaduct over the Los Angeles River (53C-1881)
5. Southbound Glendale Boulevard Bridge over the Los Angeles River (53C-1883)
6. Northbound Glendale Boulevard Bridge over the Los Angeles River (53C-1884)

The viaduct complex was determined eligible for listing by the NRHP as part of the Caltrans Historic Bridge Inventory of 1986,\textsuperscript{3} which was confirmed in the Caltrans Historic Bridge Inventory Update in 2002-2004. The viaduct complex is noted for its innovative design techniques and as a bold engineering achievement. It is also noteworthy for its aesthetic quality and use of neo-classical forms. The structure’s formal determination of NRHP eligibility makes it automatically listed in the CRHR. Based on its eligibility of the NRHP, the viaduct complex is also a historic site protected under Section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act of 1966.

All of the bridges were originally constructed between 1927 and 1929 utilizing a decorative railing system that included balustrades. However, the balustrades developed significant cracking and concrete spall and, as part of a railing repair project in 1962, significant segments of the balustrade railing were covered with gypsum board and gunite reinforced with wire mesh. As part of the repair process, the sides of the top rails were chipped or broken, where the covering activity was accomplished, to improve adhesion of the gunite material (see Section 1.3.1.1.1 for further details).

2.6.2.1 Waverly Drive Bridge
The bridge carrying Waverly Drive over Hyperion Avenue is an earth-filled reinforced concrete structure that is 65 feet long. It is two lanes wide, with a roadway and sidewalks on both sides of the bridge. Enclosing the bridge are two concrete-covered railings which repaired the original baluster railing. Cast bronze lanterns with glass globes are set at each corner of the bridge.

2.6.2.2 Hyperion Avenue Bridge over Riverside Drive
The Hyperion Avenue viaduct over Riverside Drive is a reinforced concrete arch bridge that includes three arch spans with a total length of 429 feet. This viaduct accommodates four traffic lanes and is 63 feet wide. Support for the structure is provided by two reinforced concrete abutments and two reinforced concrete piers. The main span is an open spandrel arch measuring 135 feet. Two additional filled spandrel arches, each measuring 118 feet, make up the length of the bridge. The structure has concrete-covered railings with decorative inset panels and a smooth concrete finish, and this covering was performed to repair the original baluster railing system. Two reinforced concrete octagonal-shaped pylons, capped with tile copings, are located at the east end of the main span.

\textsuperscript{3} Since updated and available online at \url{http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/structur/strmaint/historic.htm}; Portia Lee, \textit{Historic American Engineering Record, Glendale-Hyperion Viaduct, HAER No. CA-272}
2.6.2.3 Hyperion Avenue Bridge over I-5
The Hyperion Avenue viaduct over I-5 is a single span, reinforced concrete, open spandrel arch that is 135 feet long. It carries four lanes of traffic and is 71 feet wide with cantilevered walkways flanking the roadway. As with the Waverly Drive Bridge and Hyperion Avenue Bridge over Riverside Drive, the original baluster railings have been covered with concrete. The current railings have inset panels and a smooth concrete finish. Octagonal shaped pylons with tile copings along the tops are located at each end of the span. Decorative bronze-cast lanterns and glass globes, similar to those on the other spans, are set on the railings.

2.6.2.4 Hyperion Avenue Viaduct over the Los Angeles River
Composed of nine spans with a total length of 518 feet, the Hyperion Avenue viaduct over Los Angeles River Bridge segment of the bridge complex is composed of reinforced concrete spandrel arches. The bridge carries four lanes of traffic and is 68 feet wide. It is supported by three reinforced concrete abutments, each crowned with octagonal pylons, and seven reinforced concrete piers. The main span of the bridge is 68 feet wide and each of the eight additional arch spans is 48 feet wide. Cantilevered walkways flank the roadway. Solid reinforced concrete railings having decorative inset panels and a smooth concrete finish are present. These railings are identical to those found on both Waverly Drive and other portions of the viaduct complex along Hyperion Avenue.

2.6.2.5 Southbound Glendale Boulevard Bridge over the Los Angeles River
The southbound Glendale Boulevard Bridge over the Los Angeles River supports two traffic lanes, and consists of six reinforced concrete arch spans with a total length of 316 feet. Each is a filled spandrel arch 48 feet long. Reinforced concrete abutments and piers support the bridge. The railings are concrete-covered with inset panels and a smooth concrete finish (similar to all components of the complex). A concrete pylon is located at each terminus of the bridge. The pylons are hexagonal in shape, each topped with tile coping. Decorative lanterns with glass globes are set on the railings.

2.6.2.6 Northbound Glendale Boulevard Bridge over the Los Angeles River
The northbound Glendale Boulevard Bridge over the Los Angeles River segment of the bridge complex is identical to the southbound structure just discussed.

2.6.2.7 National Register Eligibility
As a group, the six viaduct structures that make up the viaduct complex are eligible for listing in the NRHP under Criteria A and C, and it retains sufficient historic integrity to convey its significance. The viaduct complex is an important element in the development of transportation systems in Los Angeles during the early twentieth century, especially those that cross the Los Angeles River (JRP, 2008). The viaduct complex was one of a group of bridges designed not only to increase vehicular traffic capacity across the river, but also to allow residents to travel between Los Angeles and surrounding cities. The Glendale-Hyperion viaduct is also a significant example of a Neo-classical designed structure, and as a significant work of the Los Angeles Bureau of Engineering (LABOE) (JRP, 2008). The bridges that comprise the viaduct integrate many elements of a classically influenced design, including its proportions and its restrained architectural treatment with use of arches, towers, original baluster railing, and light standards. Figure 2-12 shows historic photographs of the viaduct complex. The boundary of the historic property is the six structures that comprise the Glendale-Hyperion viaduct complex.
The viaduct complex’s character-defining features include its careful choice and placement of concrete arch forms; simple, elegant architectural treatment; and overall reliance on harmonious proportions. Within the overall design of the bridge, the use of both open spandrel and filled spandrel concrete arches is character defining, as it represents the careful attention LABOE staff placed on designing an aesthetically appealing structure, in addition to providing a careful engineering solution. LABOE paid close attention to the overall balance and weight of the composition, striving to create harmonious proportions, by a combination of the arch types and abutment placement.

Complementing the concrete arches are decorative features such as the walkways, belvederes, lanterns and globes, pylons, and the bridges’ classical decorative features such as molding, brackets, and inset molded panels. Pylons/towers were also chosen as an architectural design element to unite the bridge’s curves, ancillary roadways, river, and highway crossings into one composition.

In combination with a simple, open baluster railing, the sparse architectural details led to a cohesive design for the structure. As noted, the railing was later enclosed in concrete along the bridge and thus the original balustrade design detail was lost.

In addition to the structure’s NRHP-eligibility, the Glendale-Hyperion Viaduct is City of Los Angeles Historic Cultural Monument #164, designated in 1976. The viaduct complex was also included in a Caltrans study of Los Angeles Monumental Bridges prepared in 2004. Of the 45 bridges evaluated as part of this study, 29 – including the Glendale-Hyperion Viaduct – appeared to be significant as City of Los Angeles monumental bridges. The study concluded that these bridges are significant for their association with the LABOE’s bridge program in the early to mid-twentieth century, but that they do not constitute a historic district, as defined by National Park Service guidelines for applying the NRHP criteria which define a historic district as having a physical concentration of buildings, structures, objects, or sites with importance derived, in part, from that concentration of resources as a unified entity. The study concluded that bridges are dispersed throughout the city and thus cannot be categorized as a historic district. Caltrans submitted this study to SHPO and received concurrence on its findings in 2005.4

---

Figure 2-12: Historic Viaduct Photographs

Top Photo: General View of Glendale-Hyperion, looking north.
Bottom Photo: Ddeck view, looking southwest.

Both images are taken from Municipal Arts Commission, Los Angeles, Annual Reports, 1921-1929, 60-61.
2.6.3 Environmental Consequences

Criteria of Adverse Effect

The definition of effect is contained within 36 CFR Part 800: “Effect means alteration to the characteristics of a historic property qualifying it for inclusion in or eligibility for the National Register.” An adverse effect occurs “when an undertaking may alter, directly or indirectly, any of the characteristics of a historic property that qualify the property for inclusion in the National Register in a manner that would diminish the integrity of the property’s location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, or association…Adverse effects may include reasonably foreseeable effects caused by the undertaking that may occur later in time, be farther removed in distance or be cumulative.”

Examples of adverse effects may include, but are not limited to, the following:

i. Physical destruction of or damage to all or part of the property;
ii. Alteration of a property, including restoration, rehabilitation, repair, maintenance, stabilization, hazardous material remediation, and provision of handicapped access, that is not consistent with the Secretary’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties (36 CFR part 68) and applicable guidelines;
iii. Removal of property from its historic location;
iv. Change of the character of the property’s use or of physical features within the property’s setting that contribute to its historic significance;
v. Introduction of visual, atmospheric or audible elements that diminish the integrity of the property’s significant historic features;
vi. Neglect of a property which causes its deterioration, except where such neglect and deterioration are recognized qualities of a property of religious and cultural significance to an Indian tribe or Native Hawaiian organization; and
vii. Transfer, lease, or sale of property out of Federal ownership or control without adequate and legally enforceable restrictions or conditions to ensure long-term preservation of the property’s historic significance.

Of the seven effects listed above, under 36 CFR 800.5(a)(2), effects (iii), (vi), and (vii) are not applicable to this project. Under 36 CFR 800.5(a)(2)(iii), proposed work would not result in this property being removed from its historic location. Also under 36 CFR 800.5(a)(2)(vi), this property does not suffer from neglect and as a result this effect is not applicable. Finally, under criterion (viii), the viaduct complex is not federally owned nor would it change ownership as a result of this project.

As contained in Section 15064.5 of the CEQA guidelines, substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource means physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of the resource or its immediate surroundings such that the significance of a historical resource would be materially impaired.

---

5 36 CFR 800.5(a)(1).
6 36 CFR 800.5(a)(2)(i through vii).
2.6.3.1 Temporary Impacts

Construction activities associated with implementing seismic reinforcement and other bridge improvements would result in construction noise, dust, and traffic lane restrictions, but such effects would not diminish the historic integrity of the viaduct complex. No other temporary impacts to historic properties/historical resources, including the bridge structures, are anticipated from the proposed project.

2.6.3.2 Permanent Impacts

The NHPA Section 106 regulations, in 36 CFR 800.4(d)(2), state that if there are historic properties within the Area of Potential Effect (APE) of a federal undertaking, the agency official shall assess adverse effects, if any, in accordance with the Criteria of Adverse Effect defined in 36 CFR 800.5. The viaduct complex is a protected resource under Section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act, and is analyzed in Appendix B1 of this IS/EA.

As discussed below, the City’s proposed project would be designed to avoid and minimize adverse effects to the bridge, a historic property, but several crucial elements of the project would result in an adverse effect.

The architectural APE for the proposed project includes the public right-of-way that encompasses the boundaries of the viaduct complex with the widened Glendale Boulevard bridges over the Los Angeles River and the piers for the former Red Car line. Within the APE, the viaduct complex is the only historic property under Section 106 and historical resource for the purposes of CEQA compliance.

The viaduct complex is a protected resource under Section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act. The Section 4(f) Programmatic Evaluation of the viaduct complex is included as Appendix B1 of this IS/EA. The pedestrian crossing that would be constructed as a mitigation measure would not utilize the viaduct complex. Moreover, the construction of the pedestrian crossing over the Red Car piers would not result in any impact to the historical significance of the viaduct complex because the piers are remnants of a separately constructed and demolished Red Car Line bridge and exempt from Section 106 evaluation.

The striping of bicycle lanes on Hyperion Avenue over the viaduct would not result in an adverse effect because the lane striping would be painted on the paved roadway and would not involve or result in any construction or other physical changes to the viaduct, as described in Chapter 1.3.

Analysis of Adverse Effects

Project elements that affect all or portions of the viaduct complex or are going to be carried throughout the structure are discussed below. The following subsections address potential effects to each bridge that comprises the historic property. Because the work proposed is similar along several portions of each bridge, the bridges are grouped by street, so that all three structures along Hyperion Avenue are treated in one section and the two Glendale Boulevard bridges are dealt with in a single section.

Of the work proposed, restriping the roadway is planned to occur across all portions of the bridges. As originally proposed, the roadway would provide one 12-foot-wide inside lane and one 14-foot-wide outside lane for both northbound and southbound Hyperion Avenue and two 12-foot-wide lanes for northbound and southbound Glendale Boulevard with new shoulders and widened sidewalks. With the design option, bicycle lanes will be included on Hyperion, and the
traffic lane widths and configuration will be different depending on the final design selected. This action would not adversely affect any portion of the viaduct complex because it will not change the setting or alter any historic features of the complex.

As noted, a part of the proposed undertaking includes replication of the original baluster railing along all portions of the bridge. Enclosed in the 1960s, which damaged the top rails, the basic form of the original railing (built in 1929) is a significant character-defining feature of the bridge that contributed to the neo-classical design of viaduct complex (the rail covering is not considered a character-defining element). It was one of several architectural elements that unified the three-part Hyperion Avenue viaduct. As a treatment, replicating the original railing meets the Secretary of the Interior Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties, and has been encouraged as an appropriate treatment for this historic property. The replication of the railings is considered to be among the efforts to minimize and mitigate the project’s adverse effect. The motorist on the bridge deck or passing under the bridge on I-5 would again be given a sense of the original historic appearance of the bridge, and the monumental nature of the bridge captured with the rehabilitation of this original design detail.

Table 2.6-1, below, provides a summary of the analysis of effects for each historic property within the APE for this project (JRP, 2008). It is concluded that the project would have an adverse effect on two of the six bridges that comprise the viaduct complex. Caltrans submitted the FOE for this project to SHPO, who concurred with the finding of adverse effect for this undertaking in May 2009.7

Waverly Drive (53C1179)
The existing covered railing along Waverly Drive (over Hyperion Avenue) would be replicated consistent with the Secretary of Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation, which would return the original balustrades design to the structure. No other work would be performed on the bridge and thus it would not be adversely affected by the project.

Hyperion Avenue over Riverside Drive (53C1882), Hyperion Avenue over I-5 (531069), and Hyperion Avenue over the Los Angeles River (53C1881)
None of the modifications planned for the Hyperion Avenue viaducts, including the installation of bicycle lanes, would have an adverse effect on these structures. Work includes eliminating the existing 2-foot curb along the east side of Hyperion Avenue (along the retaining wall beneath the Waverly Drive Bridge) and the 4-foot curb on the east side of the Hyperion Avenue (north of Waverly Bridge) and adding a concrete barrier to protect the new replica rails that would be installed. Additional improvements include increasing the width of the sidewalk on southbound Hyperion Avenue from five feet to eight feet, tapering back to four feet along the retaining wall near Waverly Drive, and installing a concrete barrier between the widened sidewalk and traffic. In addition to the rehabilitation and reuse of the existing lighting, the project also includes the addition of replica street lights (if necessary), and, as noted above, replica replacement of the original bridge railings (balustrades), which were altered in the 1960s. The repair, rehabilitation, and reuse, as well as possible replication of the light standards, would further contribute to preserving and retaining the historic character of the Hyperion Avenue bridges and the viaduct complex as a whole. A pedestrian crosswalk (across southbound Glendale Boulevard) is also

planned at the northern end of the viaduct complex. This crosswalk would likely have signage or blinking signals, similar to other signage and blinking signals commonly used throughout a city.

The traffic safety measures, including the installation of the center median barrier and concrete railing barriers, do not require any physical demolition of historic fabric, and would not have an adverse effect under 36 CFR Part 800.5(a)(i) or (ii); nor would they have an adverse effect under 36 CFR Part 800 (iii) because previous modern improvements to the bridge deck, and construction of I-5, in the immediate vicinity of the bridge, have already impacted, to a substantial degree, the original setting and feeling of the bridge. When the current setting of the bridge is compared to the original setting as shown in Figure 2-12, the viewer can see the loss of characteristics that contributed the setting and the negligible impact the installation of the concrete barrier and median would have on this feature.

Under 36 CFR Part 800.5(a)(v), the installation of the barrier and median do not introduce “visual elements that diminish the integrity of the property’s historic significance features.” Placement of the concrete barrier between the pedestrian walk along southbound Hyperion Avenue and the roadway is far enough from the railing that it does not impair the view of the bridge from southbound I-5. Furthermore, the barrier would be a reversible treatment and thus meets the Secretary of Interior Standards for this reason. Finally, the road has been resurfaced and repaved numerous times in its 75-year history and the median barrier or repaving would not alter the historic features of the deck.

Although portions of the improvements to the pedestrian amenities would remove the sidewalks, and as a result some original fabric, the work would not have an adverse effect on the structure. Defining elements (pylons, belvederes, etc.) of the complex would not be affected by the proposed work, and the overall intent of the design, allowing pedestrian access across the viaduct complex, would be maintained with the widened sidewalk on the southbound side of Hyperion Avenue. Again under the Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation guidelines, alterations are permitted when necessary to protect public safety and access issues as in this case. Therefore, this action does not constitute an adverse effect. These elements of the project would not have an adverse effect along any portions of the bridge along Hyperion Avenue.
### Table 2.6-1: Potential Effects of the Glendale-Hyperion Project on Historic Properties Within the Project’s APE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bridge #</th>
<th>Feature Intersection</th>
<th>Physical destruction of or damage to all or part of the property</th>
<th>Alteration that is not consistent with Secretary of the Interior’s standards for the treatment of historic properties</th>
<th>Removal of the property from its historic location</th>
<th>Change in character of property’s use or physical features within the property’s setting that contribute to its historic significance</th>
<th>Introduction of visual, atmospheric, or audible elements that diminish the integrity of property’s significant historic features</th>
<th>Neglect of a property which causes its deterioration</th>
<th>Transfer, lease, or sale of property out of Federal ownership or control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>53C1179</td>
<td>Waverly Dr. over Hyperion Ave.</td>
<td>No adverse effect</td>
<td>No adverse effect</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No adverse effect</td>
<td>No adverse effect</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53C1882</td>
<td>Hyperion Ave. over Riverside Dr.</td>
<td>No adverse effect</td>
<td>No adverse effect</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No adverse effect</td>
<td>No adverse effect</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53 1069</td>
<td>Hyperion Ave. over I-5</td>
<td>No adverse effect</td>
<td>No adverse effect</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No adverse effect</td>
<td>No adverse effect</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53C1881</td>
<td>Hyperion Ave. over southbound Glendale Blvd and the Los Angeles River</td>
<td>No adverse effect</td>
<td>No adverse effect</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No adverse effect</td>
<td>No adverse effect</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53C1883</td>
<td>Southbound Glendale Blvd. over the Los Angeles River</td>
<td>Adverse effect</td>
<td>No adverse effect</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No adverse Effect</td>
<td>No adverse effect</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53C1884</td>
<td>Northbound Glendale Blvd. over the Los Angeles River</td>
<td>Adverse effect</td>
<td>No adverse effect</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No adverse effect</td>
<td>No adverse effect</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


---

8 The categories of effects listed in the table above were generated from the examples of adverse effects listed in 36 CFR 800.5(a)(2). No other types of effects to historic properties were identified or are anticipated.
Southbound Glendale over Los Angeles River (53C1883) and Northbound Glendale over the Los Angeles River (53C1884)

The project would have an adverse effect on the viaduct complex by adversely affecting two of the six structures. Both the Southbound Glendale Boulevard Bridge over the Los Angeles River (53C1883) and the Northbound Glendale Boulevard Bridge over the Los Angeles River (53C1884) would be widened as part of this project. These two structures are contributing components of the viaduct complex, albeit secondary structures within the overall property. The project would alter portions of these structures that are character-defining features of the viaduct complex. The wider replacement structure would replicate the arches of the original structure, along with the railings as discussed above, and the original pylons would be retained, rehabilitated, and placed back at their appropriate locations at the end of the railings of the Southbound Glendale Boulevard Bridge over the Los Angeles River (53C1883) and the Northbound Glendale Boulevard Bridge over the Los Angeles River (53C1884).

Work planned for both the southbound and northbound Glendale Boulevard bridges over the Los Angeles River includes widening both bridges by eight feet and modifying the I-5 on-ramp to join the widened sections of Glendale Boulevard. To accomplish this, both edges of the bridge would be reconstructed eight feet wider. The new construction would include replicating much of the original design features. All of the architectural details, including concrete arches, railings, and light standards, would be rebuilt using original plans. The original pylons would be carefully removed and repositioned on the bridges in the equivalent position to those they held originally. The flow control walls in the river that once connected this structure to the piers of a now-demolished railroad bridge (for the former Red Car line) to the south would have to be altered to accommodate the shift of the ramp to the east. Although the southbound Glendale Boulevard Bridge over the Los Angeles River (53C1883) and the northbound Glendale Boulevard Bridge over the Los Angeles River (53C1884) would be rehabilitated following, in part, the original design with some original features preserved and relocated, the proposed work would adversely affect the bridge under 36 CFR 800.5(a),(2)(i) because of the physical alteration of a portion of the historic property.

Under 36 CFR 800.5(a)(2)(i), an adverse effect is defined as “physical destruction of or damage to all or part of the property,” which under this alternative is partial demolition. The elements of the bridge complex that would be altered include many of the character-defining features essential to conveying the bridges’ neo-classical design, which are essential to the complex’s eligibility for listing in the NRHP. By removing these original components, the proposed project would diminish the bridge’s historic integrity.

For the portions of the project that would affect the complex’s historic character-defining features, the City is designing the project to follow the Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation. The City is retaining and maintaining the viaduct complex’s original use, preserving its historic character and distinctive features, and replacing deteriorated historic features to match the old features in design, color, texture, and its visual qualities. These include the modified railings on most of the structures that comprise the viaduct complex and replicating original light standards. The new features would also not create a false sense of history that would result if the project were adding features based on conjecture. Rather, the project would be partially accomplished by basing the design of the new structure on the documentary and physical evidence of the original design and by the new materials used that can be distinguished from the historic materials. Other than the specific features that are required for the widening of
the Glendale Boulevard bridges, the new additions to the viaduct complex would not destroy historic materials or features of the complex, and if the improvements made to the viaduct complex were to be removed in the future, the essential form and historic integrity of the historic property would remain.

Further project elements related to improving the Glendale Boulevard bridges include modifying the I-5 on-ramps to join the widened sections of northbound and southbound Glendale Boulevard. These two ramps are not part of the historic viaduct complex.

Several pedestrian enhancements are planned for the vicinity of both Glendale Boulevard bridges. These enhancements would not have an adverse effect on either of the bridges. Improvements in this category would consist of a pedestrian walkway beneath the viaduct complex along the Los Angeles River and the addition of a new pedestrian/bicycle ramp near the east side of the northbound bridge to provide access to the existing Los Angeles River bike path. A second pedestrian crossing would be added at southbound Glendale Boulevard at the northern end of the viaduct complex.

Because these activities do not entail removing, changing or altering any historic features or fabric of these bridges they would not have an adverse effect on either bridge or the viaduct complex as a whole.

Seismic Improvements

As explained in the project description, seismic retrofitting is planned for portions of the bridge so that the entire viaduct complex would meet current seismic performance standards. The retrofit action consists of four elements, including abutment transverse wall shear friction retrofit, spandrel column ductility retrofit, interior spandrel wall strengthening, and pier wall channel lining retrofit. All four of these elements would be undertaken along Hyperion Avenue. The abutment transverse wall shear friction retrofit and pier wall channel lining retrofit would be located on the lower portions of the bridge and would include limited physical impact to the bridge, whereas the spandrel column ductility retrofit and interior spandrel wall strengthening would consist of work to the open spandrel areas of the bridge and include construction of additional elements to the bridge. Each of the construction activities associated with the seismic retrofit and their effects is discussed below.

Abutments/Pier Seismic Improvements

Under the applicable sections of 36 CFR 800.5(a)(2), this work would not have an adverse effect. The construction work proposed would not under Section (i) cause physical damage to the property except in a localized portion of the abutment and piers. Under 36 CFR 800.5(a)(2)(ii), seismic work would consist of repair and maintenance activities that are consistent with the Secretary’s guidelines because the work proposed does not threaten to diminish the historic appearance of the historic property. For the same reasons, this work would not cause an adverse effect by introducing visual elements that diminish the integrity of the viaduct complex. As stated in the standards, “if a building needs to be seismically upgraded, modifications to the historic appearance should be minimal.” Although specifically referring to a building, this statement is applicable to a bridge as well. Work proposed to seismically improve the abutments would be consistent with this statement, would be minimal, and would not affect the historic appearance of the abutments or piers.
Spandrel Column Ductility Retrofits and interior Spandrel Wall Strengthening

Under the applicable sections of 36 CFR 800.5(a)(2), the spandrel column ductility retrofit and interior spandrel wall strengthening would not have an adverse effect. The construction activities for this work do not call for demolition (localized or otherwise); thus, the effects from these actions would not cause physical damage to all or any part of the resource. Therefore, it would not be an adverse effect under Criterion (i). Under section (ii) of the criteria, the activities for this project fall within the category of rehabilitation and are subject to the standards for this treatment. Within this treatment, the Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation allow for some alterations to a resource to ensure its continued use, provided that the alterations do not radically change, obscure, or destroy character-defining features. Adding fiber wrapping and concrete bolsters to the spandrel columns would not necessitate the removal of distinctive material along the spandrel arch, nor would it radically change or destroy character-defining features of the open spandrel portion of the bridge. Fiber wrapping the columns would obscure the original fabric along the column; however, cladding the column with an exact match of the exterior appearance original column would constitute an “in kind” treatment. Also, the original column would be retained beneath the work, preserving the original fabric, should the work be removed in the future. Moreover, the proposed “in kind” treatment would not alter the spatial relationship of the column to the arch. Considering the size and scale of the changes, the seismic retrofit impacts to the appearance of the column would be negligible.

Additionally, these actions would not alter the character of the complex’s use or alter physical features within the complex’s setting that contribute the historic significance under Criterion (iv). The open spandrel arches are one of the most prominent character-defining features of the bridge and sensitive treatment is necessary to retain a high threshold of integrity. For the same reasons as described above, the arch retrofits would not adversely impact the integrity of the arches. These actions would minimally alter the physical characteristics of these arches and are designed so that the size and scale of the new features do not adversely impact the original features. These changes would not introduce visual elements that diminish the integrity of the bridge. Overall, the viaduct complex displays a high degree of integrity, and the proposed actions would not alter that status in any significant level. In plan elevation, the overall appearance of the bridge would not appear to be altered by this work.

2.6.3.3 Cumulative Impacts

The original balustrades along the viaduct complex were repaired in 1962 by covering them with gypsum and reinforced gunnite. As part of the railing covering project, the sides of the top rails were broken, presumably to provide a base for adhesion of the gunnite. The past repair job has damaged original historic fabric.

The proposed project would replace the existing covered railings with new balustrades based on the original balustrade design, which would restore the viaduct complex to its original appearance.

Although the proposed project would result in an adverse effect to the southbound and northbound Glendale Boulevard bridges over the Los Angeles River related to the removal of some original historic fabric from the widening, the City is designing the project to follow the Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation, including retaining and maintaining the viaduct complex’s original use, preserving its historic character and distinctive features, and replacing deteriorated historic features to match the original features in design, color, texture, and its visual qualities. These include replica balustrades on most of the structures that comprise...
the viaduct complex and replicating original light standards. At a project level, the new additions to the viaduct complex would not destroy features of the bridge complex, other than the specific features that are required for the widening of the two Glendale Boulevard bridge structures, and if the new improvements made to the bridge complex were to be removed in the future, the essential form and historic integrity of the historical resource would remain. There are also no known projects in the foreseeable future that might adversely affect the historic property. Furthermore, project-level mitigation would be implemented, as described in Section 2.6.3.4 below. Because of this, the proposed project would not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to a cumulatively significant impact to this historic property.

As noted, the Glendale-Hyperion Viaduct is City of Los Angeles Historic Cultural Monument #164 and it was included in the Caltrans Los Angeles Monumental Bridges study. The study concluded that the monumental bridges are significant for their association with LABOE’s bridge program in the early to mid-twentieth century, but that they do not constitute a historic district. There are projects that have and are currently affecting other Los Angeles monumental bridges, including 1st Street Viaduct (HCM#909), Main Street Bridge (HCM#901), Riverside Bridge at Figueroa Street (HCM#908), North Spring Street (HCM#900), Riverside-Zoo Drive Bridge (HCM#910), and 6th Street Viaduct (HCM#905). There is no historic district to which these bridges contribute and thus the adverse effect on the Glendale-Hyperion Viaduct does not constitute a cumulative effect under Section 106 for impacts to the Los Angeles monumental bridges. Under CEQA, the Los Angeles monumental bridges are thematically linked and impacts on one bridge could potentially have a cumulative impact on this group. The project on the Glendale-Hyperion Viaduct will not demolish the structure and it will remain listed as a HCM. Efforts to minimize and mitigate the effects to the Glendale-Hyperion Viaduct lessen the impacts to this historical resource such that do not create a cumulative impact to the group because the bridge’s character-defining features will remain and mitigation includes replicating the historic railings through the viaduct complex enhancing the historic structure’s original design character.

There are no other key related projects which in conjunction with the proposed project, could result in cumulative impacts to the viaduct complex.

2.6.3.4 Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures

The project has been designed to incorporate features to minimize adverse effects to the viaduct complex, while meeting the project’s engineering requirements. Features include replication of the original balustrades that are character defining.

The proposed project would result in adverse effects to the Glendale Boulevard bridges over the Los Angeles River, which would be minimized by implementation of the following mitigation measures:

**H-1: Recordation to Historic American Engineering Record (HAER) Specifications:** Prior to the start of any work that could adversely affect characteristics that qualify the Glendale-Hyperion Viaduct Complex as a historic property, contact the National Park Service Pacific West Region Office (NPS), to determine if additional recordation is required for the historic property beyond that provided in “Historic

---

American Engineering Record, Glendale-Hyperion Viaduct, HAER No. CA-272,” 2000-2001. NPS should respond to the additional recordation request within 30 days. If additional documentation is required, it should be completed and accepted by the NPS before the viaduct is altered. Prepare draft and final reports.

**H-2: Historic American Buildings Survey (HABS)/HAER Dissemination:** Upon completion of the documentation prescribed in Mitigation Measure H-1, documentation meeting current archival quality standards established by the NPS’ Heritage Documentation Program to District 7 and the Caltrans Transportation History Library in Sacramento shall be provided. Archive quality documentation shall also be provided to NPS, if NPS requests it. Copies of the documentation shall be offered to, at a minimum, the Los Angeles Public Library, Los Angeles Conservancy, Los Angeles City Historical Society, Historical Society of Southern California, and the California Office of Historic Preservation.

**H-3: Online Publication:** Work with the Los Angeles Public Library to place the historical information from the HAER report, prescribed in Mitigation Measure H-1, on a City website with a link to a public library website, such as the Los Angeles Public Library website, available to the public for a minimum period of three years. The information link shall also be made available to the Caltrans Transportation Library and History Center at Caltrans Headquarters in Sacramento for inclusion on their website.

**H-4: Video Documentary:** Produce a documentary (motion picture or video) that addresses the history of the Los Angeles River monument bridges, and their importance and use within the broader contextual history of the City of Los Angeles. The motion picture or video shall be of broadcast quality, between 30- and 90-minute duration, and shall be made available to local broadcast stations, public access channels in the local cable systems, and requesting schools/libraries; one copy shall be submitted to the Caltrans Transportation Library and History Center at Caltrans Headquarters in Sacramento.

**H-5: Traveling Exhibits:** Produce and publish a booklet on the Historic Los Angeles River Bridges that addresses the history of the monumental concrete bridges of Los Angeles and this bridge’s place in that history. The booklet shall be similar in general format to the “Historic Highway Bridges of California” published by the California Department of Transportation (1991) and shall include high-quality, black and white images of the Los Angeles River Bridges, historic photographs or drawings, as appropriate, and text describing each of the bridges’ location, year built, builder, bridge type, significant character-defining features and its historic significance. Ensure that an electronic version of the booklet is posted on a City website and produce paper copies for distribution to local libraries, institutions and historical societies. One copy shall be submitted to the Caltrans Transportation Library and History Center in Sacramento. Ensure that the camera-ready master booklet is maintained and produce additional copies if there is demand.

**H-6: Replication of Design Elements:** Ensure that a Caltrans Professionally Qualified Staff Principal Architectural Historian reviews the 65% and 95% design plans and
specifications for the Glendale-Hyperion Viaduct Complex are in conformance with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties (SOI Standards), and that SHPO is afforded the opportunity to review the same design plans and specifications. Failure of the SHPO to respond within thirty (30) calendar days after receipt of the plans shall not preclude Caltrans from proceeding with the undertaking. Should the SHPO or the Council object within thirty (30) calendar days to any plans and specifications submitted for review, then Caltrans shall consult with the objecting party, for a period not to exceed ten (10) calendar days, to resolve the objection. If the objection cannot be resolved within this time period, the FHWA shall request the Council review the Finding in accordance with 36 CFR 800.5(c)(3).

2.6.4 No Build Alternative Impacts
The No Build Alternative would result in no new or additional impacts to historic resources relative to existing conditions.
2.7 Archaeological Resources

This section evaluates potential effects of the proposed project on archaeological resources.

2.7.1 Regulatory Setting

The same regulatory framework that applies to historic properties also applies to archaeological resources.

In addition, the LABOE issued a Special Order (No. S002-0590) for the protection of archaeological resources. This special order requires an archaeological monitor for construction in archaeologically sensitive areas. If archaeological resources are encountered, the construction inspector will halt work while the archaeologist evaluated the significance of the artifacts. Any culturally significant materials field notes, reports, and photographs are to be placed with an appropriate archaeological repository or appropriate Native American tribe.

2.7.2 Affected Environment

An Archaeological Survey Report (ASR) was prepared in February 2008 (AEW, 2008) to identify potential archaeological sites in the architectural area of potential effects (APE) as part of the HPSR (see Section 2.6).

The archeological APE consists of areas where excavation would occur during construction, including footings and frontage road widening.

The project area is located along the Los Angeles River floodplain in northeast Los Angeles. Elevation of the project area is approximately 400 feet above mean sea level. Vegetation in the area was formerly dominated by species characteristic of riparian and chamise-chaparral communities (Muntz, 1974). Currently, the project area is urbanized with a built environmental setting. Most of the project area consists of existing freeway, highway, ramps, viaducts/bridge over-crossings, and other related transportation improvements. I-5 and the Los Angeles River are prominent elements of the existing environment, while modern buildings and landscaping characterize much of the remaining project area. Griffith Park is located northwest of the project area and contains remnants areas of native vegetation. Past construction of these transportation-related features has resulted in grading and disturbances to all natural areas in the APE.

2.7.3 Environmental Consequences

2.7.3.1 Temporary Impacts

Based on the database research and field investigation, no temporary impacts to archaeological resources are anticipated from the proposed project due to the lack of such resources within the project APE and the disturbed nature of the project area. No further cultural resource work is recommended.

Although no archaeological resources are expected to be encountered during construction, a professional archaeologist would monitor all ground disturbing activities as requested by the Chairman of the Gabrieleno/Tongva Tribal Council. (See A-1 in section 2.7.3.4.)

If human remains are encountered during construction, standard policy of the City of Los Angeles and Caltrans would be followed. This includes notifying the County Coroner. In such an event, construction would be halted. If the remains are Native American, the Coroner is responsible for contacting the NAHC within 24 hours. The Commission, pursuant to Section 5097.98 of the PRC, shall immediately notify those persons it believes to the most likely
descendants of the deceased Native Americans. Treatment of the remains would be dependent on the views of the most likely descendent.

2.7.3.2 Permanent Impacts
The ASR was completed for the proposed project and is provided as part of the HPSR (JRP, 2008). The ASR consisted of:

- A records search for archaeological resources, encompassing the following sources:
  - South Central Coastal Information Center at California State University, Fullerton
  - Office of Historic Preservation Database of Determinations of Eligibility
  - Department of Parks and Recreation California Points of Historical Interest
  - California Historic Landmarks
  - California Inventory of Historic Resources
  - National Register of Historic Places
  - City of Los Angeles Cultural Monuments List
- A pedestrian surface reconnaissance survey of the entire APE.

Neither the records search nor the field survey revealed evidence of prehistoric or historic archaeological resources within the APE.

In accordance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, a request was made to the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) for a review of the Sacred Lands Files in May 2004 to determine if any known cultural properties are present within or adjacent to the project APE. The NAHC responded, stating that no Native American Cultural resources are known to exist within or adjacent to the project APE. However, the NAHC requested that 11 Native American individuals and organizations be contacted to solicit any information regarding cultural resources issues related to the project. These individuals and organizations were contacted, and the Chairman of the Gabrielino/Tongva Tribal Council contacted the archaeologist, stating that he had concerns regarding the project due to its proximity to the Los Angeles River where Native peoples often located their villages and cemeteries. The chairman requested that a professional archaeologist be present during ground-disturbing activities. No other comments have been received from the Native American individuals or organizations contacts.

Based on the database research and field investigation, no permanent impacts to archaeological resources are anticipated from the proposed project due to the very disturbed nature of the APE and the lack of such resources within or near the project APE. No further cultural resource work is recommended unless the project expands beyond the current APE.

2.7.3.3 Cumulative Impacts
On the basis of records research and field investigation, no cumulative impacts to archaeological resources are anticipated from the proposed project in conjunction with other projects because no related projects would affect the APE, due to the lack of such resources within the project APE, and because of the disturbed nature of the project area. No further cultural resource work is recommended unless the project expands beyond the current APE.
2.7.3.4 Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures
Although the proposed project is not expected to affect archaeological resources, as requested by the Chairman of the Gabrielino/Tongva Tribal Council, the following measure would be implemented:

A-1: A professional archaeologist would monitor all ground disturbing activities during construction and would act according to the Special Order and Caltrans policies if archaeological resources are discovered.

In addition, if buried cultural materials are encountered during construction, work in the area of the resource would be halted and applicable actions under City of Los Angeles and Caltrans policy would be implemented.

2.7.4 No Build Alternative Impacts
The No Build Alternative would result in no new or additional impacts to archeological resources relative to existing conditions.
Physical Environment

2.8 Hydrology, Water Quality, Stormwater Runoff

This section evaluates potential effects of the proposed project on hydrology, water quality, and urban runoff.

2.8.1 Regulatory Setting

Executive Order 11988 (Floodplain Management) directs all federal agencies to refrain from conducting, supporting, or allowing actions in floodplains unless it is the only practicable alternative. The Federal Highway Administration requirements for compliance are outlined in 23 CFR 650 Subpart A.

In order to comply, the following must be analyzed:

- The practicability of alternatives to any longitudinal encroachments
- Risks of the action
- Impacts on natural and beneficial floodplain values
- Support of incompatible floodplain development
- Measures to minimize floodplain impacts and to preserve/restore any beneficial floodplain values impacted by the project.

The base floodplain is defined as “the area subject to flooding by the flood or tide having a one percent chance of being exceeded in any given year.” An encroachment is defined as “an action within the limits of the base floodplain.”

Federal Requirements: Clean Water Act

In 1972 Congress amended the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, making the addition of pollutants to the waters of the United States (U.S.) from any point source unlawful unless the discharge is in compliance with a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit. Known today as the Clean Water Act (CWA), Congress has amended it several times. In the 1987 amendments, Congress directed dischargers of storm water from municipal and industrial/construction point sources to comply with the NPDES permit scheme. Important CWA sections are:

- Sections 303 and 304, which require states to promulgate water quality standards, criteria, and guidelines.

- Section 401, which requires an applicant for a federal license or permit to conduct any activity that may result in a discharge to waters of the U.S. to obtain certification from the state that the discharge will comply with other provisions of the act. (Most frequently required in tandem with a Section 404 permit request. See below.)

- Section 402, which establishes the NPDES, a permitting system for the discharges (except for dredge or fill material) of any pollutant into waters of the U.S. Regional Water Quality Control Boards (RWQCB) administer this permitting program in
California.  Section 402(p) requires permits for discharges of storm water from industrial/construction and municipal separate storm sewer systems (MS4s).

- Section 404, which establishes a permit program for the discharge of dredge or fill material into waters of the United States. This permit program is administered by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE).

The objective of the CWA is “to restore and maintain the chemical, physical, and biological integrity of the Nation’s waters.”

USACE issues two types of 404 permits:  Standard and General Permits. There are two types of General permits: Regional Permits and Nationwide Permits. Regional permits are issued for a general category of activities when they are similar in nature and cause minimal environmental effect. Nationwide permits are issued to authorize a variety of minor project activities with no more than minimal effects.

There are two types of Standard Permits:  Individual permits and Letters of Permission. Ordinarily, projects that do not meet the criteria for a Nationwide Permit may be permitted under one of USACE’s Standard Permits. For Standard Permits, the USACE decision to approve is based on compliance with U.S. EPA’s Section 404 (b)(1) Guidelines (U.S. EPA CFR 40 Part 230), and whether permit approval is in the public interest. The Section 404(b)(1) Guidelines were developed by the U.S. EPA in conjunction with USACE, and allow the discharge of dredged or fill material into the aquatic system (waters of the U.S.) only if there is no practicable alternative which would have less adverse effects. The Guidelines state that USACE may not issue a permit if there is a least environmentally damaging practicable alternative (LEDPA), to the proposed discharge that would have lesser effects on waters of the U.S., and not have any other significant adverse environmental consequences. Per Guidelines, documentation is needed that a sequence of avoidance, minimization, and compensation measures has been followed, in that order. The Guidelines also restrict permitting activities that violate water quality or toxic effluent standards, jeopardize the continued existence of listed species, violate marine sanctuary protections, or cause “significant degradation” to waters of the U.S. In addition every permit from the USACE, even if not subject to the Section 404(b)(1) Guidelines, must meet general requirements. See 33 CFR 320.4. A discussion of the LEDPA determination, if any, for the document is included in the Wetlands and Other Waters section.

**State Requirements: Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act**

California’s Porter-Cologne Act, enacted in 1969, provides the legal basis for water quality regulation within California. This Act requires a “Report of Waste Discharge” for any discharge of waste (liquid, solid, or gaseous) to land or surface waters that may impair beneficial uses for surface and/or groundwater of the State. It predates the CWA and regulates discharges to waters of the State. Waters of the State include more than just Waters of the U.S., such as groundwater and surface waters not considered Waters of the U.S. Additionally, it prohibits discharges of “waste” as defined; the definition of waste is broader than the CWA definition of “pollutant.” Discharges under the Porter-Cologne Act are permitted by Waste Discharge Requirements (WDRs) and may be required even when the discharge is already permitted or exempt under the CWA.
The State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) and RWQCBs are responsible for establishing the water quality standards (objectives and beneficial uses) required by the CWA, and regulating discharges to ensure compliance with the water quality standards. Details regarding water quality standards in a project area are contained in the applicable RWQCB Basin Plan. States designate beneficial uses for all water body segments, and then set criteria necessary to protect these uses. Consequently, the water quality standards developed for particular water segments are based on the designated use and vary depending on such use. In addition, each state identifies waters failing to meet standards for specific pollutants, which are then state-listed in accordance with CWA Section 303(d). If a state determines that waters are impaired for one or more constituents and the standards cannot be met through point source controls, the CWA requires the establishment of Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs). TMDLs specify allowable pollutant loads from all sources (point, non-point, and natural) for a given watershed.

**State Water Resources Control Board and Regional Water Quality Control Boards**

The SWRCB administers water rights, water pollution control, and water quality functions throughout the state. RWQCBs are responsible for protecting beneficial uses of water resources within their regional jurisdiction using planning, permitting, and enforcement authorities to meet this responsibility.

**National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Program**

Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems

Section 402(p) of the CWA requires the issuance of NPDES permits for five categories of storm water dischargers, including Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems (MS4s). The U.S. EPA defines an MS4 as any conveyance or system of conveyances (roads with drainage systems, municipal streets, catch basins, curbs, gutters, ditches, human-made channels, and storm drains) owned or operated by a state, city, town, county, or other public body having jurisdiction over storm water, that are designed or used for collecting or conveying storm water. The SWRCB has identified Caltrans as an owner/operator of an MS4 by the SWRCB. This permit covers all Caltrans rights-of-way, properties, facilities, and activities in the state. The SWRCB or the RWQCB issues NPDES permits for five years, and permit requirements remain active until a new permit has been adopted.

Caltrans’ MS4 Permit, under revision at the time of this writing, contains three basic requirements:

1. Caltrans must comply with the requirements of the Construction General Permit (see below);

2. Caltrans must implement a year-round program in all parts of the State to effectively control storm water and non-storm water discharges; and

3. Caltrans storm water discharges must meet water quality standards through implementation of permanent and temporary (construction) Best Management Practices (BMPs) and other measures.
To comply with the permit, Caltrans developed the Statewide Storm Water Management Plan (SWMP) to address storm water pollution controls related to highway planning, design, construction, and maintenance activities throughout California. The SWMP assigns responsibilities within Caltrans for implementing storm water management procedures and practices as well as training, public education and participation, monitoring and research, program evaluation, and reporting activities. The SWMP describes the minimum procedures and practices Caltrans uses to reduce pollutants in storm water and non-storm water discharges. It outlines procedures and responsibilities for protecting water quality, including the selection and implementation of Best Management Practices (BMPs). The proposed Project will be programmed to follow the guidelines and procedures outlined in the latest SWMP to address storm water runoff.

Part of and appended to the SWMP is the Storm Water Data Report (SWDR) and its associated checklists. The SWDR documents the relevant storm water design decisions made regarding project compliance with the MS4 NPDES permit. The preliminary information in the SWDR prepared during the Project Initiation Document (PID) phase will be reviewed, updated, confirmed, and if required, revised in the SWDR prepared for the later phases of the project. The information contained in the SWDR may be used to make more informed decisions regarding the selection of BMPs and/or recommended avoidance, minimization, or mitigation measures to address water quality impacts.

Construction General Permit

Construction General Permit (Order No. 2009-009-DWQ), adopted on September 2, 2009, became effective on July 1, 2010. The permit regulates storm water discharges from construction sites which result in a Disturbed Soil Area (DSA) of one acre or greater, and/or are smaller sites that are part of a larger common plan of development. By law, all storm water discharges associated with construction activity where clearing, grading, and excavation results in soil disturbance of at least one acre must comply with the provisions of the General Construction Permit. Construction activity that results in soil disturbances of less than one acre is subject to this Construction General Permit if there is potential for significant water quality impairment resulting from the activity as determined by the RWQCB. Operators of regulated construction sites are required to develop storm water pollution prevention plans; to implement sediment, erosion, and pollution prevention control measures; and to obtain coverage under the Construction General Permit.

The 2009 Construction General Permit separates projects into Risk Levels 1, 2, or 3. Risk levels are determined during the planning and design phases, and are based on potential erosion and transport to receiving waters. Requirements apply according to the Risk Level determined. For example, a Risk Level 3 (highest risk) project would require compulsory storm water runoff pH and turbidity monitoring, and before construction and after construction aquatic biological assessments during specified seasonal windows. For all projects subject to the permit, applicants are required to develop and implement an effective Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). In accordance with Caltrans’s Standard Specifications, a Water Pollution Control Plan (WPCP) is necessary for projects with DSA less than one acre.
Section 401 Permitting

Under Section 401 of the CWA, any project requiring a federal license or permit that may result in a discharge to a water body must obtain a 401 Certification, which certifies that the project will be in compliance with State water quality standards. The most common federal permits triggering 401 Certification are CWA Section 404 permits issued by USACE. The 401 permit certifications are obtained from the appropriate RWQCB, dependent on the project location, and are required before USACE issues a 404 permit.

In some cases the RWQCB may have specific concerns with discharges associated with a project. As a result, the RWQCB may issue a set of requirements known as Waste Discharge Requirements (WDRs) under the State Water Code that define activities, such as the inclusion of specific features, effluent limitations, monitoring, and plan submittals that are to be implemented for protecting or benefiting water quality. WDRs can be issued to address both permanent and temporary discharges of a project.

The Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board is required by federal law to issue permits to municipalities so that, over time, the source of pollution is reduced to the maximum extent practicable. The Los Angeles County Storm Water Permit requires that city departments coordinate and implement best management practice in several program areas including

- Public Outreach and Education
- Planning and Construction
- Public Agency Activities
- Business Inspections, and
- Illicit Connection and Illicit Flows Detection and Elimination

The purpose of these programs is to implement pollution prevention programs that will, to the maximum extent practicable, reduce the discharge of pollutants from the storm drain system to protect receiving waters and their beneficial uses. The City of Los Angeles falls is a permittee that is subject to this permit, and has Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan. Project applicants are required to prepare and implement a Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan when their projects fall into any of these categories:

- Single-family hillside residential developments
- Housing developments of 10 or more dwelling units (including single family tract developments)
- Industrial /Commercial developments with one acre or more of impervious surface area
- Automotive service facilities
- Retail gasoline outlets
- Restaurants
- Parking lots of 5,000 square feet or more of surface area or with 25 or more parking spaces
• Projects with 2,500 square feet or more of impervious area that are located in, adjacent to, or draining directly to designated Environmentally Sensitive Areas (ESA).\textsuperscript{10}

2.8.2 Affected Environment

The project site is located along an urbanized roadway about five miles north of the Los Angeles civic center. The existing viaduct complex traverses the Los Angeles River, and runoff from the project area is conveyed to the Los Angeles River through the storm drain system.

A Location Hydraulic Study was performed in 2004 by CH2M HILL. According to the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) Panels 06037C1610F and 06037C1626F (Figures 2-13 and 2-14), effective date September 26, 2008, the Los Angeles River is within a FEMA Zone A floodplain. FEMA defines a Zone A as an “area of 100 year flood base flood; base flood elevations and flood hazard factors not determined. These maps also show that the remainder of the project area is within Zone X, which is defined by FEMA as “areas determined to be outside of the 0.2% annual chance floodplain.”

Water Resources Control Board and the LARWQCB have jurisdiction over water quality at the project site. The Water Quality Control Plan: Los Angeles Region Basin Plan for the Coastal Watersheds of Los Angeles and Ventura Counties (LARWQCB, 1995), is designed to preserve and enhance water quality and protect the beneficial uses of all regional waters. Specifically, the Basin Plan (1) designates beneficial uses for surface and groundwater, (2) sets narrative and numerical objectives that must be attained or maintained to protect the designated beneficial uses and conform to the state's anti-degradation policy, and (3) describes implementation programs to protect all waters in the region.

Under the Basin Plan, the Los Angeles River has the following existing beneficial uses: agricultural supply (AGR), water contact recreation (REC 1), non-contact water recreation (REC 2), warm freshwater habitat (WARM), wildlife habitat (WILD), and wetland habitat (WET); and the following potential beneficial uses: municipal and domestic supply (MUN) and industrial service supply (IND).

The Los Angeles River upstream and downstream of the viaduct complex is open-bottomed and lined with cobbles. The banks are concrete-covered riprap. A concrete pad forms the bottom of the Los Angeles River at the viaduct complex crossing. The concrete pad along the river bottom extends between 60 to 130 feet upstream of the viaduct piers and downstream from 250 to 360 feet from the viaduct support piers.

The existing storm drain system conveys precipitation and other runoff from the project site and vicinity to the Los Angeles River, which subsequently empties into the Pacific Ocean.

The project site is on the border of the San Fernando Valley and San Gabriel Valley Groundwater Basins. The San Fernando Basin is a significant source of drinking water, with an estimated total volume of three million acre-feet of groundwater stored in aquifers within the alluvial fill of the basin. The groundwater of the San Fernando Basin has been used as a source of drinking water for more than 800,000 residents within the cities of Los Angeles, Burbank, Glendale, and San Fernando (CH2M HILL, 2002).

Figure 2-13: FEMA Map
Figure 2-14: FEMA Map
Groundwater quality in the region is generally degraded by infiltration of contaminants from surrounding land uses. Some examples of the primary pollutants in much of the groundwater throughout these basins are volatile organic compounds from industry, as well as nitrates from past agricultural activities. Portions of the Subject Property are situated over a National Priorities List (NPL) groundwater contamination site (CH2M HILL, 2004). As part of the Northeast Interceptor Sewer Phase II environmental work, City staff identified the extent of the Pollock superfund site (TCE and PCE contaminated groundwater) in the Los Angeles Narrows area, and the viaduct complex is located above a portion of the site (CLA, 2005b). The concentration of TCE and PCE contamination within the Pollock superfund site varies by location.

2.8.3 Environmental Consequences

2.8.3.1 Temporary Impacts
The minimum channel capacity conveyance would be preserved during construction, allowing the flow to pass through unobstructed. No impacts to flood flow due to construction activities are anticipated.

The viaduct complex is an earth-filled bridge structure, and during construction earth would be exposed. The proposed project could result in erosion of exposed surfaces during construction if rain events occur before construction is completed. In such cases, sediment in runoff from the construction site could flow into the local storm drain system. The total area of the project work zones would be approximately 6 acres. However, fewer than two acres would be under construction at any given time. Nonetheless, construction would require coverage under the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board (LARWQCB).permit for storm water discharges resulting from construction. In addition, because the northbound I-5 off-ramp is controlled by Caltrans, construction of this element would require coverage under the statewide permits, including CAS 000002 and CAS 000003. Therefore, a stormwater pollution prevention plan (SWPPP) and monitoring program would be prepared and subsequently implemented during construction. In addition, a Storm Water Data Report (SWDR) would be prepared and submitted to Caltrans for approval.

Construction of the proposed project would occur in a staged manner to keep traffic lanes open during construction. As mentioned above, soil surfaces would be exposed during construction, which could erode and enter the storm drain system and the Los Angeles River during rain events or if overwatering of the site for dust suppression occurs.

Widening of the Glendale Boulevard bridges over the Los Angeles River would require the placement of timber falsework in the river channel, and the casting (in concrete) of bridge structures. The placement of the falsework is not in itself expected to result in contaminants that could enter affect water quality; however, casting of the new bridge structures could result in unset concrete leakage or drippings into the river.

The proposed project would also require construction in the Los Angeles River to install foundations for the pier extensions and abutment extensions. This work would require temporary in-channel flow diversions around the pile excavation locations, such as cofferdams. Excavated soil would be immediately removed from the work area and concrete piles casted. Because there would be excavation within the Los Angeles River, construction equipment would be present in the river channel (albeit restricted to the concrete pad). Construction activity could
result in excavated soil, sediment, and possibly equipment fluids entering the river, which would be adverse to water quality in the river.

The SWPPP would include erosion and sediment control, non-storm runoff management, post construction stormwater management, waste and disposal management, maintenance, inspection, and a sampling and analysis protocol for potentially contaminated runoff. The SWPPP would identify specific Best Management Practices (BMPs) that would be implemented during construction to minimize or eliminate the potential for spills and leakage of construction materials and erosion of disturbed areas by water and wind. Examples of BMPs with proven effectiveness and that are likely to be specified in the SWPPP include:

- Utilization of temporary silt fence
- Daily sweeping of the work area to minimize sediment buildup,
- Stockpile management for excavations in the Los Angeles River, and
- Control barriers (gravel bag berm, temporary silt fence, fiber roll, or other material) to control work area runoff.

With preparation and implementation of the SWPPP and associated BMPs, adverse impacts to water quality during construction are not likely to occur.

As mentioned above, groundwater quality in the project area is generally degraded. Construction of the proposed project would not adversely affect groundwater quality because it would not add additional pollutant constituents to groundwater. For the construction of piles in the river channel/banks, contaminated groundwater may be encountered. To install piles by drilling, the hole would first be drilled, then a reinforcing cage lowered into the hole, and the hole filled with concrete. As the concrete fills the hole, groundwater within the hole becomes displaced and is discharged from the drilled hole. Any uncontrolled discharges of displaced groundwater would flow into the river and adversely affect water quality in the river.

Any groundwater that must be dewatered during construction would be tested for the presence of petroleum hydrocarbons and other contaminants. If contaminants are present, the dewatered groundwater would be treated prior to discharge to the City’s sewer system. Such discharges would require an Industrial Waste Discharge permit from the City’s Bureau of Sanitation and be required to comply with the specified discharge pollutant levels. Since the dewatered groundwater would be tested and treated (if necessary) prior to discharge to the sewer system, adverse impacts would not occur.

2.8.3.2 Permanent Impacts

The entire project site is paved with asphalt or concrete, and storm flows generated on the viaduct complex and at-grade streets during rain events flow to various storm drain inlets, and are conveyed and discharged to the Los Angeles River. The proposed project would provide roadway and pedestrian improvements to Hyperion Avenue along the viaduct complex, would widen the existing Glendale Boulevard Bridge by approximately eight feet on each side, and would reconfigure the northbound I-5 off-ramp to Glendale Boulevard.

Although the widening of the Glendale Boulevard bridges over the Los Angeles River represents an increase in paved area, it would not result in the generation of additional storm water runoff as the widened area would capture rainfall that would otherwise fall or be conveyed to the Los
Angeles River. None of the other project elements would increase runoff to flow to the Los Angeles River.

In the project area, the Los Angeles River is mapped on the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRM, panel number 060137 0056 C), which shows that the FEMA 100-year flood would be fully contained within the channel (CLA, 2005a). The proposed project includes the placement of some fill material within the Los Angeles River for piles to the support the pier extensions; however, the piles and pier extensions would be emplaced along a completely paved (on the concrete pad) portion of the river. The new piles that would support the pier extensions would be below the existing channel bottom, the pier extensions would be minor, and the pier extensions would be designed to not affect channel hydraulics. In addition, the walkway along the left river bank would be designed not to affect channel hydraulics. As a consequence, the proposed project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death from flooding.

The proposed project is not capacity-enhancing and would not add new travel lanes. Although it would slightly widen the Glendale Boulevard bridge structures over the Los Angeles River, no substantial increases in pollutant deposition to the roadway would occur because increased vehicular travel would not occur. To the contrary, with the reconfiguration of the northbound I-5 off-ramp to Glendale Boulevard, a small reduction in vehicle miles traveled would occur from the elimination of the existing right-turn only (to northbound Glendale Boulevard) from the off-ramp. As such, a minor reduction is pollutant deposition on roadways is expected with a resultant minor decrease in pollutant loadings to the Los Angeles River.

**Risk Assessment**

The project site is included on the FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Maps, as previously discussed in Section 2.8.2. The Los Angeles River flood flows are confined within the levees. The Los Angeles River is a major floodway, and the 100-year flood is contained in the channel. The remaining areas of the project site are located in Zone X, which are areas determined to be outside of the 500-year floodplain.

The pedestrian crossing over the Los Angeles River that is downstream of the viaduct complex (previously discussed) will have no impact on the floodwater conveyance or water quality of the river; no support columns will be constructed in the river as part of this crossing.

There is no longitudinal encroachment due to the project. The project does not represent a significant encroachment into the Los Angeles floodplain, as defined in the Federal Aid Highway Program Manual. Because there are no floodplain values that will be impacted, no restoration or preservation of floodplain values is required.\(^\text{11}\)

**2.8.3.3 Cumulative Impacts**

The proposed project would improve the viaduct complex and is not anticipated to result in any significant effects related to hydrology and water quality. The proposed project would not result in an adverse cumulative impact related to hydrology and water quality.

---

2.8.3.4 Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures

To avoid potential releases of exposed soil from construction areas to the Los Angeles River and the resultant increases in turbidity, implementation of the Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) would include certain avoidance and minimization measures.

As part of the SWPPP, a runoff management plan and measures that would minimize the potential for sediments from entering the river from construction areas would be implemented. Such measures could include the use of water diversion, coffer dams, or other filters to keep sediments from entering the storm drains.

To avoid potential releases of concrete drippings to the Los Angeles River during widening of the Glendale Boulevard bridges over the river, the SWPPP would implement a management plan and measures that would minimize the potential for unset concrete to drip into the Los Angeles River. Such measures could include the installation of secondary catch or containment systems.

To avoid potential releases of excavated soil to the Los Angeles River and the resultant increases in turbidity from construction of the pier extensions, the SWPPP would implement a spoils management plan with measures that would minimize the potential for excavated soil releases from pile drilling to the Los Angeles River. Such measures could include immediate containment of excavated soils by effective soil management methods.

To avoid potential release of contaminated groundwater into the Los Angeles River during construction of the piles for the pier extensions, the SWPPP would implement a groundwater management plan and measures that would minimize the potential for dewatered groundwater from pile construction to enter the Los Angeles River. Such measures could include concurrent withdrawal of groundwater within pile holes while the piles are being cast, or other equally effective method to manage displaced water from drilled pile holes (during pile casting).

In addition to the measures addressed in the SWPPP, a detention/infiltration basin would be established as part of the Sunnynook Park and a permanent water quality Best Management Practice (BMP) for purposes of runoff from the viaduct complex. This would utilize the construction staging area between I-5 and the Los Angeles River just northwest of the viaduct complex. Preparation of this facility would involve excavation of the ground, removal of several trees to construct the basin, and planting of new trees and ground cover after demobilization of contractor facilities. The basin would provide detention for reduction of peak runoff volume, infiltration for groundwater recharge and volume reduction and pre-treatment of stormwater prior to river discharge. The basin would be provided with metered drainage to prevent insect vector issues as well as provide for emergency overflow into the river as protection for adjacent transportation.

2.8.4 No Build Alternative Impacts

The No Build Alternative would result in no new or additional impacts to hydrology, water quality, and stormwater runoff relative to existing conditions.
2.9 Hazardous Waste/Materials

This section evaluates potential effects of the proposed project-related to hazardous wastes and materials.

2.9.1 Regulatory Setting

Hazardous materials and hazardous waste are regulated by many state and federal laws. These include not only specific statutes governing hazardous waste, but also a variety of laws regulating air and water quality, human health and land use.

The primary federal laws regulating hazardous wastes/materials are the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act of 1976 (RCRA) and the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act of 1980 (CERCLA). The purpose of CERCLA, often referred to as Superfund, is to clean up contaminated sites so that public health and welfare are not compromised. RCRA provides for “cradle to grave” regulation of hazardous wastes. Other federal laws include:

- Community Environmental Response Facilitation Act (CERFA) of 1992
- Clean Water Act
- Clean Air Act
- Safe Drinking Water Act
- Occupational Safety and Health Act (OSHA)
- Atomic Energy Act
- Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA)
- Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA)

In addition to the acts listed above, Executive Order 12088, Federal Compliance with Pollution Control, mandates that necessary actions be taken to prevent and control environmental pollution when federal activities or federal facilities are involved.

Hazardous waste in California is regulated primarily under the authority of the Federal Resource Conservation and Recovery Act of 1976, and the California Health and Safety Code. Other California laws that affect hazardous waste are specific to handling, storage, transportation, disposal, treatment, reduction, cleanup and emergency planning.

Worker health and safety and public safety are key issues when dealing with hazardous materials that may affect human health and the environment. Proper disposal of hazardous material is vital if it is disturbed during project construction.

2.9.2 Affected Environment

The current adjoining properties and portions of the project site are comprised of transportation, residential, commercial, and industrial land uses.

Based on a review of historical aerial photographs, historical topographic maps, Sanborn maps, and city directories for the project site, the past uses of adjoining properties are generally consistent with current land uses. A records search of all reasonably ascertainable environmental databases including the standard state and federal sources in accordance with ASTM standard
practice was conducted (by Environmental Data Resources, Inc.) to identify potential sources of contamination that could affect the project, as indicated in the Supplement to *Initial Site Assessment Report for Glendale Hyperion Bridges and Street Improvement Project* (CH2M Hill, April 2012). The original Initial Site Assessment has since been updated for current conditions.

The database report identified six known sites of environmental significance within the ASTM search distance, but none within the project boundaries. The remaining sites were determined to have a low potential to impact the project site they had no reported impacts to groundwater, they received closure approval received from the lead regulatory agency, and/or they are located at relative distance from the project site.

- **San Fernando Valley Area #2 and #4.** These sites are listed on the National Priorities List (NPL). They are part of the large-scale contamination located in the San Fernando Valley. In 1986, four sites from the San Fernando Valley were included on the Superfund NPL based on drinking water well fields that were known to be contaminated by volatile organic compounds (VOCs). The Area #2 well field is located approximately 4 miles north of the Subject Property, and the Area #4 well field is located approximately 1 mile southeast of the Subject Property.

  Contamination in many of the areas of the four sites has migrated together as one large plume; therefore, both sites are being addressed here together. Groundwater at both of the sites is contaminated with tetrachloroethylene (PCE) and trichloroethylene (TCE). Plume maps indicate that there may be low levels of PCE in the shallow groundwater east of the project site. The groundwater contamination plume extends into the project area. Remedial investigations and feasibility studies were completed in 1992. Records of Decision (ROD) were issued in 1996. Remedial measures at the sites include pump-and-treat systems and well-head treatment. Another ROD was issued in 2009 to include treatment systems that would remove chromium and 1,4-dioxane, as well as enhance VOC recovery.\(^\text{12}\)

- **Los Feliz Fuel Stop, 3160 Riverside Drive (currently the Riverside Service Station).** This site is located approximately 600 feet north of the Hyperion Avenue overcrossing of Riverside Drive. This site had an open leaking underground storage tank (UST) site on file with the LARWQCB. A diesel and gasoline fuel leak was discovered during a tank removal in 1994. Methyl-tert-butyl-ether (MTBE), and benzene, toluene, ethylbenzene, and xylene (BTEX) have been detected in soil and groundwater. BTEX and MTBE groundwater plumes migrated offsite 150 feet toward the east-southeast. Groundwater at the site is approximately 18 feet below ground surface (bgs). The site was closed in January 2009 because the extent of soil and groundwater contamination was defined; residual soil contamination was below screening levels; and groundwater modeling and other observations indicated that the plume is contained and would naturally attenuate.\(^\text{13}\)


\(^\text{13}\) *Ibid.*
• Shell Service Station, 3047 Glendale Boulevard. This site is located on the northwest corner of Glenfeliz Boulevard and Glendale Boulevard adjacent to the project site. This site is listed (with the LARWQCB) as having had a leaking UST. The site was closed in July 1998. Both groundwater and soil were contaminated at the site. Contaminated soil was excavated from the site. Groundwater is approximately 20 to 30 feet bgs and flows to the south, toward the project site. Three monitoring wells were installed at the site.

• Unocal #5140, 3070 Glendale Boulevard. This site is located on the southwest corner of Glenhurst Avenue and Glendale Boulevard adjacent to the Subject Property. This site was listed (with the LARWQCB) as a leaking UST. This site was closed in March 1997. Two gasoline leaks were discovered in April and May 1994. Both soil and groundwater were impacted by the gasoline releases. Contaminated soil was excavated and removed, and a vacuum extraction system was installed and operated for 4 months. The site was closed in September 2010 because the extent of soil and groundwater contamination was defined; active soil and groundwater remediation has been completed; residual soil contamination would not cause harm to human health and the environment; and the nearest production well is 3,665 feet from the site.14

• Douglas Berglund/Former Texaco, 2900 Riverside Drive (currently the Valero station). This site is located approximately 700 feet from the south end of the northbound Glendale Bridge. This site was listed (with the LARWQCB) as a leaking UST. During tank closure, gasoline was observed at the water table, approximately 23 feet bgs. Remedial action was implemented. Groundwater flow is estimated to flow east-southeast (away from the project location). Vapor extraction, sparging and groundwater treatment were conducted in 2005. The site was closed in June 2006 after confirmation boring data indicated that petroleum hydrocarbon concentrations in soil and groundwater beneath the site were significantly reduced.15

• Triangle Texaco, 2918 Riverside Drive (currently the Valero station). This site is located approximately 700 feet from the south end of the northbound Glendale Bridge and is located in the same location as the Douglas Berglund site above. This site was listed as an open leaking UST site. A gasoline leak was discovered in a UST in 1996. Soil samples collected indicated soil contamination. No groundwater contamination at the site was reported. Vapor extraction, sparging and groundwater treatment were conducted in 2005. The site was closed in June 2006 after confirmation boring data indicated that petroleum hydrocarbon concentrations in soil and groundwater beneath the site were significantly reduced.16

Four of the above six sites have been identified as having the potential to impact the project site because of contaminated soil or groundwater at these sites. These sites are located adjacent to the project site and have had significant contamination. They include the San Fernando Valley NPL site, the Los Feliz Fuel Stop site, the Shell Service Station site, and the Unocal #5140 site. However, as noted above, the Los Feliz Fuel Stop site and the Unocal #5140 site are now

14 Ibid.
15 Ibid.
16 Ibid.
considered not to pose a threat of contamination. The remaining two sites described above have significant contamination but are unlikely to impact the Subject property. They are located south of the project boundaries, and groundwater contamination in this area tends to migrate east-southeast.

I-5 is located beneath a portion of the viaduct complex. The existing off-ramp from northbound I-5 that exits at Glendale Boulevard is located just south of the northbound Glendale Boulevard bridge. There is a landscaped area between I-5, Glendale Boulevard, and the off-ramp, and due to its proximity, this area could contain aerially deposited lead (ADL) from vehicular emissions when leaded gasoline was commonly used.

The viaduct complex contains multiple traffic lanes that are delineated with yellow striping. Prior to 1997, yellow traffic paint, yellow thermoplastic paint, or permanent tapes were known to contain lead chromate as the pigment. Because of this, the striping along Hyperion Avenue, Riverside Drive, and Glendale Boulevard may contain hazardous levels of lead and/or chromium that could affect both the environment and human health.

In some bridges, asbestos-containing materials (ACM) have been used in the joints as seals. A review of the as-built plans for the viaduct complex did not identify the presence of such material; however, its lack of identification in the as-built plans cannot guarantee that ACM is not present.

On some bridges, paint coatings contain lead-based paint (LBP). The existing covered rails are painted, and their removal could result in releases of LBP (if present) in the form of dust and debris. A review of the as-built plans for the viaduct complex did not identify if the coatings are lead-based.

2.9.3 Environmental Consequences

2.9.3.1 Temporary Impacts
Temporary impacts related to hazardous materials encountered during construction could occur if existing laws and regulations governing the identification and handling of such materials are not complied with.

Contaminated Soils and Groundwater
Due to the presence of potential sources of hydrocarbon contamination in groundwater near the project site (past leaks associated with nearby gas stations) and because the TCE and PCE groundwater contamination plume (San Fernando Valley NPL) has extended into the project area, there is a potential for excavations to encounter contaminated groundwater and soils during construction. Because the potential sources of contamination are not located immediately adjacent to the project site, any groundwater contamination that is encountered likely would have migrated to the project site.

The majority of excavations for the project would be relatively shallow for abutment strengthening work and are not expected to encounter groundwater. In addition, other seismic strengthening improvements and roadway improvements to the viaduct complex would not encounter groundwater. Construction of the project would however, require construction of foundations (including installation of piles) for pier and abutment extensions for the widening of the Glendale Boulevard bridges. The installation of piles in the bottom of the Los Angeles River would occur by casting in drilled holes. During the drilling process, contaminated groundwater could seep into the drilled holes, and when the piles are cast with concrete, the contaminated
groundwater would be displaced to the river channel as the concrete fills the bottom of the drilled hole. In addition, the excavated soils may be contaminated. The potential exposure to the contaminated groundwater and possibly contaminated soil by construction workers could pose some health hazards to the workers.

**Aerially Deposited Lead (ADL)**
Historically, lead-based additives in gasoline, emitted through automobile engine exhaust, have settled onto the adjacent road shoulders and medians. Because the landscaped area where the existing northbound off-ramp from I-5 to Glendale Boulevard would be reconfigured has been subjected to past aerial deposition of lead from vehicular emissions, ADL-containing soils may be encountered during the reconfiguration, which could pose safety hazards to workers or the public.

**Lead Chromate Traffic Striping**
Prior to 1997, yellow traffic paint, yellow thermoplastic paint, or permanent tapes were known to contain lead chromate as the pigment. These materials have the potential to contain hazardous levels of lead and/or hexavalent chromium that would affect both the environment and human health. The Project would require the removal of existing traffic striping and pavement markings along the viaduct complex. Traffic paint and markers are typically removed using sand blasting or air blasting equipment. Yellow traffic striping is present along the center of Hyperion Avenue along the viaduct complex and Glendale Boulevard (near the location of the new signalized intersection at the I-5 off-ramp). Because the existing yellow traffic paint on the project site may contain lead chromate pigments, and if removed by sand blasting, aerial dispersion of the material could occur; there is a potential for adverse health impacts to workers and the public.

**Asbestos-Containing Materials (ACM)**
As discussed above, there is the potential for ACM to be present in bridge joints. If present, ACM could be disturbed during demolition activities associated with the widening of the northbound and southbound Glendale Boulevard bridges (over the Los Angeles River), which could result in adverse impacts.

**Lead-Based Paint (LBP)**
As discussed above, portions of the viaduct complex that would be removed have been painted, such as the covered rails, and there is the potential that some layers are lead-based. If present, LBP could be disturbed during demolition activities associated with the removal of the existing rails along the viaduct complex, which could result in adverse impacts.

**2.9.3.2 Permanent Impacts**
Once roadway improvements are constructed, traffic operations on these roadways would not result in the generation of hazardous wastes that could impact the corridor. Likewise, motorists would not impact the existing sites in the vicinity of the roadways simply by driving through the area.

Occasional vehicular accidents could result in the release of hazardous waste or materials, such as fuels for motor vehicles or hazardous material cargo. The potential for such releases is not considered substantial, as all hazardous materials must be properly manifested, packaged, labeled, and transported in accordance with federal regulations (49 CFR 170-179). Compliance with other federal, state, and local laws and regulations (e.g., driver training and licensing and USDOT packaging requirements) would further serve to limit potential hazardous materials...
releases. In addition, releases would be expected to be cleaned up as part of the established emergency response to each vehicle crash and would not constitute adverse impacts.

Furthermore, the center median barrier, realigned I-5 off-ramp, and wider Glendale Boulevard bridges are expected to decrease the potential for vehicular accidents along the viaduct complex.

2.9.3.3 Cumulative Impacts
Although the proposed project could result in adverse impacts from encountering contaminated groundwater or soil, from the removal of lead chromate based traffic paint, from handling ADL-affected soils, and from encountering ACM or LBP during demolition/construction, these impacts would be avoided or mitigated, as described below. Since no other projects are known that could result in additive hazardous material impacts, no adverse cumulative impacts related to hazardous wastes/materials are anticipated to occur under the proposed project.

2.9.3.4 Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures
Existing federal and state laws and regulations provide stringent control over hazardous waste management, as well as prevention and response to spills and releases. Construction of the proposed project or any alternative would be required to comply with all existing hazardous waste laws and regulations. To ensure that the potential to encounter contaminated groundwater or soil are planned for, the following avoidance measures would be implemented in compliance with laws and regulations.

HZ-1: Contaminated Ground Water. Conduct groundwater sampling and testing during the design phase to determine the level of groundwater contamination and the depths. Require the selected contractor to prepare and implement a management plan in the event that hazardous wastes, petroleum hydrocarbons, or contaminated groundwater are encountered during construction. Implementation could require the contractor to utilize a photo-ionization detector (PID) or other organic vapor detector during all pile drilling/boring activities and to employ appropriate worker protection measures should detected levels exceed Cal-OSHA standards. Groundwater that seeps into the drilled hole for pile installations would be pumped out of the pile hole as or before it is filled with concrete. The contaminated water would be temporarily stored, and the water removed (vacuum truck) or treated and discharged under permit from the City or LARWQCB, depending on the discharge outlet. All contaminated groundwater, contaminated soil, and hazardous wastes and debris encountered or generated during construction would be properly excavated, stored, tested, treated and/or disposed in accordance with all federal, state, and local laws and regulations.

HZ-2: Lead Chromate Traffic Paint. Perform representative sampling and testing of yellow traffic paint along the viaduct complex (during the project design phase or prior to construction) that could be affected by construction. If lead, lead chromate, or other hazardous materials in the paint exceed standards, abate the traffic paint (prohibit its removal by sand-blasting or grinding methods) and properly dispose of the material prior to construction.

The measure below would be required to avoid or minimize potential hazardous waste impacts related to encountering ADL in the landscaped area where the off-ramp from northbound I-5 to Glendale Boulevard would be reconfigured.
HZ-3: Aerially Deposited Lead. During design of the northbound I-5 off-ramp reconfiguration to Glendale Boulevard, perform representative sampling and testing of the area ramp alignment area for the presence of ADL. If ADL is present above action levels, abate the ADL-contaminated soil, in accordance with all applicable laws and regulations, prior to construction of the reconfigured ramp. A Health and Safety Plan by Contractor would be required pursuant to Contract General Conditions/General requirements (GC/GR).

The measure below would be required to avoid disturbing ACM if present in the bridge joints and/or LBP (if present) that could be affected by demolition/construction activity.

HZ-4: Asbestos-Containing Materials or Lead-Based Paint. Perform a survey (during the design phase or prior to construction) of the bridge joints that could be disturbed from demolition or construction activity to determine if they contain asbestos. In addition, conduct a survey for the presence of LBP in areas of the viaduct complex to be removed or physically affected. If present, remove the ACM and/or LBP prior to or as part of the demolition process, in accordance with all applicable laws, regulations, and rules. A Health and Safety Plan by Contractor would be required pursuant to GC/GR requirements.

2.9.4 No Build Alternative Impacts
The No Build Alternative would result in no new or additional impacts related to hazardous waste/material relative to existing conditions.
2.10 Air Quality

This section addresses the potential impacts to air quality associated with the implementation of the proposed project.

2.10.1 Regulatory Setting

The Federal Clean Air Act (FCAA) as amended in 1990 is the federal law that governs air quality. The California Clean Air Act of 1988 is its companion state law. These laws, and related regulations by the United States Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA) and California Air Resources Board (ARB), set standards for the quantity of pollutants that can be in the air. At the federal level, these standards are called National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS). NAAQS and State ambient air quality standards have been established for six transportation-related criteria pollutants that have been linked to potential health concerns. The criteria pollutants are: carbon monoxide (CO), nitrogen dioxide (NO$_2$), ozone (O$_3$), particulate matter (PM, broken down for regulatory purposes into particles of 10 micrometers or smaller – PM$_{10}$ and particles of 2.5 micrometers and smaller – PM$_{2.5}$), lead (Pb), and sulfur dioxide (SO$_2$). In addition, State standards exist for visibility reducing particles, sulfates, hydrogen sulfide (H$_2$S), and vinyl chloride. These standards can be found in Table 2.10-1. The NAAQS and State standards are set at a level that protects public health with a margin of safety, and are subject to periodic review and revision. Both State and Federal regulatory schemes also cover toxic air contaminants (air toxics); some criteria pollutants are also air toxics or may include certain air toxics within their general definition.

Federal and State air quality standards and regulations provide the basic scheme for project-level air quality analysis under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). In addition to this type of environmental analysis, a parallel “Conformity” requirement under the FCAA also applies.

FCAA Section 176(c) prohibits the U.S. Department of Transportation and other Federal agencies from funding, authorizing, or approving plans, programs or projects that are not first found to conform to State Implementation Plan (SIP) for achieving the goals of Clean Air Act requirements related to the NAAQS. “Transportation Conformity” takes place on two levels: the regional, or planning and programming, level, and the project level. The proposed project must conform at both levels to be approved. Conformity requirements apply only in nonattainment and “maintenance” (former nonattainment) areas for the NAAQS, and only for the specific NAAQS that are or were violated. U.S. EPA regulations at 40 CFR 93 govern the conformity process.

Regional conformity is concerned with how well the regional transportation system supports plans for attaining the standards set for carbon monoxide (CO), nitrogen dioxide (NO$_2$), ozone (O$_3$), particulate matter (PM$_{10}$ and PM$_{2.5}$), and in some areas sulfur dioxide (SO$_2$). California has attainment or maintenance areas for all of these transportation-related “criteria pollutants” except SO$_2$, and also has a nonattainment area for lead (Pb). However, lead is not currently required by the FCAA to be covered in transportation conformity analysis. Regional conformity is based on Regional Transportation Plans (RTPs) and Federal Transportation Improvement Programs (FTIPs) that include all of the transportation projects planned for a region over a period of at least 20 years for the RTP) and 4 years (for the FTIP). RTP and FTIP conformity is based on use of travel demand and air quality models to determine whether or not the implementation of those projects would conform to emission budgets or other tests showing that
requirements of the Clean Air Act and the SIP are met. If the conformity analysis is successful, the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO), such as the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG); Federal Highway Administration (FHWA); and Federal Transit Administration (FTA), make determinations that the RTP and FTIP are in conformity with the SIP for achieving the goals of the FCAA. Otherwise, the projects in the RTP and/or FTIP must be modified until conformity is attained. If the design concept, scope, and “open to traffic” schedule of a proposed transportation project are the same as described in the RTP and FTIP, then the proposed project is deemed to meet regional conformity requirements for purposes of project-level analysis.

Conformity at the project-level also requires “hot spot” analysis if an area is “nonattainment” or “maintenance” for carbon monoxide (CO) and/or particulate matter (PM$_{10}$ or PM$_{2.5}$). A region is “nonattainment” if one or more of the monitoring stations in the region measures violation of the relevant standard and U.S. EPA officially designates the area nonattainment. Areas that were previously designated as nonattainment areas but subsequently meet the standard may be officially re-designated to attainment by U.S. EPA and are then called “maintenance” areas. “Hot spot” analysis is essentially the same, for technical purposes, as CO or particulate matter analysis performed for NEPA purposes. Conformity does include some specific procedural and documentation standards for projects that require a hot spot analysis. In general, projects must not cause the “hot spot”-related standard to be violated, and must not cause any increase in the number and severity of violations in nonattainment areas. If a known CO or particulate matter violation is located in the project vicinity, the project must include measures to reduce or eliminate the existing violation(s) as well.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pollutant</th>
<th>Averaging Time</th>
<th>California Standards$^1$</th>
<th>National Standards$^2$</th>
<th>Primary$^3$</th>
<th>Secondary$^4$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O$_3$</td>
<td>1-Hour</td>
<td>0.09 ppm (180 µg/m$^3$)</td>
<td>$^5$</td>
<td>$^5$</td>
<td>$^5$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8-Hour</td>
<td>0.070 ppm (137 µg/m$^3$)</td>
<td>0.075 ppm (147 µg/m$^3$)</td>
<td>0.075 ppm (147 µg/m$^3$)</td>
<td>$^5$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>8-Hour</td>
<td>9.0 ppm (10,000 µg/m$^3$)</td>
<td>9 ppm (10,000 µg/m$^3$)</td>
<td>$^5$</td>
<td>$^5$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1-Hour</td>
<td>20 ppm (23,000 µg/m$^3$)</td>
<td>35 ppm (40,000 µg/m$^3$)</td>
<td>$^5$</td>
<td>$^5$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO$_2$</td>
<td>Annual Arithmetic Mean</td>
<td>0.03 ppm (56 µg/m$^3$)</td>
<td>0.053 ppm (100 µg/m$^3$)</td>
<td>0.053 ppm (100 µg/m$^3$)</td>
<td>$^5$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1-Hour</td>
<td>0.18 ppm (338 µg/m$^3$)</td>
<td>0.1 ppm (188 µg/m$^3$)</td>
<td>$^5$</td>
<td>$^5$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO$_2$</td>
<td>Annual Arithmetic Mean</td>
<td>$^7$</td>
<td>$^7$</td>
<td>$^7$</td>
<td>$^7$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24-Hour</td>
<td>0.04 ppm (105 µg/m$^3$)</td>
<td>$^7$</td>
<td>$^7$</td>
<td>$^7$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3-Hour</td>
<td>$^7$</td>
<td>$^7$</td>
<td>0.5 ppm (1,300 µg/m$^3$)</td>
<td>$^7$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.25 ppm</td>
<td></td>
<td>$^7$</td>
<td>$^7$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2.10-1: Ambient Air Quality Standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pollutant</th>
<th>Averaging Time</th>
<th>California National Standards²</th>
<th>Primary³</th>
<th>Secondary⁴</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Standards¹</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1-Hour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM₁₀</td>
<td>Annual Arithmetic Mean</td>
<td>20 µg/m³</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24-Hour</td>
<td>50 µg/m³</td>
<td>150 µg/m³</td>
<td>150 µg/m³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM₂.₅</td>
<td>Annual Arithmetic Mean</td>
<td>12 µg/m³</td>
<td>15 µg/m³</td>
<td>15 µg/m³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24-Hour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulfates</td>
<td>24-Hour</td>
<td>25 µg/m³</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pb</td>
<td>30-Day Average</td>
<td>1.5 µg/m³</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Calendar Quarter</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.5 µg/m³</td>
<td>1.5 µg/m³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rolling 3-month Average</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.15 µg/m³</td>
<td>0.15 µg/m³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydrogen Sulfide</td>
<td>1-Hour</td>
<td>0.03 ppm (42 µg/m³)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vinyl Chloride</td>
<td>24-Hour</td>
<td>0.010 ppm (26 µg/m³)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visibility Reducing Particles</td>
<td>8-Hour (10 A.M. to 6 P.M., PST)</td>
<td>See Note⁶</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹California standards for O₃, CO, SO₂ (1 hour and 24 hour), NO₂, PM₁₀, PM₂.₅, and visibility-reducing particles are values that are not to be exceeded. The standards for sulfates, Pb, hydrogen sulfide, and vinyl chloride are not to be equaled or exceeded.

²National standards (other than O₃, particulate matter, and those based on annual averages or annual arithmetic means) are not to be exceeded more than once a year. The O₃ standard is attained when the fourth highest 8-hour concentration in a year, averaged over 3 years, is equal to or less than the standard. For PM₁₀, the 24-hour standard is attained when the expected number of days per calendar year with a 24-hour average concentration above 150 µg/m³ is equal to or less than one. For PM₂.₅, the 24-hour standard is attained when 98 percent of the daily concentrations, averaged over 3 years, are equal to or less than the standard. For NO₂, the 1-hour standard is attained when the 3-year average of the 99th percentile of the daily maximum 1-hr average at each monitor within an area does not exceed 0.1 ppm. For SO₂, the 1-hour standard is attained when the 3-year average of the 99th percentile of the daily maximum 1-hour average at each monitor within an area does not exceed 0.075 ppm.

³National Primary Standards: The levels of air quality necessary, with an adequate margin of safety, to protect the public health.

⁴National Secondary Standards: The levels of air quality necessary to protect the public welfare from any known or anticipated adverse effects of a pollutant.

⁵The federal 1-hour ozone standard was revoked by USEPA in June 2005.

⁶Insufficient amount to produce an extinction coefficient of 0.23 per kilometer due to particles when the relative humidity is less than 70 percent.

⁷On June 2, 2010, the USEPA established a new 1-hour SO₂ standard, effective August 23, 2010, which is based on the 3-year average of the 99th percentile of 1-hour daily maximum concentrations. The USEPA also revoked both the existing 24-hour SO₂ standard of 0.14 ppm and the annual primary SO₂ standard of 0.030 ppm, effective August 23, 2010.

ppm = parts per million  
µg/m³ = micrograms per cubic meter

Source: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (2011); California Air Resources Board (2010).
2.10.2 Affected Environment

The Project site is located in the greater Los Angeles area within the South Coast Air Basin (SCAB). The SCAB encompasses all or portions of Los Angeles, Orange, San Bernardino, and Riverside Counties. The SCAB is bordered by the Pacific Ocean to the southwest and coastal mountains to the north and east. The following air quality sections were written with reference to the *Air Quality Technical Study Glendale Boulevard-Hyperion Avenue Complex of Bridges Improvement Project* (July 2012).

### 2.10.2.1 Climate and Meteorology

An important consideration in any atmospheric analysis is the local climate of the area under study. The following sections discuss the climatology and meteorology of the Southern California area to assist in understanding the conditions that may be favorable or unfavorable to the dispersion of pollutants emitted in association with this project.

Warm dry summers, low precipitation, and mild winters characterize the overall climate within the SCAB. The combination of topography, summer sunshine, temperate winters, infrequent rainfall, light winds, and moderate humidity, contribute to the SCAB’s air pollution conditions. The region experiences frequent temperature inversions where air temperatures that normally decrease with height instead increase with increasing altitude. Temperature inversions, prevent air close to the ground surface from mixing with the air aloft. The resulting condition traps air pollution near the ground. The condition is exacerbated during the summer due to the interaction between the ocean surface and lower layer atmosphere, creating a moist marine layer, preventing pollutants from mixing and dispersing upwards.

Particulate matter with diameters less than 10 micrometers and 2.5 micrometers (PM$_{10}$ and PM$_{2.5}$, respectively) cause considerable inhalation health concerns throughout the year. The dry and moderately windy summers create windblown particulate matter. During the winter months, overcast skies and marine layers help to trap PM$_{10}$ and PM$_{2.5}$, which contributes to keeping particulate matter levels elevated in the SCAB.

Photochemical smog results from a chemical reaction in the air between hydrocarbons and nitrogen dioxide (NO$_2$) under strong sunlight to form ozone (O$_3$). Thus, the worst smog conditions occur during the summer. Light westerly daytime summer winds that drive air pollution inland toward the mountains further influence local smog concentrations in the SCAB.

During the fall and winter seasons, the air pollutants of principal concern are carbon monoxide (CO) and NO$_2$. High NO$_2$ levels typically occur during autumn and winter on days having summer-like conditions. CO concentrations are highly localized and, because most CO emissions are from motor vehicles, the highest CO concentrations are associated with heavy traffic.

The South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) maintains monitoring stations throughout the SCAB to observe progress toward attainment of air quality standards. The monitoring station representative of the project site is the Burbank West Palm Avenue Station located at 228 West Palm Avenue in Burbank. Table 2.10-2 shows a five-year summary (2006 through 2010) of data collected at this station for nonattainment air pollutants (CARB, 2011a).
Table 2.10-2: Summary of Ambient Monitoring Levels at the Burbank West Palm Avenue Station

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pollutant</th>
<th>Standard/Exceedance</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CO (ppm)</td>
<td>Year Coverage (%)</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Max. 1-hour Concentration (ppm)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>ND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Max. 8-hour Concentration (ppm)</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># Days&gt;Federal 1-hour Std. of &gt;35 ppm</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># Days&gt;Federal 8-hour Std. of &gt;9 ppm</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># Days&gt;California 8-hour Std. of &gt;9.0 ppm</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO₂ (ppm)</td>
<td>Year Coverage (%)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Max. 1-hour Concentration (ppm)</td>
<td>0.103</td>
<td>0.087</td>
<td>0.105</td>
<td>0.088</td>
<td>0.082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Max. 8-hour Concentration (ppm)</td>
<td>0.129</td>
<td>0.097</td>
<td>0.110</td>
<td>0.097</td>
<td>0.084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># Days&gt;Federal 8-hour Std. of &gt;0.075 ppm</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># Days&gt;California 1-hour Std. of &gt;0.09 ppm</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># Days&gt;California 8-hour Std. of &gt;0.07 ppm</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO₂ (µg/m³)</td>
<td>Year Coverage (%)</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Max. 24-hour Concentration (µg/m³)</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Annual Average (µg/m³)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>ND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM₁₀ (µg/m³)</td>
<td>Year Coverage (%)</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Max. 24-hour Concentration (µg/m³)</td>
<td>71.0</td>
<td>109.0</td>
<td>66.0</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>51.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#Days&gt;Fed. 24-hour Std. of &gt;150 µg/m³</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>ND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#Days&gt;California 24-hour Std. of &gt;50 µg/m³</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>60.9</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>ND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Annual Average (µg/m³)</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM₂.₅ (µg/m³)</td>
<td>Year Coverage (%)</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Max. 24-hour Concentration (µg/m³)</td>
<td>50.7</td>
<td>56.5</td>
<td>68.9</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>43.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State Annual Average (µg/m³)</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#Days&gt;Fed. 24-hour Std. of &gt;35 µg/m³</th>
<th>ND</th>
<th>6.1</th>
<th>11.8</th>
<th>4.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annual Average (µg/m³)</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
Hydrogen sulfide, vinyl chloride, and visibility-reducing particles are not monitored in the SCAB.
ND = No Data, or not enough data.

Sources:
http://www.aqmd.gov/smog/historicaldata.htm
http://www.arb.ca.gov/adam/

2.10.2.2 Attainment Status and State Implementation Plans
As mentioned in Section 2.10.1, the greater Los Angeles area within the South Coast Air Basin (SCAB) is in federal attainment or maintenance for CO, NO₂, and SO₂. Table 2.10-3 summarizes both the current Federal and State attainment status for the greater Los Angeles area within the SCAB.

Table 2.10-3: Federal and State Attainment Status for the South Coast Air Basin

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pollutant</th>
<th>Federal Classification</th>
<th>State Classification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ozone (O₃)</td>
<td>Non-Attainment (Extreme)</td>
<td>Non-Attainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Particulate Matter (PM₁₀)</td>
<td>Non-Attainment (Serious)</td>
<td>Non-Attainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Particulate Matter (PM₂.₅)</td>
<td>Non-Attainment</td>
<td>Non-Attainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbon Monoxide (CO)</td>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>Attainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitrogen Dioxide (NO₂)</td>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>Non-Attainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulfur Dioxide (SO₂)</td>
<td>Attainment</td>
<td>Attainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead (Pb)</td>
<td>Non-Attainment</td>
<td>Non-Attainment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1For the Los Angeles County portion of the SCAB.


The South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) is presently guided by the following portions of the California State Implementation Plan (SIP) for nonattainment or maintenance criteria pollutants:

- 2007 Ozone SIP
- 2003 PM₁₀ SIP
- 2007 PM₂.₅ SIP
- 2005 CO SIP (Maintenance Plan)
- 2007 NO₂ SIP (Maintenance Plan)
The most recently approved Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) was adopted by the SCAQMD Governing Board on June 1, 2007 and revised in October 2007. The 2007 AQMP projects attainment of the federal 8-hour O_3 and 24-hour PM_{2.5} standards by 2023 and 2014, respectively. However, to meet those targets, it is necessary to supplement the identified control measures with undefined long-term (“black box”) measures that will reduce emissions by approximately 27 tons per day of VOC and 190 tons per day of NO_x (SCAQMD, 2007a). Given the uncertainty in its ability to find effective black box measures, the SCAQMD Board asked CARB to request of USEPA that the federal 8-hour ozone classification be changed to “extreme,” which would modify the attainment deadline to June 15, 2024 (SCAQMD, 2007b). When CARB submitted the October 2007 version of the AQMP to USEPA as a SIP revision, it concurred with the SCAQMD’s request for reclassification of the 8-hour ozone status from severe 17 to extreme (CARB, 2007). On May 5, 2010, USEPA granted the request (Federal Register, 2010).

2.10.3 Environmental Consequences

The proposed project is a non-capacity enhancing project that would not increase the number of traffic lanes; rather, it would provide safety improvements to motorists and pedestrians that use the viaduct complex, seismic improvements to increase the reliability of viaduct complex to withstand earthquakes, slightly wider Glendale Boulevard bridges over the Los Angeles River to provide shoulders and standard traffic lane widths, reconfiguration and signalization of the northbound I-5 off-ramp to Glendale Boulevard to improve site distance and allow left-turns on to southbound Glendale Boulevard, a new access point to the Los Angeles River bike path, and replacement balustrades that replicate the original balustrade design on the complex. The following sections describe regional conformity, project level conformity, and other air quality impacts.

2.10.3.1 Temporary Impacts

2.10.3.1.1 Issues to Consider

Construction Impacts

Short-term increases in air pollutants would result from construction activities associated with the project. Equipment would be used during site preparation; removal of the rails along the viaduct complex; and excavation, demolition, and paving involved with the construction of substructure and superstructure improvements. These construction activities would involve the use of diesel- and gasoline-powered equipment that would generate emissions of pollutants, namely NO_x, CO, PM_{10}, PM_{2.5}, SO_x, and VOC. Fugitive dust (PM_{10}) would be generated during excavation and other construction activities as well. Additionally, construction of the proposed project would be phased to keep the viaduct complex open to traffic.

Because of the need to keep Hyperion Avenue, Glendale Boulevard (both northbound and southbound), and Riverside Drive operational during construction (refer to Section 2.4), construction would be phased over the entire construction duration (30 months). However, to keep the overall construction duration within reasonable limits, concurrent construction of specific phases would be necessary. From an air quality standpoint, the worst-case construction scenario would include the following phases:

- Pedestrian Bridge (see Section 2.4) and Off-ramp Realignment
• Hyperion Avenue retrofit and substructure retrofit,
• Glendale Boulevard excavation for widening

Although the contractor would have discretion in scheduling all phases of the project to meet the construction schedule, these concurrent activities are assumed because they represent the most intensive phases of work and the maximum overlap under worst-case conditions. Emissions associated with these construction phases were estimated using projected construction activities, estimated hours of equipment operations, and estimated load factors of equipment for each activity. Specific construction information consisted of the following:

• Number of pieces and types of construction equipment
• Equipment load factors (percent of operations under load conditions)
• Equipment usage factors (amount of time the equipment is used during the day)
• Number of daily construction workers onsite during a typical peak construction day
• Total volume of excavated material
• Construction start date: June 2014
• Construction end date: December 2016
• Construction duration: 2.5 years (30 months)

The construction emission calculations followed the general procedures in the SCAQMD CEQA Air Quality Handbook (SCAQMD, 1993) and incorporated the emission factors from OFFROAD2007 for the construction equipment, EMFAC2007 for the vehicles, and CalEEMod (Version 2011.1) for fugitive dust.

Table 2.10-4 provides a summary of maximum daily emissions by source for project-related construction activities. These values represent the maximum daily emissions calculated for each source, and include the installation of a steel-construction pedestrian bridge (see Section 2.4) as a mitigation measure to accommodate the community’s desire to maintain pedestrian access across the Los Angeles River during construction. Table 2.10-4 also identifies the maximum daily emissions when maximum overlap would occur. It should be noted that the maximum daily emissions would not be sustained over the entire construction duration; rather, they would exist only when construction phase overlap peaks. The maximum combined daily emissions from all sources for the project-related construction activities and applicable SCAQMD significance thresholds (SCAQMD, 1993) are also provided.
Table 2.10-4: Maximum Daily Construction Emissions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>NOx</th>
<th>SOx</th>
<th>PM10</th>
<th>PM2.5</th>
<th>VOC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daily Maximum (lb/day)</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCAQMD Mass Daily Thresholds (lb/day)</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


*Bolded values indicate exceedance of the SCAQMD thresholds.*

ROG = reactive organic gases

The major sources contributing to the NOX emissions would be construction equipment exhaust and, to a lesser extent, offsite construction-related vehicle exhaust. Although the maximum daily NOX emissions come close to the SCAQMD threshold, it is unlikely that the NOX emissions will exceed the daily threshold because the construction analysis is considered conservative.

As shown in Table 2.10-4, none of the criteria pollutant emissions are predicted to exceed daily significance thresholds for construction of the Glendale-Hyperion Viaduct Complex improvements; thus the construction emissions impacts would be less than significant and no avoidance, minimization or mitigation measures are required during construction.

Comparison to Localized Significance Thresholds

In addition to the regional significance thresholds discussed above, the SCAQMD has developed localized significance thresholds (LSTs) for use in CEQA air quality impacts assessments. For project sites that are 5 acres or less, the SCAQMD-developed LSTs can be used to determine whether a project would generate significant localized air quality impacts (SCAQMD, 2008) in lieu of conducting a dispersion modeling analysis. As shown in Table 2.10-5, none of the construction criteria pollutant emissions are predicted to exceed the localized significance thresholds. Therefore, localized impacts from criteria pollutant emissions would result in a less than significant impact to air quality.

Table 2.10-5: Maximum Daily Construction Emissions Comparison to LSTs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>NOx</th>
<th>SOx</th>
<th>PM10</th>
<th>PM2.5</th>
<th>ROG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daily Maximum (lb/day)</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCAQMD Localized Thresholds (lb/day)</td>
<td>1695</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: UltraSystems, 2011

*Bold values indicate exceedance of the SCAQMD thresholds.*

NA = Not applicable, LST has not been established.

Approximately 44 percent of the PM10 and PM2.5 emissions result from fugitive dust. Project construction activities will be required to comply with fugitive dust control measures listed in
SCAQMD Rule 403 (Fugitive Dust). However, as Tables 2.10-3 and 2.10-4 indicate, even without Rule 403, the emissions from PM$_{10}$ and PM$_{2.5}$ are less than the SCAQMD thresholds. Therefore, localized air quality impacts from PM$_{10}$ and PM$_{2.5}$ emissions are expected to be to less than significant without Rule 403.

Other Pollutants
Another pollutant of potential concern in assessing localized air quality impacts associated with construction activities is naturally occurring asbestos. Asbestos is a toxic air contaminant that is regulated under the Asbestos Airborne Toxic Control Measure (AATCM), which was adopted by the California Air Resources Board (CARB) in 1990 and amended in 2000. The AATCM states that allowable asbestos content in surfacing materials must be less than 0.25 percent, effective spring 2001. In addition to surfacing materials, asbestos may occur naturally in serpentinite and ultramafic rock and can be released when the rock is broken or crushed.

According to the Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology, the project is in a county that contains serpentinite or ultramafic rock (Department of Conservation, 2000). However, any serpentinite or ultramafic rock found in Los Angeles County is restricted to the Catalina Islands. The surficial geology of the Los Angeles area is composed of quaternary alluvial material that consists of sands, gravels, silts, and clays but not ultramafic or serpentinite material. Therefore, fugitive asbestos from naturally occurring materials would not be emitted in significant quantities during construction or operation of the Glendale-Hyperion Viaduct Complex. Surfacing materials would also not contain more than 0.25 percent asbestos; therefore, the proposed project would not cause a significant impact on air quality from emissions of asbestos.

2.10.3.2 Permanent Impacts
2.10.3.2.1 Regional Conformity
Federally funded or approved transportation projects, in general, are subject to the transportation conformity requirements of the federal Clean Air Act (CAA) and to evaluation under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). Transportation conformity requires two conformity determinations (i) regional conformity determination and (ii) project level conformity determination in nonattainment and maintenance areas for CO, PM$_{10}$, and PM$_{2.5}$.

This project is exempt from regional conformity requirements because it is exempt under 40 CFR §93.127 from regional emissions analysis as it would be classified as an intersection signalization project. Separate listing of the project in the Regional Transportation Plan and Transportation Improvement Program, and their regional conformity analyses, is not necessary, although the project is listed in the 2013 FTIP. (See below.) The project will not interfere with timely implementation of Transportation Control Measures identified in the applicable SIP and regional conformity analysis.

2.10.3.2.2 Project Level Conformity
The proposed project is included in the 2013 FTIP under Project IDs LA0F007, LA0F008, and LA0F009. Because the proposed project would not increase traffic throughput or increase the capacity of the viaduct complex (see Table 2.10-6 and Table 2.10-7), no increases in criteria pollutants would result that could cause adverse impacts to air quality. Furthermore, operation of
the proposed project would not result in an incremental increase of criteria pollutants relative to the No Project alternative.

The reconfiguration of the northbound I-5 off-ramp to Glendale Boulevard would allow exiting motorists the option of making a left-turn on to southbound Glendale Boulevard, which would eliminate the current approximately 0.5-mile movement whereby motorists exiting the northbound off-ramp have to make a right turn onto northbound Glendale Boulevard, weave to the far left lane of Glendale Boulevard and make a U-turn at Glenfeliz Boulevard to southbound Glendale Boulevard. The reconfigured off-ramp would therefore result in a reduction in total vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and a corresponding reduction in related vehicle emissions, including greenhouse gases. (See Table 2.10-8.)

The reconfiguration of the northbound I-5 off-ramp to Glendale Boulevard would require replacement of the current stop-controlled approach intersection with a new signalized intersection. Without the signalization, the intersection would operate at a Level of Service (LOS) D; however, with the new signalization, the intersection would operate at a (LOS) B in the evaluation year 2036. Carbon monoxide and particulate matter hotspots are a concern when intersections operate at unacceptable levels of service, generally LOS E or F. Because the new signalized intersection at the reconfigured northbound I-5 off-ramp to Glendale Boulevard would operate at a free flowing level (LOS B), no CO or particulate matter hotspots are expected to occur from project operation. (See Table 2.10-9.) Similarly, this new intersection is not expected to result in PM$_{10}$ or PM$_{2.5}$ hotspots because it would operate at LOS B in the future. The following discussions present the documentation for project level conformity for CO and PM hotspots.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Existing (2011)</th>
<th>Opening Year (2016)</th>
<th>RTP Horizon Year (2036)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A.M./P.M. (1,000’s)</td>
<td>ADT (1,000’s)</td>
<td>Truck ADT (1,000’s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-5 Mainline</td>
<td>14.1/15.1</td>
<td>240.7</td>
<td>No Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-5 NB Off-Ramp</td>
<td>0.5/0.7</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-5 NB On-Ramp</td>
<td>0.3/0.3</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glendale Boulevard, NB</td>
<td>0.3/0.5</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glendale Boulevard, SB</td>
<td>0.7/0.7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyperion Avenue, NB</td>
<td>0.8/1.3</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyperion Avenue, SB</td>
<td>1.3/1.1</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: MGE Engineering, Inc., 2012, Email communication from Jeff Crovitz, MGE Engineering, Inc. and Benjamin Wong, UltraSystems Environmental, Inc. (November 16, and 18, 2011), and UltraSystems Environmental, Inc.

Note: Opening Year volumes were based on a conservative increase of 1% per year.
### Table 2.10-7: Peak Hour Traffic Volume – No Build Alternative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Existing (2011)</th>
<th>Opening Year (2016)</th>
<th>RTP Horizon Year (2036)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A.M./P.M. (1,000’s)</td>
<td>ADT (1,000’s)</td>
<td>Truck ADT (1,000’s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-5 Mainline</td>
<td>14.1/15.1</td>
<td>240.7</td>
<td>No Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-5 NB Off-Ramp</td>
<td>0.5/0.7</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-5 NB On-Ramp</td>
<td>0.3/0.3</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glendale Boulevard, NB</td>
<td>0.3/0.5</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glendale Boulevard, SB</td>
<td>0.7/0.7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyperion Avenue, NB</td>
<td>0.8/1.3</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyperion Avenue, SB</td>
<td>1.3/1.1</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: MGE Engineering, Inc., 2012, Email communication from Jeff Crovitz, MGE Engineering, Inc. and Benjamin Wong, UltraSystems Environmental, Inc. (November 16, and 18, 2011), and UltraSystems Environmental, Inc.

Note: Opening Year volumes were based on a conservative increase of 1% per year.
### Table 2.10-8: Daily Peak Hour VMT and Emissions Reduction (U-turn Versus Left-turn) From Northbound I-5 Off-ramp Signalization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Off-ramp Opening Year 2015</th>
<th>Total VMT</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>NOx</th>
<th>SOx</th>
<th>PM10</th>
<th>PM2.5</th>
<th>ROG</th>
<th>CO2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U-turn</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>84.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left-turn</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>80.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RTP Horizon Year 2036</th>
<th>Total VMT</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>NOx</th>
<th>SOx</th>
<th>PM10</th>
<th>PM2.5</th>
<th>ROG</th>
<th>CO2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U-turn</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>87.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left-turn</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>83.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Email communication from Jeff Crovitz, MGE Engineering, Inc. and Benjamin Wong, UltraSystems Environmental, Inc. (October 20, 2011), EMFAC2011-SG, and UltraSystems Environmental, Inc.

Note:
Estimations based on left-turn peak hour (P.M.) volume traffic counts
Intersection signalization will be constructed first and is expected to open in 2015

### Table 2.10-9: Level of Service (LOS) at I-5 NB Off-ramp – Build Versus No-Build Alternative (RTP Horizon Year: 2036)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>A.M. Peak Hour</th>
<th>P.M. Peak Hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing, Unsignalized (2011)</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build, Signalized (2036)</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[1 Left Turn + 1 Right Turn]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build, Signalized (2036)</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[1 Shared Left/Right + 1 Right Turn]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No-Build, Unsignalized (2036)</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: MGE Engineering, Inc., 2012

CO Hotspots

The USEPA redesignated the SCAB as attaining the federal CO standards effective June 11, 2007. Under Section 175A of the Clean Air Act, however, this means that the SCAB is a maintenance area for CO. According to the Transportation Conformity Regulation (40 CFR Part 93 Subpart A), maintenance areas must demonstrate project level conformity for CO. Project level conformity for CO is demonstrated by evaluating the potential for a project to create CO hot spots.

Localized CO impacts resulting from the proposed project were evaluated following the California Department of Transportation (Department) guidance document, Transportation Project Level Carbon Monoxide Protocol (CO Protocol) (UCDITS 1997). The CO Protocol includes two conformity requirement decision flow charts: Figure 1, Requirements for New
Responses to Questions from Requirements for New Projects

3.1.1 Is the project exempt from all emissions analyses?

No. The proposed project is not included in the list of projects exempt in Table 1 of the CO Protocol.

3.1.2 Is the project exempt from regional emissions analysis?

Yes. The project is included in the list of projects exempt from regional emissions analysis in Table 2 of the CO Protocol (Intersection signalization projects at individual intersections).

3.1.9 Examine local impacts. (Proceed to Section 4 of the CO Protocol which includes Figure 3.)

According to the Protocol, the determination of project-level CO impacts should be carried out following the Local Analysis flowchart shown in Figure 3 of the protocol. The responses for the questions in Figure 3 of the CO Protocol follow.

Responses to Questions from Local CO Analysis of the CO Protocol

Level 1: Is the project in a CO nonattainment area?

No. The Project site is located in a state CO attainment area (CARB, 2011b) and in a federal CO maintenance area effective September 27, 2010 (EPA, 2011).

Level 1: Was the area redesignated as “attainment” after the 1990 Clean Air Act?

Yes. The area was redesignated “attainment” effective June 11, 2007 for state area designations, but has since been designated as a maintenance area effective September 27, 2010 for national area designations.

Level 1: Has “continued attainment” been verified with the local air district, if appropriate?

Yes. A CO maintenance plan was approved by USEPA for the project area on May 11, 2007 (Proceed to Level 7).

Level 7: Does the project worsen air quality?

No. The CO Protocol lists three criteria to determine whether a project would worsen air quality:

a. Would the project increase the percentage of vehicles operating in cold start mode?
No. A cold start occurs when a vehicle is shut-off, and subsequently started any time after the shut-off. Because this Project involves widening and improvements to a roadway, where vehicles may idle, but will seldom shut-off, this Project is not anticipated to increase the percentage of vehicles operating in cold start mode.

b. Would the project increase traffic volumes greater than 5 percent?

No. Table 2.10-6 and Table 2.10-7 show that there is no increase in traffic volume between the build alternative and no-build alternative.

c. Would the project worsen traffic flow?

No. Table 2.10-9 shows that the Level of Service (LOS) at the proposed signalized intersection would improve compared to the unsignalized or no-build alternative.

In addition to the answers to 4.7.1, Table 2.10-8 shows how emissions, including CO, will be reduced by realigning and signalizing the intersection of the northbound I-5 off-ramp with Glendale Boulevard versus the no-build alternative. Because the project would not increase traffic volumes (see Table 2.10-6 and Table 2.10-7) and would improve traffic flow, the project would not worsen air quality. Therefore, according to the guidance in the CO Protocol, the analysis is complete; and the project does not need further analysis. The project would not be expected to create a CO hot spot; therefore, the project has demonstrated project-level conformity for CO.

PM Hotspots

At the project level, PM_{10} and PM_{2.5} must be evaluated because the proposed project is located in a federal nonattainment area for both pollutants. Although this site is also located in a state nonattainment area for PM_{10} and PM_{2.5}, a guidance document for quantitative assessment of the contribution of individual traffic projects to local violations of the state 24-hour standards does not exist at this time, nor is a local PM_{10} and PM_{2.5} analysis required at the state level to show project level conformity.

On March 10, 2006, the USEPA published a final rule that established transportation conformity criteria and procedures for determining which projects must be analyzed for local impacts in PM_{10} and PM_{2.5} nonattainment and maintenance areas. The PM guide was developed to help agencies satisfy the requirements of this rule. Following the PM guide, if a project is found not to be a “project of air quality concern (POAQC),” a qualitative PM_{2.5}/PM_{10} analysis is not required. Additionally, a quantitative PM hot-spot analysis is only required if the project is of “local air quality concern” (USEPA, 2010).

Based on 40 CFR 93.123(b)(1), the project would likely be found not to be of local air quality concern; however, an interagency consultation process through SCAG determines whether a project requires a qualitative or quantitative analysis. For projects in SCAG, this consultation process involves submitting a completed “PM Conformity Hot Spot Analysis Project Summary Form for Interagency Consultation” to the SCAG Transportation Conformity Working Group (TCWG) monthly meeting.
The proposed project was presented during the January 24, 2012, SCAG TCWG meeting for consideration. At this meeting, the SCAG TCWG concurred the proposed project would not be a POAQC. Additional discussion can be found in the Air Quality Technical Study Glendale Boulevard-Hyperion Avenue Complex of Bridges Improvement Project (December 2011).

On February 27, 2014, the Federal Highway Administration found that the project-level transportation conformity requirements of 40 CFR Part 93 have been met. (See Appendix G.)

### 2.10.3.2.3 Other Issues to Consider

#### Mobile Source Air Toxics

As part of the NEPA process for highway projects, an analysis of mobile source air toxics (MSATs) must be considered.

In the USEPA final rule, Control of Emissions of Hazardous Air Pollutants from Mobile Sources (66 FR 17235), a group of 21 toxics was identified as mobile source air toxics (FHWA, 2009). USEPA further identified the following subgroup of toxics as priority MSATs: benzene, formaldehyde, acetaldehyde, diesel particulate matter/diesel exhaust organic gases, acrolein, and 1,3-butadiene (FHWA, 2009). These compounds were selected because motor vehicles are significant contributors to the emissions of these pollutants (66 FR 17235).

According to the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Interim Guidance on Air Toxics Analysis in NEPA Documents, projects with no meaningful MSAT impacts do not require an MSAT analysis (FHWA, 2009). The proposed project would not result in any meaningful changes in traffic volumes, vehicle mix, location of the existing facility, or any other factor that could cause an increase in emissions impacts relative to the no-build alternative. (See Tables 2.10-4 and 2.10-5). Therefore, the project would have minimal air quality impacts from criteria pollutants and is not linked with any special MSAT concerns. In addition, the USEPA projects that between 1999 and 2050, programs to improve vehicle emission standards and gasoline formulations will reduce on-highway emissions of benzene, formaldehyde, 1,3-butadiene, and acetaldehyde by 72 percent. Since 1990, the cancer risk from toxic air pollutants has fallen by 45 percent statewide, despite significant industrial growth and a substantial increase in the number of motor vehicles (CARB 2008). Therefore, the proposed project is exempt from the analysis of MSATs.

#### 2.10.3.3 Cumulative Impacts

The proposed project by itself would not generate construction-related emissions that exceed the SCAQMD thresholds. A search using CEQAnet found no projects with overlapping construction periods within 2 miles of the proposed project site (CEQAnet, 2011). As a result, no cumulative construction-related emissions would be expected; thus, the project would result in less than significant cumulative air quality impacts.

The proposed project would not generate additional traffic because roadway capacity would not change as a result of completion of the proposed project. The cumulative impact of all planned transportation impacts, including the proposed project, has been evaluated in the conforming 2008 RTIP. The project also is included in the 2004/2005 HBRR Program. Because the proposed project has been evaluated at a regional level for conformity purposes, the contribution of the project to cumulative regional air quality impacts would not be adverse.
2.10.3.4 Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures

From the discussion above, the project is expected to have no adverse impacts from air quality emissions.

Project construction activities will be required to comply with fugitive dust control measures listed in SCAQMD Rule 403 (Fugitive Dust).

Most of the construction impacts to air quality are short-term in duration and, therefore, will not result in long-term adverse conditions. Implementation of the following measures, some of which may also be required for other purposes such as storm water pollution control, will reduce any air quality impacts resulting from construction activities:

- The construction contractor shall comply with Caltrans’ Standard Specifications in Section 14 (2010).
  - Section 14-9.01 specifically requires compliance by the contractor with all applicable laws and regulations related to air quality, including air pollution control district and air quality management district regulations and local ordinances.
  - Section 14-9.02 is directed at controlling dust. If dust palliative materials other than water are to be used, material specifications are contained in Section 18.

- Apply water or dust palliative to the site and equipment as frequently as necessary to control fugitive dust emissions. Fugitive emissions generally must meet a “no visible dust” criterion either at the point of emission or at the right-of-way line depending on local regulations.

- Spread soil binder on any unpaved roads used for construction purposes, and all project construction parking areas.

- Wash off trucks as they leave the right-of-way as necessary to control fugitive dust emissions.

- Properly tune and maintain construction equipment and vehicles. Use low-sulfur fuel in all construction equipment as provided in CA Code of Regulations Title 17, Section 93114.

- Develop a dust control plan documenting sprinkling, temporary paving, speed limits, and expedited revegetation of disturbed slopes as needed to minimize construction impacts to existing communities.

- Locate equipment and materials storage sites as far away from residential and park uses as practical. Keep construction areas clean and orderly.
• Near sensitive air receptors, establish Environmentally Sensitive Areas (ESAs) or their equivalent within which construction activities involving the extended idling of diesel equipment would be prohibited, to the extent feasible.

• Use track-out reduction measures such as gravel pads at project access points to minimize dust and mud deposits on roads affected by construction traffic.

• Cover all transported loads of soils and wet materials prior to transport, or provide adequate freeboard (space from the top of the material to the top of the truck) to minimize emission of dust (particulate matter) during transportation.

• Promptly and regularly remove dust and mud that are deposited on paved, public roads due to construction activity and traffic to decrease particulate matter.

• Route and schedule construction traffic to avoid peak travel times as much as possible, to reduce congestion and related air quality impacts caused by idling vehicles along local roads.

• Install mulch or plant vegetation as soon as practical after grading to reduce windblown particulate in the area. Be aware that certain methods of mulch placement, such as straw blowing, may themselves cause dust and visible emission issues and may need to use controls such as dampened straw.

2.10.4 No Build Alternative Impacts

The No Build Alternative would result in no new or additional impacts related to air quality relative to existing conditions. However, the No Build Alternative would not realize the minor beneficial air quality effects of the proposed project, namely, reduced air emissions associated with reduced vehicle miles traveled from the elimination of the right-turn only option at the existing northbound I-5 off-ramp to Glendale Boulevard. (See Table 2.10-8).
2.11 Noise

This section evaluates the potential construction noise impacts on nearby noise-sensitive receptors resulting from the proposed project. For federally funded highway transportation projects, traffic noise must be considered for projects that would result in an increase in traffic or bring traffic closer to sensitive receptors. The proposed project does not involve either; therefore, traffic noise is not discussed further.

2.11.1 Regulatory Setting

Caltrans does not provide specific construction noise criteria. However, the Caltrans’ Traffic Noise Analysis Protocol for New Highway Construction and Reconstruction Projects, May 2011, recommends that construction noise levels normally should not exceed a maximum of 86 dBA between 9:00 p.m. and 6:00 a.m. at a distance of 50 feet from the job site activities. If construction noise is anticipated to be a substantial problem, measures to minimize or eliminate adverse construction noise impacts on the communities should be examined.

The policies and regulations of City of Los Angeles Noise Ordinance concerning the generation and control of construction noise are contained in Chapter IV, Article 1, Section 41.40 of the City of Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC). The LAMC places the following restrictions on the hours of construction activities:

“No person shall, between the hours of 9 p.m. and 7 a.m. of the following day, perform any construction or repair work of any kind upon, or any excavating for any building or structure, where any of the foregoing entails the use of any power driven drill, riveting machine excavator or any other machine, tool, device or equipment which makes loud noises to the disturbance of persons occupying sleeping quarters in any dwelling hotel or apartment or other place of residence. In addition, the operation, repair or servicing of construction equipment and the job-site delivering of construction materials in such areas shall be prohibited during the hours herein specified.”

The section further states that:

“No person, other than an individual homeowner engaged in repair or construction of his single-family dwelling shall perform any construction or repair work of any kind upon, or any earth grading for, any building or structure located on land developed with residential buildings under the provisions of Chapter I of this Code, or perform such work within 500 feet of land so occupied, before 8 a.m. or after 6 p.m. on any Saturday or national holiday nor at any time on any Sunday. In addition, the operation, repair or servicing of construction equipment and the job-site delivering of construction materials in such areas shall be prohibited on Saturdays and on Sundays during the hours herein specified.”

Section 112.05 of Article 2, Chapter XI, specifies that any powered equipment or powered hand tool that produces a maximum noise level exceeding 75 dBA at a distance of 50 feet from construction and industrial machinery is prohibited. The 75 dBA noise limitation does not apply when compliance is technically infeasible. The City’s code states, “Technical infeasibility shall mean that said noise limitations cannot be complied with despite the use of mufflers, shields, sound barriers, and/or other noise reduction devices or techniques during the operation of the equipment.” To comply with this ordinance, the demolition equipment to be used for the proposed project would be equipped with noise reduction devices such as mufflers. Use of other techniques, such as shields and sound barriers, would be implemented whenever feasible.
Section 41.40 (j) (Noise Due to Construction) of Article 1, Chapter IV (Public Welfare), specifies that “major public works construction by the City of Los Angeles and its proprietary Departments” may obtain a variance from the Board of Police Commissioners to perform nighttime construction activities otherwise prohibited by 41.40 (c), and that such construction must comply with all conditions of the variance. Additionally, the council district offices and neighborhood councils must be notified.

2.11.2 Affected Environment

2.11.2.1 Fundamentals of Noise

Noise is defined as sound that is loud, unpleasant, unexpected, or undesired. A continuous sound can be described by its frequency (pitch) and its amplitude (loudness). The loudness of sound increases and decreases with increasing and decreasing amplitude. These units are called decibels (dB). Because decibels are logarithmic units, sound pressure levels cannot be added or subtracted by ordinary arithmetic means. When two equal sound levels are combined, they would produce a combined sound level that is 3 dB greater than the original sound level. In other words, sound energy must be doubled to produce a 3 dB increase. If two sound levels differ by 10 dB or more, the combined sound level is equal to the higher sound level (the lower sound level does not increase the higher sound level).

Sound pressure level alone is not a reliable indicator of loudness. The frequency or pitch of a sound also has a substantial effect on how humans respond. In general, the healthy human ear is most sensitive to sounds between 1,000 Hertz (Hz) and 5000 Hz, and it perceives a sound within that range as being more intense than a sound of a higher or lower frequency with the same magnitude. To approximate the frequency response of the human ear, a weighting adjustment, referred to as the A-scale, has been developed to approximate the frequency response of humans when listening to most ordinary sounds. Noise levels for traffic noise reports are typically reported in terms of A-weighted decibels or dBA. Figure 2-15 show various general noise levels in dBA associated with common sounds.

Noise levels diminish with distance at the rate of approximately 6.0 dBA per doubling of distance. For example, if a noise source produces a noise level of 89 dBA at a reference distance of 50 feet, then the noise would be 83 dBA at a distance of 100 feet from the noise source, 77dBA at a distance of 200 feet, and so on.
2.11.2.2 Existing Noise Environment

**Land Uses**

Land uses in the project area are comprised primarily of residential and commercial uses along Hyperion Avenue, Glendale Boulevard, and Riverside Drive. Noise in the project area is dominated by traffic noise along these same streets, as well as I-5, which the viaduct complex traverses.

Along the west side of Glendale Boulevard north of I-5 and the Los Angeles River, commercial uses comprise first row properties with predominantly single-family homes comprising second-row properties and beyond. Along the east side of Glendale Boulevard, both residential and commercial uses make up the first row properties with primarily single-family homes in subsequent rows (including residences with rear yards along the Los Angeles River), although occasional multi-family structures are present. Noise from the viaduct complex and Glendale Boulevard diminishes greatly and blends with the overall background noise (primarily from I-5 traffic) beyond first and second row properties.

Along Riverside Drive, two multi-family residential structures are located near the viaduct complex, one is adjacent to the viaduct complex on the west side (Archstone Apartments), and the other is located farther to the east of Glendale Boulevard. The remaining land uses along...
Riverside Drive are commercial and industrial. Several 3rd and 4th floor balconies of a limited number of the units of the Archstone complex face the viaduct complex.

The area surrounding the Waverly Drive Bridge is comprised of mostly single-family homes, although some apartment complexes are present. Along Hyperion Avenue, roadway noise is substantially diminished beyond first row homes.

2.11.3 Environmental Consequences

2.11.3.1 Temporary Impacts

Noise impacts from construction of the proposed project are a function of the noise generated by construction equipment, the location and sensitivity of nearby receptors, and the timing and duration of noise-generating activities.

Construction of the proposed project would be conducted over an approximately 30-month period. Construction noise levels typically vary depending upon construction activities. Each construction activity generates has its own noise characteristics resulting from the mix of construction equipment involved and the related work activity. The construction phases of the proposed project are described in Section 1.3.1.1.9, Project Construction. The loudest construction noise levels are expected to result from demolition of the sides (rails) of the bridge structures and construction of the substructure and superstructure improvements (Glendale Boulevard bridge widening). These construction phases are expected to represent the worst-case phase from a noise standpoint because they involve the highest number of construction equipment and equipment having the greatest noise-generating characteristics. Table 2.11-1 estimates the noise exposure anticipated for various construction phases together with the construction equipment mix used to calculate noise levels for each phase.
Table 2.11-1: Summary of Construction Tasks and Predicted Noise Emissions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task #</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Equipment (Number)</th>
<th>Usage Factor</th>
<th>Noise Level at 50 feet(^2), L(^{eq}) (^3) (day), dBA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1a</td>
<td>Hyperion Bridge Removal (Within 100 feet from R7)</td>
<td>Compressor (2)</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Generator (2)</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Concrete Saw (2)</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Loader (1)</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1b</td>
<td>Hyperion Bridge Removal (Outside 100 feet from R7)</td>
<td>Compressor (2)</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Generator (2)</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Concrete Saw (2)</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Loader (1)</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2a</td>
<td>Hyperion Barrier/Sidewalk Construction (Within 100 feet from R7)</td>
<td>Generator (2)</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Concrete Pump (1)</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2b</td>
<td>Hyperion Barrier/Sidewalk Construction (Outside 100 feet from R7)</td>
<td>Generator (2)</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Concrete Pump (1)</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3</td>
<td>Hyperion Abutment Retrofit</td>
<td>Generator (1)</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Excavator (1)</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Concrete Pump (1)</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4</td>
<td>Hyperion Channel Lining Retrofit</td>
<td>Concrete Saw (1)</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5</td>
<td>Glendale Widening Excavation</td>
<td>Excavator (2)</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6</td>
<td>Glendale Widening Demolition</td>
<td>Excavator (2)</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Compressor (2)</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A7</td>
<td>Glendale Foundation Widening</td>
<td>Compressor (2)</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Generator (2)</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hydraulic Crane (2)</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Auger (2)</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A8</td>
<td>Glendale Substructure Widening</td>
<td>Compressor (2)</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Generator (2)</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hydraulic Crane (2)</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Concrete Pump (1)</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A9</td>
<td>Glendale Superstructure Widening</td>
<td>Compressor (2)</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Generator (2)</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hydraulic Crane (2)</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Concrete Pump (2)</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Notes:
1 Usage factor is the fraction of time equipment is in use over an eight-hour work shift.
2 FHWA Roadway Construction Noise Model (RCNM) is the source for construction equipment noise levels.
3 \(L_{eq}\) is the equivalent steady state sound level which, in a stated period of time, would contain the same acoustical energy as the time-varying sound level during the same period.

In addition to the temporary effects presented above, infrequent and short-term (1-2 days) nighttime construction activities would be required to install protective barriers along the viaduct complex structures. Ideally, this construction activity would be scheduled for periods when traffic activity on the viaduct complex roadways and I-5 freeway below are at minimum use levels. While these construction activities would not be particularly noisy, they do have the potential to exceed acceptable nighttime ambient levels for nearby sensitive receptors. As noted
above, the prohibitions on night and weekend construction do not apply to construction of major public works projects. In this case, the Board of Police Commissioners would grant a variance which would impose conditions on the work to protect nearby residents from noise impacts.

The City’s standard construction specifications require construction equipment to have noise-suppressing devices and require noise controls such as placement of noise barriers, use of low-noise-generating equipment, maintenance of mufflers and ancillary noise-abatement equipment, scheduling of high-noise-producing activities during periods that are least sensitive, routing of construction-related truck traffic away from noise-sensitive areas, and reduction of construction vehicle speeds. Despite the required noise controls, it may not be technically feasible for all construction equipment to meet the 75 dBA maximum noise level.

The noise emissions described in Table 2.11-3 above are at a distance of 50 feet with no attenuating factors. A resident inside a house or apartment would experience lower noise levels. According to the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA Highway Traffic Noise Analysis and Abatement Policy (2011), a building with open windows would provide approximately 10 dB reduction, and a building with closed windows could expect an additional 10-25 dB reduction depending on window type and building type. For example, a light frame building with a closed ordinary sash window would reduce the noise levels by 20 dB.

Where technically feasible, construction equipment noise would be maintained at or below the 75 dBA maximum level, and where not technically feasible, construction would occur within the allowed times, in compliance with City regulations and conditions of approval of any variance. Also, construction would be conducted in compliance with the standard specifications for public works construction, which includes noise minimization measures as described above. Therefore, the noise impacts would be less than significant.

2.11.3.2 Permanent Impacts
The proposed project includes reconfiguration of the northbound I-5 off-ramp to Glendale Boulevard. This change is expected to reduce the vehicle miles traveled along Glendale Boulevard by allowing motorists who desire to travel south on Glendale Boulevard to simply make a left turn from the off-ramp to southbound Glendale Boulevard (this movement is not currently allowed). Because this project is not capacity increasing, and as a result of this reconfiguration, traffic noise along Glendale Boulevard (north of the off-ramp) would be slightly or minimally reduced. Based on the above, no permanent adverse noise impacts would occur from the project.

2.11.3.3 Cumulative Impacts
Because there would be no anticipated construction overlap of the proposed project and other projects within the vicinity, cumulative construction noise impacts would not occur.

2.11.4 No Build Alternative Impacts
The No Build Alternative would result in no project-related changes to existing noise.
Biological Environment

This section of the document focuses on issues covered in the Natural Environment Study prepared by UltraSystems Environmental in August 2011.

2.12 Wetlands

2.12.1 Regulatory Setting

Wetlands and other waters are protected under a number of laws and regulations. At the federal level, the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, more commonly referred to as the Clean Water Act (CWA) (33 United States Code [USC] 1344), is the primary law regulating wetlands and surface waters. One purpose of the CWA is to regulate the discharge of dredged or fill material into waters of the U.S., including wetlands. Waters of the U.S. include navigable waters, interstate waters, territorial seas and other waters that may be used in interstate or foreign commerce. To classify wetlands for the purposes of the CWA, a three-parameter approach is used that includes the presence of hydrophytic (water-loving) vegetation, wetland hydrology, and hydric soils (soils formed during saturation/inundation). All three parameters must be present, under normal circumstances, for an area to be designated as a jurisdictional wetland under the CWA.

Section 404 of the CWA establishes a regulatory program that provides that discharge of dredged or fill material cannot be permitted if a practicable alternative exists that is less damaging to the aquatic environment or if the nation’s waters would be significantly degraded. The Section 404 permit program is run by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) with oversight by the United States Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA).

The USACE issues two types of 404 permits: General and Standard permits. There are two types of General permits: Regional permits and Nationwide permits. Regional permits are issued for a general category of activities when they are similar in nature and cause minimal environmental effect. Nationwide permits are issued to allow a variety of minor project activities with no more than minimal effects.

Ordinarily, projects that do not meet the criteria for a Nationwide Permit may be permitted under one of USACE’s Standard permits. There are two types of Standard permits: Individual permits and Letters of Permission. For Standard permits, the USACE decision to approve is based on compliance with U.S. EPA’s Section 404(b)(1) Guidelines (U.S. EPA 40 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] Part 230), and whether permit approval is in the public interest. The Section 404 (b)(1) Guidelines (Guidelines) were developed by the U.S. EPA in conjunction with the USACE, and allow the discharge of dredged or fill material into the aquatic system (waters of the U.S.) only if there is no practicable alternative which would have less adverse effects. The Guidelines state that the USACE may not issue a permit if there is a least environmentally damaging practicable alternative (LEDPA) to the proposed discharge that would have lesser effects on waters of the U.S., and not have any other significant adverse environmental consequences.

The Executive Order for the Protection of Wetlands (EO 11990) also regulates the activities of federal agencies with regard to wetlands. Essentially, this EO states that a federal agency, such as the FHWA and/or Caltrans, as assigned, cannot undertake or provide assistance for new
construction located in wetlands unless the head of the agency finds: 1) that there is no practicable alternative to the construction and 2) the proposed project includes all practicable measures to minimize harm.

At the state level, wetlands and waters are regulated primarily by the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB), the Regional Water Quality Control Boards (RWQCB) and the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW). In certain circumstances, the Coastal Commission (or Bay Conservation and Development Commission or Tahoe Regional Planning Agency) may also be involved. Sections 1600-1607 of the California Fish and Game Code require any agency that proposes a project that will substantially divert or obstruct the natural flow of or substantially change the bed or bank of a river, stream, or lake to notify CDFW before beginning construction. If CDFW determines that the project may substantially and adversely affect fish or wildlife resources, a Lake or Streambed Alteration Agreement will be required. CDFW jurisdictional limits are usually defined by the tops of the stream or lake banks, or the outer edge of riparian vegetation, whichever is wider. Wetlands under jurisdiction of the USACE may or may not be included in the area covered by a Streambed Alteration Agreement obtained from the CDFW.

The RWQCBs were established under the Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act to oversee water quality. Discharges under the Porter-Cologne Act are permitted by Waste Discharge Requirements (WDRs) and may be required even when the discharge is already permitted or exempt under the CWA. In compliance with Section 401 of the CWA, the RWQCBs also issue water quality certifications for activities which may result in a discharge to waters of the U.S. This is most frequently required in tandem with a Section 404 permit request. Please see the Water Quality section for additional details.

2.12.2 Affected Environment

The viaduct complex spans the Los Angeles River in the Los Angeles Narrows area. The Los Angeles River is a navigable waterway and is considered a Water of the U.S. as defined by USACE. The River is also considered jurisdictional by CDFW under Section 1600 of the Fish and Game Code.

Although the Los Angeles River is unlined both upstream and downstream of the viaduct complex, the river bottom in the immediate vicinity of the viaduct complex crossing is lined with concrete. The concrete bottom extends upstream approximately 50 feet northwest of the southbound Glendale Boulevard Bridge and downstream approximately 120 feet southeast of the concrete hydraulic control structures and abandoned piers for the former Red Car line (Figure 2-16).

Further upstream and downstream the river bottom is comprised of cobbles, which allows rising groundwater to enter the river. Along these unlined areas of the Los Angeles River, patches of riparian and wetland plant communities have established, specifically riparian forest, riparian scrub, and emergent freshwater marsh communities.

2.12.2.1 Riparian Forest

The study area contains stands of mature cottonwood and willow species with a developed understory of mulefat and other riparian shrubs. Based on species composition, the community most closely resembles Southern Cottonwood/Willow Riparian Forest intermixed with the Mulefat Scrub (Holland 1986). The vegetation is dominated by Fremont cottonwood (Populus...
fremontii), western sycamore (Platanus racemosa), and Goodding’s willow (Salix gooddingii).
The overstory canopy occurs in isolated dense patches, with a dense shrub layer consisting of willow saplings (Salix spp.), mulefat (Baccharis salicifolia), and other shrubs and sub-shrubs. These forests also contain a number of exotic species including arundo (Arundo donax), cocklebur (Xanthium strumarium), and lady’s thumb (Polygonum persicaria).

2.12.2.2 Riparian Scrub
As described above, the understory of the Riparian Forest contains mostly mulefat scrub and southern willow scrub species. Characterized more generally as riparian scrub, this community is dominated by shrubby willow species (Salix spp.) and mulefat (Baccharis salicifolia). Occasionally, patches of vegetation within the river contain riparian scrub species only. Density and maturity of the vegetation varies both laterally and horizontally within the channel. This variation may be due to a number of factors. In portions of the channel subjected to significant flood scour, vegetation is naturally thinned; or it may be absent altogether.

2.12.2.3 Freshwater Emergent Marsh
Emergent marsh habitats occur within the channel along slow-moving portions of the river that have unobstructed soil surfaces. Holland (1986) has classified these areas as Coastal and Valley Freshwater marsh. Common plant species in this community include bulrush (Scirpus sp.), cattail (Typha latifolia), sedge (Carex sp.), flatsedge (Cyperus sp.) and marsh purslane (Ludwigia peploides). Several exotic species have successfully invaded the freshwater marsh adjacent to the project area, including arundo (Arundo donax), cocklebur (Xanthium strumarium), lady’s thumb (Polygonum persicaria), and castor bean (Ricinus communis).

Fresh water emergent marsh is the closest natural plant community to the proposed project area. Sizable stands of freshwater marsh begin within approximately 50 feet upstream and 120 feet downstream of the proposed project area. Some cattail and marsh purslane also occur sporadically at the base of the bridge piers (abutments) located on the downstream side of the concrete channel.
CHAPTER 2: AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT, ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Figure 2-16: Biological Study Area Map

Source: CNDDB, 2010; Bing Maps, 2009; Ultrasystems Environmental, Inc., 2011
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2.12.3 Environmental Consequences

2.12.3.1 Temporary Impacts

No temporary impacts to riparian forest or riparian scrub would be expected with implementation of the avoidance and minimization measures described below. Although riparian vegetation exists upstream and downstream from the proposed project area, construction equipment would be restricted to the existing concrete foundation and access routes. No heavy equipment, including cranes and drill rigs, would be permitted to encroach into the unlined portion of the river.

Equipment may be tracked or wheeled into the channel from several access points. The river channel can be accessed from the existing bike path entrance off of southbound Glendale Boulevard and from the path at Ferncroft Road near the landscaped median separating northbound Glendale Boulevard traffic from two-directional traffic on the frontage road. Another access point is located off Fletcher Drive approximately 0.75 miles downstream from the viaduct complex.

Currently, the water within the Los Angeles River flows as sheet-flow over the entire width of the concrete pad at the viaduct complex crossing. Placement and operation of construction equipment in the channel would therefore require the diversion of surface waters by coffer dams or other approved flow diverters. The coffer dam would be erected on the existing concrete channel as not to displace any riparian or wetland habitat upstream and downstream from the bridge.

Although all bridge foundations and pier abutments are concrete lined, some sparse freshwater emergent plants have established along the base of these structures, primarily cattails and marsh purslane. This vegetation would have to be removed to accommodate the proposed retrofits. An estimated 2,000 square feet of native vegetation would need to be removed. It is likely this vegetation is dynamic; colonizing around support structures in the spring, growing and flowering over the summer, and then becoming dislodged in the winter from large flood events. Therefore, the presence and extent of this vegetation during the start of project construction may change. Furthermore, vegetation would be permitted to recolonize these areas once project construction was completed.

These stands could support nesting birds (e.g. red-winged blackbirds) during the breeding season (February through August). Therefore, vegetation removal should occur only after pre-construction bird surveys have been performed or outside of the nesting season (see mitigation measures B-4 and B-5 in section 2.14.3.4 for guidance concerning nesting bird surveys).

To avoid impacts to vegetation downstream of the viaduct complex, diverted water should be restored to the full width of the Los Angeles River prior to intercepting any vegetation (see mitigation measure B-2). Because the length of the concrete pad extending from the end of the hydraulic control channels is relatively short (approximately 35 feet), flow diversion structures should be designed to spread flow across the entire concrete pad before entering the unlined portions of the river. If not, some wetland vegetation immediate downstream may receive less water than they are acclimated to, and could be temporarily impacted.

2.12.3.2 Permanent Impacts

The proposed project would include the widening of both the southbound and northbound Glendale Boulevard bridges over the Los Angeles River. The widening would require that the
foundation footings and piers within the river channel be extended by approximately eight feet to support the widened superstructures. The areas within the Los Angeles River where the piers and foundations would be extended are within the concrete lined portions of the river and as described, contain sparse emergent vegetation. The nearest wetland community upstream subsisting on soil substrate is located at least 50 feet from the existing piers and the nearest wetland community downstream is located about 120 feet from the existing piers. Because none of the pier extensions or foundations would encroach into any unlined portion of the Los Angeles River, no permanent adverse impacts to wetlands would occur.

2.12.3.3 Cumulative impacts

The proposed project would not permanently affect wetlands in the Los Angeles River. According to the CEQAnet Database (2011), there are no other current or planned projects whose construction could adversely affect wetlands in the Los Angeles River. Therefore, no cumulative impacts would occur to wetlands in the river. This determination, however, is based on adherence to the following avoidance and minimization measures.

2.12.3.4 Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures

To avoid potential impacts to wetlands in the Los Angeles River downstream from the viaduct complex, the following measure would be implemented:

B-1: Cofferdams or other approved flow diversions should be erected in the existing concrete channel during project construction to minimize pollution of river water as part of a Storm Water Protection Plan (SWPPP). To optimize pollution capture and stream flow during project implementation, flow should be diverted from one or two of the four channels at any given time.

B-2: Restore diverted flow within the Los Angeles River to the full width of the river channel upstream from the locations of the riparian/wetland islands. This would ensure that the wetlands immediately downstream of the concrete pad would not be deprived of water that they would otherwise receive.

2.12.4 No Build Alternative Impacts

The No Build Alternative would not provide seismic or other improvements to the viaduct complex, and as such, would not result in any impacts to wetlands.

2.12.5 Wetlands Only Practicable Finding

The evaluation presented in Section 2.12.1 through 2.12.4 satisfies the requirements of E.O. 11990 for projects constructed in wetlands. To accomplish the objectives of the proposed project, there is no practicable alternative to increasing the footprint of structure in the Los Angeles River channel, or to deploying and using construction equipment therein. Because none of the pier extensions or foundations would encroach into any unlined portion of the Los Angeles River, no permanent adverse impacts to wetlands would occur. Potential short-term impacts would be avoided by measures B-1 and B-2, which are presented in Section 2.12.3.4. Based on the above considerations, it is determined that there is no practicable alternative to the proposed construction in wetlands and that the proposed action includes all practicable measures to minimize harm to wetlands that may result from such use.
2.13 Plant Species

2.13.1 Regulatory Setting
The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) share regulatory responsibility for the protection of special status plant species. Special status is a general term for species that are afforded varying levels of regulatory protection because they are rare and/or subject to population and habitat declines. The highest level of protection is given to threatened and endangered (T&E) species; these are species that are formally listed or proposed for listing as endangered or threatened under the Federal Endangered Species Act (FESA) and/or the California Endangered Species Act (CESA). Please see the Threatened and Endangered Species Section (2.15) in this document for detailed information regarding T&E species.

This section of the document discusses all the other, non-T&E special status plant species, including CDFW fully protected species and species of special concern, USFWS candidate species, and non-listed plants in the California Native Plant Society (CNPS) Rarity Ranking System database.

The regulatory requirements for FESA can be found at United States Code 16 (USC), Section 1531, et. seq. See also 50 CFR Part 402. The regulatory requirements for CESA can be found at California Fish and Game Code Section 2050, et. seq. Caltrans projects are also subject to the Native Plant Protection Act, found at Fish and Game Code Section 1900-1913, and the California Environmental Quality Act, Public Resources Code, Sections 2100-21177.

Invasive plant (and animal) species are now well recognized as major threats to native ecosystems. Executive Order 13112 tasked Federal Agencies in 1999 to (i) prevent the introduction of invasive species; (ii) detect and respond rapidly to and control populations of such species in a cost-effective and environmentally sound manner; (iii) monitor invasive species populations accurately and reliably; (iv) provide for restoration of native species and habitat conditions in ecosystems that have been invaded; (v) conduct research on invasive species and develop technologies to prevent introduction and provide for environmentally sound control of invasive species; and (vi) promote public education on invasive species and the means to address them; and not authorize, fund, or carry out actions that it believes are likely to cause or promote the introduction or spread of invasive species in the United States or elsewhere unless, pursuant to guidelines that it has prescribed, the agency has determined and made public its determination that the benefits of such actions clearly outweigh the potential harm caused by invasive species; and that all feasible and prudent measures to minimize risk of harm will be taken in conjunction with the actions. The Executive Order also established a National Invasive Species Council to oversee the implementation of these task orders.

Other applicable Federal legislation aimed at controlling exotic species include the Noxious Weed Control Act of 2004, which creates a national funding program for weed management entities and the National Aquatic Invasive Species Act of 2005 (HR 1591) that updated national policy on ballast water and other aquatic invasive species.

To comply with Executive Order 13112, the project proponent shall consult the California Invasive Plant Council’s (Cal-IPC) weed management guidelines. While weed management strategies are often species specific, hand weeding and mowing is appropriate for relatively small areas.
2.13.2 Affected Environment

A search of the California Natural Diversity Database was conducted to identify special status species in the project area. In addition, field surveys were conducted in the project area and along the Los Angeles River on August 12, 2011.

According to the CNDDB (2011) search, three non-T&E special status plant species have the potential to occur within the riparian and wetland islands in the Los Angeles River: Davidson’s bush mallow (*Malacothamnus davidsonii*), Parish’s gooseberry (*Ribes divaricatum var. parishii*), and San Bernardino aster (*Symphyotrichum defoliatum*). Although these species are not listed as endangered or threatened at a federal or state level, the California Native Plant Society considered them to be rare, threatened, or endangered in California and elsewhere. These species were not observed during recent field surveys of the project area (in 2008 or 2011). However, field surveys were not exhaustive and the presence or absence of these three plant species cannot be certain.

2.13.3 Environmental Consequences

2.13.3.1 Temporary Impacts

As discussed above, construction of the pier extensions for the viaduct complex would require the temporary diversion of flow in the Los Angeles River. If water flowing out of flow diversion structures do not fully spread across the entire river channel bottom before encountering wetland vegetation, it is possible that some individuals of Davidson’s bush mallow, Parish’s gooseberry, and San Bernardino aster could be adversely affected from reduced water availability. Flow diversion structures should be installed to avoid this issue.

2.13.3.2 Permanent Impacts

As discussed above, the proposed project requires extending the viaduct complex piers within the river channel by approximately eight feet to support widened superstructures. The areas within the Los Angeles River where the piers and foundations would be extended are within the concrete lined portions of the river where only minimal colonization of common wetland species was observed. Therefore, removal of this vegetation would be unlikely to impact a special status species. If special status species in these locations are observed during pre-construction surveys, CDFW should be immediately notified and consulted for potential plant relocation.

Otherwise, the nearest wetland communities are located at least 50 feet upstream and 120 feet downstream from the existing piers. Because none of the pier extensions or foundations would encroach into any unlined portion of the Los Angeles River, no adverse impacts to Davidson’s bush mallow, Parish’s gooseberry, or San Bernardino aster would be expected.

2.13.3.3 Cumulative impacts

As discussed above, the proposed project would not be expected to negatively impact Davidson’s bush mallow, Parish’s gooseberry, or San Bernardino aster present in the Los Angeles River. Similarly, there are no other known related projects that could affect these species in the river. As a consequence, the proposed project would not result in cumulative impacts to these special status plant species.

2.13.3.4 Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures

To avoid impacts to Davidson’s bush mallow, Parish’s gooseberry, San Bernardino aster that may be present in the Los Angeles River downstream from the viaduct complex, mitigation measure B-1 through B-3 described above should be implemented.
2.13.4 No Build Alternative Impacts
The No Build Alternative would not provide seismic or other improvements to the viaduct complex, and therefore would not result in any impacts to Davidson’s bush mallow, Parish’s gooseberry, or San Bernardino aster.
CHAPTER 2: AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT, ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

2.14 Animal Species

Many state and federal laws regulate impacts to wildlife. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) Fisheries and the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) are responsible for implementing these laws. This section discusses potential impacts and permit requirements associated with animals not listed or proposed for listing under the state or federal Endangered Species Act. Species listed or proposed for listing as threatened or endangered are discussed in Section 2.15 below. All other special-status animal species are discussed here, including CDFW fully protected species and species of special concern, and USFWS or NOAA Fisheries candidate species.

Federal laws and regulations pertaining to wildlife include the following:

- National Environmental Policy Act
- Migratory Bird Treaty Act
- Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act

State laws and regulations pertaining to wildlife include the following:

- California Environmental Quality Act
- Sections 1600-1603 of the Fish and Game Code
- Section 4150 and 4152 of the Fish and Game Code

2.14.1 Regulatory Setting

2.14.1.1 Migratory Bird Treaty Act

The original Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) of 1918 implemented the 1916 Convention between the United States and Great Britain (for Canada) for the protection of migratory birds. Specific provisions of the statute include the establishment of a federal prohibition, unless permitted, to:

...pursue, hunt, take, capture, kill, attempt to take, capture or kill, possess, offer for sale, sell, offer to purchase, purchase, deliver for shipment, ship, cause to be shipped, deliver for transportation, transport, cause to be transported, carry, or cause to be carried by any means whatever, receive for shipment, transportation or carriage, or export, at any time, or in any manner, any migratory bird, included in the terms of the Convention ... for the protection of migratory birds ... or any part, nest, or egg of any such bird.

Birds species protected under the provisions of the MBTA are identified by the List of Migratory Birds (50 CFR, § 10.13, as updated by the 1983 American Ornithologists Union Checklist and published supplements through 1995, USFWS).

2.14.1.2 Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act

The original Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act (FWCA) of 1934 authorized the Secretaries of Agriculture and Commerce to provide assistance to and cooperate with Federal and State agencies to protect, rear, stock, and increase the supply of Wildlife and fur-bearing animals, as well as to study the effects of domestic sewage, trade wastes, and other polluting substances on wildlife. Amendments to the FWCA require consultation with the Fish and Wildlife Service and the fish and wildlife agencies of States where the "waters of any stream or other body of water
are proposed or authorized, permitted or licensed to be impounded, diverted...or otherwise controlled or modified" by any agency under a Federal permit or license. Consultation is to be undertaken for the purpose of "preventing loss of and damage to wildlife resources."

2.14.1.3 Federal Fisheries and Essential Fish Habitat Consultation Summary
The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) works with federal agencies to conserve and enhance essential fish habitat (EFH). Consultation is required when a federal agency authorizes, funds, or undertakes an action that may adversely affect EFH. In 2004, the FHWA authorized Caltrans as a non-federal representative to consult with NOAA regarding the management and protection of EFH (50 CFR 600.920(c)). The Proposed project carried out with the proposed avoidance measures, however, is not expected to “adversely affect” EFH. Therefore consultation with NOAA is not required. An adverse effect is defined as any impact that reduces quality and/or quantity of EFH. This includes direct or indirect physical, chemical, or biological alterations of the waters or substrate and loss of, or injury to species and their habitat, and other ecosystem components, or reduction of the quality and/or quantity of EFH.

2.14.1.4 California Fish and Game Code, Section 1600
Section 1600 of the Fish and Game Code regulates the alteration of the bed, bank, or channel of a stream, river, or lake, including dry washes. Generally, CDFW asserts jurisdiction up to the top of significant bank cuts, or to the outside of any riparian vegetation associated with a water course. Activities that have the potential to affect jurisdictional areas can be authorized through the issuance of a Streambed Alteration Agreement (SAA). The SAA specifies conditions and mitigation measures that would minimize impacts to riparian resources from proposed actions.

The CDFW maintains the responsibility of the state under CEQA and through the USACE 404 process to comment on potential impacts to special status species. They are also responsible for project compliance with the California Endangered Species Act (described in Section 2.16) and must be consulted if impacts to state-listed species are likely to occur.

2.14.2 Affected Environment
Several non-T&E special-status animal species have the potential to occur within the riparian and wetland habitats near the proposed project site. These species include the peregrine falcon (Falco peregrinus anatum), western mastiff bat (Eumops perotis californicus), hoary bat (Lasiurus cinereus), western yellow bat (Lasiurus xanthinus) and the big free-tailed bat (Nyctinomops macrotis) which are all species of concern at the state level. The southwestern willow flycatcher is discussed below in Section 2.15.

A number of special status species that were identified in the 2001 CNDDB search were not identified in 2011. These included the Least bell's vireo (Vireo bellii pusillus), yellow warbler (Dendroica petechia), yellow-breasted chat (Icteria virens), Santa Ana speckled dace (Rhinichthys osculus), arroyo chub (Gila orcutti), Santa Ana sucker (Catostomus santaanae), and unarmored three-spine stickleback (Gasterosteus aculeatus williamsoni). These species historically occurred in the region but are unlikely to inhabit the project area currently because of past habitat modification (i.e. urban development) and isolation from suitable habitat. The arroyo chub was last known to occur in the vicinity of the site, in the Sepulveda basin, in 1993. There are no recorded occurrences in the CNDDB of the arroyo chub within the project vicinity. Similarly, it is possible all three bird species could fly through and temporarily inhabit in the project area in route to more suitable habitat.
2.14.3 Environmental Consequences

2.14.3.1 Temporary Impacts
As discussed above, construction of the pier extensions for the viaduct complex would require the temporary in-channel diversion of flow in the Los Angeles River. However, the work area would be confined to the concrete pad in the river channel, and equipment entering and leaving the construction site would not directly damage or affect riparian habitat upstream or downstream from the concrete pad. Therefore, riparian habitat used by these special status species would not be affected.

Peregrine Falcon

The peregrine falcon (Falco peregrinus anatum) was not observed during the field survey. However, given their tolerance of urban environments and the presence of large perch trees and edifices on the project area, its occurrence on site is possible. Breeding habitat for these species may also be present. As a result, project construction would likely result in the temporary displacement of the Peregrine falcon from the project site. Avoidance measures should be implemented to avoid and/or minimize impacts to the Peregrine falcon.

Western Mastiff Bat, Hoary Bat, Western Yellow Bat, and Big Free Tailed Bat

Although no bats were observed during the field survey, all four sensitive bat species identified above could inhabit the project area. Like the Peregrine falcon, marginal yet potentially suitable roosting and foraging habitat exists on the project site. For instance, potential roost sites may exist beneath bridge supported structures not readily visible from streets or sidewalks. Therefore, project construction could result in the temporary displacement of these bat species from the project site. Several avoidance measures should be implemented to avoid and/or minimize impacts to bats.

Other Special Status Species

As discussed above, a number of special status species identified in the 2001 CNDDB search were not identified in 2011. To address these unlikely, albeit potential occurrences, avoidance measures are recommended to reduce potential project impacts. To avoid impacts to arroyo chub from water diversion under the bridge, preconstruction surveys for the species should be conducted. If the species is detected in the river channel, seine netting should be installed to capture individuals of this species and captured individuals are to be released at appropriate locations downstream. In addition, diversion structures should be constructed to minimize debris, soil and silt releases to the river. Influxes of excavated soil could temporarily increase turbidity downstream that might affect the arroyo chub, if present.

Construction noise may have some effect on migratory/transitory birds using these riparian and wetland areas. However, substantial background noise is already present on the site from the adjacent roads and freeway, so birds using the sites are expected to be acclimated to noise disturbance. Therefore, this impact is expected to be minimal. If transitory birds do vacate the area from noise disturbance, there are adjacent riparian/wetland areas available. No permanent or long-term impacts to the species would therefore be anticipated.

2.14.3.2 Permanent Impacts
As discussed above, the proposed project requires extending the viaduct complex piers within the river channel by approximately eight feet to support widened superstructures. The areas within the Los Angeles River where the piers and foundations would be extended are within the
concrete lined portions of the river where only minimal wetland vegetation exists. Therefore, removal of this vegetation would be unlikely to impact a special status animal species. Otherwise, the nearest wetland communities are located at least 50 feet upstream and 120 feet downstream from the existing piers. Because none of the pier extensions or foundations would encroach into any unlined portion of the Los Angeles River, no adverse impacts to special status animal species would be expected.

2.14.3.3 Cumulative impacts

The proposed project would not permanently affect special status animal species that may be present in the Los Angeles River or that utilize riparian habitat in the river. As a consequence, the proposed project would not result in cumulative impacts to these animal species.

Although construction of pier extensions in the Los Angeles River channel could result in temporary impacts to the Peregrine falcon, the Western mastiff bat, the hoary bat, the Western yellow bat, and the big free tailed bat, avoidance measures would be implemented to avoid potential adverse impacts. As a consequence, the proposed project would not contribute to or result in significant cumulative impacts to these animal species.
2.14.3.4 Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures

To avoid potential impacts to riparian habitat in the Los Angeles River downstream from the viaduct complex, measure B-1 (coffer dam for pollution control) and B-2 (restore flow to downstream vegetation) described above would be implemented.

In order to broadly avoid impacts to special-status species the following avoidance measure would be implemented:

**B-3:** A Worker Environmental Awareness Program (WEAP) would be prepared and all construction crews and contractors would be required to participate in WEAP training prior to starting work on the project. The WEAP training would include a review of the special-status species that could exist in the Project area, the locations of the special-status biological resources, their legal status and protections, and measures to be implemented for avoidance of these sensitive resources. A record of all personnel trained would be maintained. (This measure was not featured in the NES prior to its approval)

To avoid the potential disruptions from construction noise to the breeding activities of Peregrine falcon, bats species, and migratory birds:

**B-4:** Conduct pre-construction nest surveys of the riparian habitat within 500 feet of the work area (in the Los Angeles River channel) to identify nest sites for special-status bird species. The surveys should be conducted prior to the onset of breeding season before construction is scheduled to begin. If nest structures or sites are identified, they should be excluded to ensure that no nesting of these species occurs within 500 feet of construction activities.

**B-5:** A qualified biological monitor shall be present throughout the duration of construction activities over the course of nesting bird season (February 15th to August 31st) to monitor the activity of nests occupied by Migratory Bird Treaty Act-protected birds. (This measure was added after the NES was approved and is not featured within it.)

To avoid impacts to arroyo chubs, the following avoidance measure will be implemented:

**B-6:** A qualified biologist shall conduct a pre-construction survey for arroyo chub (Gila orcutti) immediately below the viaduct complex. If the species is observed, then the qualified biologist should install seine netting prior to construction in order to capture individuals of arroyo chub in the work zone. Captured individuals would be released at appropriate locations downstream of project site. This capture and release regime would occur at all significant phases of in-channel diversions, including the initial placement of diversions.

To avoid potential turbidity increases to the Los Angeles River that could adversely affect the arroyo chub, the following avoidance measure would be implemented:

**B-7:** Turbidity curtains shall be installed at the downstream end of the construction work zone in the river channel for the duration of in-channel construction. Turbidity curtains shall be inspected weekly and prior to and following storm events. If repair is necessary maintenance shall occur immediately (within 48 hours) to ensure pollutants do not disperse throughout the river.
To avoid impacts to special status bats species that may be present beneath the viaduct complex, the following avoidance measure would be implemented:

**B-8:** Within 30 days of bridge construction or tree removal, a qualified biologist shall conduct a pre-construction survey for the presence of roosting bats. If active nursery roosts are found (typically between April 15 and August 1) a work exclusion area of 500 feet will be cordoned off, and construction activities will be re-scheduled to occur after juvenile bats are able to forage independently. If sensitive bat species are present but there is not an active roost, the client will enter into a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with CDFW. Alternate habitat shall be provided if bats are to be excluded from maternity roosts. A qualified biologist with a scientific collecting permit will implement bat exclusion measures. A roost with comparable spatial and thermal characteristics shall be constructed as directed by a qualified biologist. In the event that adult bats need to be handled and relocated, a qualified biologist shall prepare and implement a relocation plan subject to approval by CDFW that includes relocating all bats found on-site to an alternate suitable habitat.

If bat roosts are found outside the breading season, openings to these roosts should be blocked after the bats have emerged for their night-time feeding to prevent the bats from re-entering. The bats will be temporarily forced to find other roosting areas and other structures in the area.

While a visual assessment of bat roost habitat does not require a permit, handling of bats for removal requires two permits from CDFW; a Scientific Collecting Permit (SCP) and a MOU. The MOU describes the type of surveys, methods, and species proposed, and purpose of bat captures. Applicants must show that they possess experience with trapping and handling bats before they are issued an MOU. Such experience is usually accumulated by working with a licensed bat worker under their permits, and demonstrating the necessary skills and abilities to CDFW (Johnson et al., 2004).

Prior to initiation of construction, a qualified biologist shall be designated to monitor construction activities and advise construction personnel of the potential biological issues associated with development of the site. The biological monitor shall attend weekly construction meeting and provide onsite direction for addressing habitat- or species-specific issues as they are encountered during construction. If as a result of pre-construction surveys the biologist establishes exclusion zones around trees or buildings to protect nesting birds or roosting bats, the biological monitor should advise the construction crews of those areas and of the importance of respecting and maintaining those zones.

Due to local and California Health Department restrictions, no direct contact by workers with any bat species is allowed. The Project Biologist/Biological Monitor shall be contacted immediately should any bats be identified within the project’s limits of construction, who will oversee exclusion or removal efforts, as necessary. If construction is to occur in phases or over an extended period of time, multiple pre-construction surveys may be required to address seasonal bat migrants and the potential influx of new arrivals.
Because bats are nocturnal, work activities are not to occur within 100 feet of the bridge between sunset and sunrise. Airspace access to and from the bridge is to remain approximately the same. Bird-exclusion netting must not be used. No clearing and grubbing is to occur adjacent to the structure. Lighting is not to be used near the structure where it would shine on the structure. Combustion equipment, such as generators, pumps, and vehicles are not to be parked, nor operated, under or adjacent to the structure. Personnel are not to be present under the bridge during the evening or at night.

2.14.4 No Build Alternative Impacts

The No Build Alternative would not provide seismic or other improvements to the viaduct complex, and as such, would not result in any impacts to special status animal species that may occur in the project vicinity.
2.15 Threatened and Endangered Species

2.15.1 Regulatory Setting

The primary federal law protecting threatened and endangered species is the Federal Endangered Species Act (FESA): 16 United States Code (USC), Section 1531, et seq. See also 50 CFR Part 402. This act and subsequent amendments provide for the conservation of endangered and threatened species and the ecosystems upon which they depend. Under Section 7 of this act, federal agencies, such as the Federal Highway Administration, are required to consult with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and the National Marine Fisheries Service (NOAA Fisheries) to ensure that they are not undertaking, funding, permitting or authorizing actions likely to jeopardize the continued existence of listed species or destroy or adversely modify designated critical habitat. Critical habitat is defined as geographic locations critical to the existence of a threatened or endangered species. The outcome of consultation under Section 7 is a Biological Opinion or an Incidental Take statement. Section 3 of FESA defines take as "harass, harm, pursue, hunt, shoot, wound, kill, trap, capture or collect or any attempt at such conduct."

California has enacted a similar law at the state level, the California Endangered Species Act (CESA), California Fish and Game Code, Section 2050, et seq. CESA emphasizes early consultation to avoid potential impacts to rare, endangered, and threatened species and to develop appropriate planning to offset project caused losses of listed species populations and their essential habitats. The CDFG is the agency responsible for implementing CESA. Section 2081 of the Fish and Game Code prohibits "take" of any species determined to be an endangered species or a threatened species. Take is defined in Section 86 of the Fish and Game Code as "hunt, pursue, catch, capture, or kill, or attempt to hunt, pursue, catch, capture, or kill." CESA allows for takes incidental to otherwise lawful development projects; for these actions, an incidental take permit is issued by CDFG. For species listed under both FESA and CESA requiring a Biological Opinion under Section 7 of the FESA, CDFG may also authorize impacts to CESA species by issuing a Consistency Determination under Section 2080.1 of the Fish and Game Code.

Another federal law, the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act of 1976, was established to conserve and manage fishery resources found off the coast, as well as anadromous species and Continental Shelf fishery resources of the United States, by exercising (A) sovereign rights for the purposes of exploring, exploiting, conserving and managing all fish within the exclusive economic zone established by Presidential Proclamation 5030, dated March 10, 1983, and (B) exclusive fishery management authority beyond the exclusive economic zone over such anadromous species, Continental Shelf fishery resources, and fishery resources in special areas.

2.15.2 Affected Environment

Two federal endangered species, the southwestern willow flycatcher (Empidonax traillii extimus) and Gambel’s water cress (Nasturtium gambelli), have the potential to occur within the riparian and wetland habitat near the proposed project site. Neither species was observed during the reconnaissance-level field survey; however this does not indicate the species are necessarily absent from the proposed project area. While the habitat appears too degraded, open, and
fragmented to support breeding activity by southwestern willow flycatcher, early seral stage willows and mulefat near the project area could support transitory visits by the species. Habitat suitability for Gambel’s water cress is low and the species has not been recorded in the project vicinity for over a century. Only three to four known populations exist in Los Angeles County amounting to fewer than 300 individuals.

2.15.3 Environmental Consequences

2.15.3.1 Temporary Impacts

Construction of the pier extensions for the viaduct complex would require the temporary in-channel diversion of flow in the Los Angeles River. However, the work area would be confined to the concrete pad in the river channel, and equipment entering and leaving the construction site would not directly damage or affect riparian habitat upstream or downstream from the concrete pad. As a consequence, the proposed project would not adversely affect habitat used by either species.

The southwestern willow flycatcher is considered a potential transitory user of the riparian habitat in the project area. Degradation of riparian habitat therefore could negatively impact individuals inhabiting the site. In addition, heightened noise from construction may impact their behavior and their ability to communicate with one another. However, substantial background noise is already present on the site from the adjacent roads and freeway, so birds using the sites are expected to be acclimated to noise disturbance. Therefore, this impact is expected to be minimal. If transitory birds do vacate the area from noise disturbance, there are adjacent riparian/wetland areas available.

Given the overall rarity of Gambel’s water cress and the lack of recent nearby records, it is very unlikely the plant exists in any wetland vegetation near the project site. Nonetheless, adherence to mitigation measures B-1 through B-3 will ensure adequate precautions are taken to avoid any potential impacts to the species.

2.15.3.2 Permanent Impacts

No permanent impacts to the southwestern willow flycatcher or Gambel’s water cress are anticipated. As discussed above, the areas within the Los Angeles River where the piers and foundations would be extended are within the concrete-lined portions of the river where no riparian vegetation is located. Because none of the pier extensions or foundations would encroach into any unlined portion of the Los Angeles River, no adverse impacts to habitat used by the southwestern willow flycatcher would therefore be expected.

For this project and concerns for the USFWS listed species; **Southwestern Willow Flycatcher** (*Empidonax trailli, extimus*), the determination for the potential for impact is **No Effect**. This project doesn’t contain the constituent elements necessary for breeding and/or nesting of this listed species. This project is within an urban setting with an insufficient acreage of willow riparian habitat and/or the necessary riparian understory mix required for nestion Southwestern Willow Flycatcher species. This species may occur only as a migrant or vagrant during pre-nesting season.
Additionally, concerns for the State and Federally listed Gambel’s Water Cress (*Nasturtium gambelii*), the determination for the potential for impact is also No Effect. The project does contain degraded habitat potentially suitable for the species, however no known record of this species has been recorded in Los Angeles County in over 100 years. According to CNDDB records, the last record of this species in Los Angeles County was in 1904. The only record of this species at the time of state listing in 1990, was from three populations, all located in San Luis Obispo County. Since the time of listing an additional population was discovered at Vandenberg Air Force Base in Santa Barbara County.

### 2.15.3.3 Cumulative impacts
No cumulative impacts to the southwestern willow flycatcher or Gambel’s water cress would occur from this project. No permanent impacts to existing, marginal habitat is expected and foreseeable temporary impacts to habitat can be avoided by adhering to the following avoidance measures.

### 2.15.3.4 Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures
To avoid impacts to riparian habitat located downstream from the viaduct complex which could be used by the southwestern willow flycatcher, measure **B-1 through B-3** described above would be implemented. To avoid impacts to Gambel’s water cress, adherence to mitigation measures **B-1** through **B-3** should be implemented.
Chapter 3 California Environmental Quality Act Evaluation

3.1 Introduction

This chapter analyzes the environmental impacts of the proposed project pursuant to CEQA. The analysis is conducted following the City of Los Angeles Environmental Quality Act Guidelines (adopted July 31, 2002), which incorporate all of the State CEQA Guidelines.

The proposed project is subject to federal, as well as state environmental review requirements because the City of Los Angeles proposes the use of federal funds and/or the project requires federal approval actions. Proposed Project documentation, therefore, has been prepared in compliance with both CEQA and NEPA. The City of Los Angeles is the project proponent and the lead agency under CEQA. FHWA’s responsibility for environmental review, consultation, and any other action required in accordance with NEPA and other applicable Federal laws for this project is being, or has been, carried out by the Caltrans under its assumption of responsibility pursuant to 23 U.S.C. 327.

One of the primary differences between NEPA and CEQA is the way significance is determined. Under NEPA, significance is used to determine whether an EIS, or some lower level of documentation, should be prepared. An EIS is required under NEPA when the proposed federal action (project) as a whole has the potential to “significantly affect the quality of the human environment.” The determination of significance is based on context and intensity. Some impacts determined to be significant under CEQA may not be of sufficient magnitude to be determined significant under NEPA. Under NEPA, once a decision is made regarding the need for an EIS, it is the magnitude of the impact that is evaluated and no judgment of its individual significance is deemed important for the text. NEPA does not require that a determination of significant impacts be stated in the environmental documents.

On the other hand, CEQA requires lead agencies to identify each “significant effect on the environment” resulting from the proposed project and ways to mitigate such effects. If the proposed project may have a significant effect on any environmental resource, then an EIR must be prepared. Each significant effect on the environment must be disclosed in the EIR and mitigated if feasible. In addition, the CEQA Guidelines list a number of mandatory findings of significance, which also require the preparation of an EIR. There are no types of actions under NEPA that parallel the findings of mandatory significance of CEQA. This chapter discusses the effects of this proposed project and CEQA significance.

The determination of whether a proposed project requires the preparation of an EIR is generally based on the results of an Initial Study. For this project, an initial study checklist (Appendix A) did indicate the potential for significant impacts. Thus, the public was informed that an EIR would be prepared. However, the detailed analyses prepared for this joint CEQA/NEPA
document found that most potential impacts were not significant and that all potentially significant impacts could be reduced to an insignificant level through the implementation of recommended mitigation measures. Therefore, a Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) is proposed to be adopted by the City. If the City adopts the MND and approves the project, it will also adopt a mitigation program to ensure implementation of the mitigation measures.

3.2 Discussion of Environmental Effects

3.2.1 Less than Significant Effects

Refer to the introduction of Chapter 2 of this document, which identifies environmental issues considered, but for which no adverse impacts were identified. Consequently, there is no further discussion regarding those issues in this document.

As described in Chapter 2, the proposed project is expected to result in less than significant impacts in the following areas below:

- Land Use, Planning, and Growth (Section 2.1)
- Utilities/Emergency Services (Section 2.3)
- Visual/Aesthetics (Section 2.5)
- Hydrology and Water Quality (Section 2.8)
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials (Section 2.9)
- Air Quality (Section 2.10)
- Noise (Section 2.11)

Please refer to the above-referenced sections for a detailed analysis for each subject area.

3.2.2 Significant Environmental Effects

As discussed in Chapter 2, the proposed project may result in significant impacts that may be reduced to less than significant with mitigation in the following areas:

- Community Character and Cohesion (Section 2.2.1-included under Community Impacts )
- Traffic and Transportation/Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities (Section 2.4)
- Cultural Resources (Section 2.6 – 2.7)
- Biological Resources (Section 2.12 – 2.15)

Please refer to the above-referenced sections for a detailed analysis for each subject area.
3.3 Mitigation Measures for Significant Impacts under CEQA

Table 3-1 summarizes mitigation measures recommended to minimize impacts of the Proposed Project to affected environmental resource areas under CEQA. This list includes minimization measures for impacts that are less than significant, but that can be further minimized by the implementation of such measures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource Area</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biological Resources</td>
<td><strong>B-1:</strong> Coffer dams or other approved flow diversions should be erected in the existing concrete channel during project construction to minimize pollution of river water as part of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). To optimize pollution capture and stream flow during project implementation, flow should be diverted from one or two of the four channels at any given time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>B-2:</strong> Restore diverted flow within the Los Angeles River to the full width of the river channel upstream from the locations of the riparian/wetland islands. This would ensure that the wetlands immediately downstream of the concrete pad would not be deprived of water that they would otherwise receive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>B-3:</strong> Conduct a Worker Environmental Awareness Program (WEAP). All construction crews and contractors should be required to participate in WEAP training prior to starting work on the project. The WEAP training will include a review of the special-status species and other sensitive resources that could exist in the Project area, the locations of the sensitive biological resources, their legal status and protections, and measures to be implemented for avoidance of these sensitive resources. A record of all personnel trained should be maintained.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>B-4:</strong> Conduct pre-construction nest surveys of the riparian habitat within 500 feet of the work area (in the Los Angeles River channel) to identify nest sites for special-status bird species. The surveys should be conducted prior to the onset of breeding season before construction is scheduled to begin. If nest structures or sites are identified, they should be excluded to ensure that no nesting of these species occurs within 500 feet of construction activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>B-5:</strong> A qualified biological monitor should monitor construction activities over the course of nesting bird season (February 15th to August 31st) for the presence of nests occupied by Migratory Bird Treaty Act-protected birds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>B-6:</strong> Conduct a pre-construction survey for arroyo chub (<em>Gila orcutti</em>) immediately below the viaduct complex. If any arroyo chub are found, the qualified biologist should install seine netting prior to construction in order to capture individuals of arroyo chub in the work zone. Captured individuals would be released at appropriate locations downstream of project site. This capture and release regime would occur at all significant phases of in-channel diversions, including the initial placement of diversions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>B-7:</strong> Install turbidity curtains at the downstream end of the construction work zone in the river channel for the duration of in-channel construction. Turbidity curtains should be inspected weekly and prior to and following storm events. If repair is necessary, maintenance should occur immediately (within 48 hours) to ensure pollutants do not disperse throughout the river.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|                        | **B-8:** Within 30 days before bridge construction or tree removal, a qualified biologist should conduct a pre-construction survey for the presence of roosting bats. If
Table 3-1: Mitigation Measures for Significant Impacts under CEQA and minimization measures for less-than-significant impacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource Area</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sensitive bat species are found, the following measures should be implemented:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If active nursery roosts are found (typically between April 15 and August 1) a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>work exclusion area of 500 feet should be cordoned off, and construction activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>should be re-scheduled to occur after juvenile bats are able to forage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>independently. If sensitive bat species are present but there is not an active roost,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the client should enter into a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with CDFW.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alternate habitat should be provided if bats are to be excluded from</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>maternity roosts. A qualified biologist with a scientific collecting permit should</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>implement bat exclusion measures. A roost with comparable spatial and thermal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>characteristics should be constructed as directed by the biologist. In the event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>that adult bats need to be handled and relocated, the biologist should prepare and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>implement a relocation plan subject to approval by CDFW that includes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>relocating all bats found on-site to an alternate suitable habitat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Resources</td>
<td>H-1: Recordation to Historic American Engineering Record Specifications: Prior to the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>start of any work that could adversely affect characteristics that qualify the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Glendale-Hyperion Viaduct Complex as a historic property, contact the National</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Park Service Pacific West Region Office (NPS), to determine if additional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>recordation is required for the historic property beyond that provided in “Historic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NPS should respond to the additional recordation request within 30 days. If</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>additional documentation is required, it should be completed and accepted by the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NPS before the viaduct is altered. Prepare draft and final reports.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H-2: HABS/HAER Dissemination: Upon completion of the documentation prescribed in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mitigation Measure H-1, documentation meeting current archival quality standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>established by the NPS’ Heritage Documentation Program to District 7 and the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Caltrans Transportation History Library in Sacramento shall be provided. Archive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>quality documentation shall also be provided to NPS, if NPS requests it. Copies of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the documentation shall be offered to, at a minimum, the Los Angeles Public Library,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Los Angeles Conservancy, Los Angeles City Historical Society, Historical Society of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Southern California, and the California Office of Historic Preservation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H-3: Online Publication: Work with the Los Angeles Public Library to place the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>historical information from the HAER report, prescribed in Mitigation Measure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H-1, on a City website with a link to a public library website, such as the Los</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Angeles Public Library website, available to the public for a minimum period of three</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>years. The information link shall also be made available to the Caltrans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transportation Library and History Center at Caltrans Headquarters in Sacramento for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>inclusion on their website.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H-4: Video Documentary: Produce a documentary (motion picture or video) that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>addresses the history of the Los Angeles River monument bridges, and their</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>importance and use within the broader contextual history of the City of Los Angeles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The motion picture or video shall be of broadcast quality, between 30- and 90-minute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>duration, and shall be made available to local broadcast stations, public access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>channels in the local cable systems, and requesting schools/libraries; one copy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>shall be submitted to the Caltrans Transportation Library and History Center at</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Caltrans Headquarters in Sacramento.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H-5: Informational Booklet: Produce and publish a booklet on the Historic Los</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Angeles River Bridges that addresses the history of the monumental concrete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>bridges of Los Angeles and this bridge’s place in that history. The booklet shall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>be similar in general format to the “Historic Highway Bridges of California”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>published by the California Department of Transportation (1991) and shall</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3-1: Mitigation Measures for Significant Impacts under CEQA and minimization measures for less-than-significant impacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource Area</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>include high-quality, black and white images of the Los Angeles River Bridges, historic photographs or drawings, as appropriate, and text describing each of the bridges’ location, year built, builder, bridge type, significant character-defining features and its historic significance. Ensure that an electronic version of the booklet is posted on City of Los Angeles website and produce paper copies for distribution to local libraries, institutions and historical societies. One copy shall be submitted to the Caltrans Transportation Library and History Center in Sacramento. Ensure that the camera-ready master booklet is maintained and produce additional copies if there is demand.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

H-6: Design Plans and Specifications Reviews: Ensure that a Caltrans Professionally Qualified Staff Principal Architectural Historian reviews the 65% and 95% design plans and specifications for the Glendale-Hyperion Viaduct Complex are in conformance with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties (SOI Standards), and that SHPO is afforded the opportunity to review the same design plans and specifications. Failure of the SHPO to respond within thirty (30) calendar days after receipt of the plans shall not preclude Caltrans from proceeding with the undertaking. Should the SHPO or the Council object within thirty (30) calendar days to any plans and specifications submitted for review, then Caltrans shall consult with the objecting party, for a period not to exceed ten (10) calendar days, to resolve the objection. If the objection cannot be resolved within this time period, the FHWA shall request the Council review the Finding in accordance with 36 CFR 800.5(c)(3).

H-7: Construction Monitoring Plan: Prepare construction monitoring plan and conduct periodic monitoring of construction activities to ensure the project is conducted in a manner that meets the SOI Standards. Provide Caltrans a draft construction monitoring plan, in which Caltrans shall have thirty (30) calendar days after receipt of the document to review and comment, and prepare a final construction monitoring plan. The plan shall include description of the project, description of the historic property’s character-defining features, discussion of the monitoring’s purpose, and construction activities to be monitored, as well as methods, schedule, and procedures for monitoring and reporting. Caltrans shall ensure that the construction monitoring plan is implemented. Monitoring reports shall include photographs indicating that the activities are in compliance with the SOI Standards. The monitor shall meet the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards for Architectural Historian or Historic Architect pursuant to CFR 36 CFR Part 61, Appendix A (PQS Standards).

Archaeological Resources

Although the Proposed Project is not expected to affect archaeological resources, as requested by the Chairman of the Gabrielino/Tongva Tribal Council, the following measure should be implemented:

A-1: A professional archaeologist should monitor all ground disturbing activities during construction and should act according to the Special Order and Caltrans policies if archaeological resources are discovered.

In addition, if buried cultural materials are encountered during construction, work in the area of the resource should be halted and applicable actions under City of Los Angeles and Caltrans policy should be implemented.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Note: HZ-1 through HZ-4 are legal requirements, and are included here for informational purposes only.

HZ-1: Contaminated Ground Water: Conduct groundwater sampling and testing during the design phase to determine the level of groundwater contamination and the depths. Require the selected contractor to prepare and implement a management plan in the event that hazardous wastes, petroleum hydrocarbons, and/or contaminated...
Table 3-1: Mitigation Measures for Significant Impacts under CEQA and minimization measures for less-than-significant impacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource Area</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>groundwater are encountered during construction. Implementation could require the contractor to utilize a photo-ionization detector (PID) or other organic vapor detector during all pile drilling/boring activities and to employ appropriate worker protection measures should detected levels exceed Cal-OSHA standards. Groundwater that seeps into the drilled hole for pile installations would be pumped out of the pile hole as or before it is filled with concrete. The contaminated water would be temporarily stored, and the water removed (vacuum truck) or treated and discharged under permit from the City or LARWQCB, depending on the discharge outlet. All contaminated groundwater, contaminated soil, and hazardous wastes and debris encountered or generated during construction would be properly excavated, stored, tested, treated and/or disposed in accordance with all federal, state, and local laws and regulations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HZ-2: Lead Chromate Traffic Paint. Perform representative sampling and testing of yellow traffic paint along the viaduct complex that could be affected by construction prior to removal. If lead, lead chromate, or other hazardous materials in the paint exceed standards, abate the traffic paint (prohibit its removal by sand-blasting or grinding methods) and properly dispose of the material prior to construction.

HZ-3: Aerially Deposited Lead. During design of the northbound I-5 off-ramp reconfiguration to Glendale Boulevard, perform representative sampling and testing of the area ramp alignment area for the presence of ADL. If ADL is present above action levels, abate the ADL-contaminated soil, in accordance with all applicable laws and regulations, prior to construction of the reconfigured ramp. A Health and Safety Plan by Contractor would be required pursuant to Contract General Conditions/General requirements (GC/GR).

HZ-4: Asbestos-Containing Materials or Lead-Based Paint. Perform a survey (during the design phase or prior to construction) of the bridge joints that could be disturbed from demolition or construction activity to determine if they contain asbestos. In addition, conduct a survey for the presence of LBP in areas of the viaduct complex to be removed or physically affected. If present, remove the ACM and/or LBP prior to or as part of the demolition process, in accordance with all applicable laws, regulations, and rules. A Health and Safety Plan by Contractor would be required pursuant to GC/GR requirements.

Traffic

T-1: The signalization for the realigned off-ramp intersection will include traffic control for southbound Glendale Boulevard traffic, north of the Hyperion Bridge overcrossing. Traffic control will include, but not limited to, signalization to allow traffic to stop north of Hyperion Bridge overcrossing rather than at the new realigned off-ramp intersection. The design, placement, and operation of the device would meet LADOT and Caltrans requirements.

T-2: Construct an alternate pedestrian crossing over the Los Angeles River across the existing Red Car piers (downstream of the viaduct complex) to connect the bike path along the southwest side of the Los Angeles River with Glendale Boulevard on the northeast side of the river. The pedestrian crossing, in conjunction with the new access to the LA River bikeway from northbound Glendale Boulevard, would provide a detour route around the Glendale Boulevard Bridges during construction. In order for this measure to serve as an effective detour for pedestrians, the pedestrian crossing and the new access to the bike path would have to be fully constructed and operational before commencing the widening of Glendale Boulevard Bridges.
3.4 Monitoring Program for CEQA Mitigation

A Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) for adopted mitigation measures (under CEQA) would be implemented by the City’s Bureau of Engineering and/or the Bureau of Contract Administration. Measures that require specifications in contract documents would be implemented by the Bureau of Engineering. Measures that require implementation during construction will be enforced by the Bureau of Contract Administration. Compliance monitoring for the mitigation measures would be the responsibility of the Bureau of Engineering.

3.5 Growth

The Proposed Project is a bridge improvement and safety project that would not add new travel lanes or increase travel capacity of the existing viaduct complex. Because of this, the Proposed Project would not result in land use, population, or traffic growth inducement.

3.6 Climate Change

Climate change refers to long-term changes in temperature, precipitation, wind patterns, and other elements of the earth's climate system. An ever-increasing body of scientific research attributes these climatological changes to greenhouse gases (GHGs), particularly those generated from the production and use of fossil fuels.

While climate change has been a concern for several decades, the establishment of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) by the United Nations and World Meteorological Organization’s in 1988, has led to increased efforts devoted to greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions reduction and climate change research and policy. These efforts are primarily concerned with the emissions of GHGs related to human activity that include carbon dioxide (CO$_2$), methane, nitrous oxide, tetrafluoromethane, hexafluoroethane, sulfur hexafluoride, HFC-23 (fluoroform), HFC-134a (1,1,1,2-tetrafluoroethane), and HFC-152a (difluoroethane).

Two terms are typically used when discussing the impacts of climate change. "Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Mitigation" is a term for reducing GHG emissions in order to reduce or "mitigate" the impacts of climate change. “Adaptation” refers to the effort of planning for and adapting to impacts due to climate change (such as adjusting transportation design standards to withstand more intense storms and higher sea levels).\(^1\)

Transportation sources (passenger cars, light duty trucks, other trucks, buses and motorcycles) in the state of California make up the largest source (second to electricity generation) of greenhouse gas emitting sources. Conversely, the main source of GHG emissions in the United States is electricity generation followed by transportation. The dominant GHG emitted is CO$_2$, mostly from fossil fuel combustion.

There are four primary strategies for reducing GHG emissions from transportation sources: 1) improve system and operation efficiencies, 2) reduce growth of vehicle miles traveled (VMT) 3) transition to lower GHG fuels and 4) improve vehicle technologies. To be most effective all four should be pursued collectively. The following regulatory setting section outlines state, federal, and local (City of Los Angeles) efforts to comprehensively reduce GHG emissions from transportation sources, among other sources.

3.6.1 Regulatory Setting

3.6.1.1 State

With the passage of several pieces of legislation including State Senate and Assembly Bills and Executive Orders, California launched an innovative and pro-active approach to dealing with greenhouse gas emissions and climate change at the state level.

Assembly Bill 1493 (AB 1493), Pavley. Vehicular Emissions: Greenhouse Gases (AB 1493), 2002: requires the California Air Resources Board (ARB) to develop and implement regulations to reduce automobile and light truck greenhouse gas emissions. These stricter emissions standards were designed to apply to automobiles and light trucks beginning with the 2009-model year. In June 2009, the United States Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA) Administrator granted a Clean Air Act waiver of preemption to California. This waiver allowed California to implement its own GHG emission standards for motor vehicles beginning with model year 2009. California agencies will be working with Federal agencies to conduct joint rulemaking to reduce GHG emissions for passenger cars model years 2017-2025.

Executive Order S-3-05: (signed on June 1, 2005, by Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger) the goal of this Executive Order is to reduce California’s GHG emissions to: 1) 2000 levels by 2010, 2) 1990 levels by the 2020 and 3) 80 percent below the 1990 levels by the year 2050. In 2006, this goal was further reinforced with the passage of Assembly Bill 32.

AB32 (AB 32), the Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006: AB 32 sets the same overall GHG emissions reduction goals as outlined in Executive Order S-3-05, while further mandating that ARB create a plan, which includes market mechanisms, and implement rules to achieve “real, quantifiable, cost-effective reductions of greenhouse gases.” Executive Order S-20-06 further directs state agencies to begin implementing AB 32, including the recommendations made by the State’s Climate Action Team.

Executive Order S-01-07: Governor Schwarzenegger set forth the low carbon fuel standard for California. Under this Executive Order, the carbon intensity of California’s transportation fuels is to be reduced by at least ten percent by 2020.

Senate Bill 97 (Chapter 185, 2007): required the Governor's Office of Planning and Research (OPR) to develop recommended amendments to the State CEQA Guidelines for addressing greenhouse gas emissions. The Amendments became effective on March 18, 2010.

3.6.1.2 City of Los Angeles

The City of Los Angeles released its climate action plan, “Green LA: An Action Plan to Lead the Nation in Fighting Global Warming”, in May 2007. The plan sets forth a goal of reducing the
City’s greenhouse gas emissions to 35 percent below 1990 levels by the year 2030, one of the most aggressive goals of any big city in the United States. This voluntary plan identifies over 50 action items, grouped into focus areas, to reduce emissions. While the emphasis is first on municipal facilities and operations, several measures address programs to reduce emissions in the community.

The cornerstone of the plan is the increased use of clean, renewable energy by the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (LADWP). Many actions address City operations and facilities, while others describe services provided by the City to the community (e.g. LADWP’s energy efficiency rebates and the Bureau of Sanitation’s curbside recycling program). The City also attempts to influence policies not within its direct control that can aid in emissions reduction, such as through its membership on the board of Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority.

The current focus of the plan is to reduce CO₂ emissions generated through the course of providing municipal services to residents of Los Angeles. Reductions in CO₂, when taken in aggregate with reductions by other jurisdictions and industries, will help slow the pace of global warming and reduce the impact on the environment. Whenever possible, the benefits (tons of GHG emissions reduced or avoided) of each of the City’s GHG reductions actions will be calculated.

Between 1990 and 2004, the City reduced its CO₂ emissions by 4.5 percent, despite an approximate 12.5 percent increase in population. Two of the primary reasons for the decrease are the City’s generation of cleaner electrical power (through the expansion of renewable energy sources) and the conservation of energy used in City buildings.

### 3.6.2 Project Analysis

An individual project does not generate enough GHG emissions to significantly influence global climate change. Rather, global climate change is a cumulative impact. This means that a project may participate in a potential impact through its incremental contribution combined with the contributions of all other sources of GHG. In assessing cumulative impacts, it must be determined if a project’s incremental effect is “cumulatively considerable.” See CEQA Guidelines sections 15064(h)(1) and 15130. To make this determination the incremental impacts of the project must be compared with the effects of past, current, and probable future projects. To gather sufficient information on a global scale of all past, current, and future projects in order to make this determination is a difficult if not impossible task.

The AB 32 Scoping Plan contains the main strategies California will use to reduce GHG. As part of its supporting documentation for the Draft Scoping Plan, CARB released the GHG inventory for California (Forecast last updated: 28 October 2010). The forecast (Figure 3-1) is an estimate of the emissions expected to occur in the year 2020 if none of the foreseeable measures included

---

2 This approach is supported by the AEP: Recommendations by the Association of Environmental Professionals on How to Analyze GHG Emissions and Global Climate Change in CEQA Documents (March 5, 2007), as well as the SCAQMD (Chapter 6: The CEQA Guide, April 2011) and the US Forest Service (Climate Change Considerations in Project Level NEPA Analysis, July 13, 2009).
in the Scoping Plan were implemented. The base year used for forecasting emissions is the average of statewide emissions in the GHG inventory for 2006, 2007, and 2008.

Figure 3-1: CALIFORNIA GREENHOUSE GAS FORECAST

![California Greenhouse Gas Emissions Forecast](http://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/inventory/data/forecast.htm)

Caltrans and its parent agency, the Business, Transportation, and Housing Agency, have taken an active role in addressing GHG emission reduction and climate change. Recognizing that 98 percent of California’s GHG emissions are from the burning of fossil fuels and 40 percent of all human made GHG emissions are from transportation, Caltrans has created and is implementing the Climate Action Program at Caltrans that was published in December 2006 (see Climate Action Program at Caltrans (December 2006)).

### 3.6.2.1 Construction Emissions

Greenhouse gas emissions for transportation projects can be divided into those produced during construction and those produced during operations. Construction GHG emissions include emissions produced as a result of material processing, emissions produced by onsite construction equipment, and emissions arising from traffic delays due to construction. Construction emissions will be produced at different levels throughout the construction phase; their frequency and occurrence can be reduced through innovations in plans and specifications and by implementing better traffic management during construction phases. In addition, with innovations such as longer pavement lives, improved traffic management plans, and changes in materials, the GHG emissions produced during construction can be mitigated to some degree by longer intervals between maintenance and rehabilitation events.

### 3.6.2.2 Operational Emissions

Although short-term construction GHG emissions are unavoidable, there will likely be long-term GHG benefits as a result of the realignment and signalization of the northbound I-5 off-ramp to
Glendale Boulevard. As discussed in Section 2.10.3.2, the proposed project is not a capacity or volume increasing project; instead, it is a bridge seismic retrofit project with recirculation improvements like the realignment of the off-ramp. The signalization of the off-ramp will improve traffic flow as seen in the reduction of the existing LOS C (2011) to LOS B (2036). Additionally, the operation of the project will save VMT from shortening the path travelled for southbound vehicles exiting the I-5 from onto northbound Glendale Boulevard. Table 2.10-6 shows the resulting peak hour CO$_2$ emission savings from the lowered VMT. Therefore, the project will result in low- to no-potential for increase in GHG emissions.

### 3.6.3 CEQA Conclusion

Because of the long-term nature of climate change, and the short-term nature of the construction (2.5 years), the project’s construction does not hinder, nor help the City’s climate action plan. Additionally, the operation of the project does not increase the volume of traffic; instead, the northbound I-5 off-ramp realignment and signalization would save VMT and GHG emissions compared to the existing configuration. Therefore, the GHG impacts from the project are less than significant.
Chapter 4  Comments and Coordination

4.1 Introduction

Early and continuing coordination with the general public and appropriate public agencies is an essential part of the environmental process to determine the scope of environmental documentation, the level of analysis, potential impacts and mitigation measures and related environmental requirements. Agency consultation and public participation for this project have been accomplished through a variety of formal and informal methods, including: project development briefings and team meetings, community meetings, and notifications required as part of the Section 106 process. This chapter summarizes the results of the City of Los Angeles’ efforts to fully identify, address and resolve project-related issues through early and continuing coordination.

4.2 Community Meetings

Several community meetings were held in the early part of the project development process to obtain feedback on the project as it was initially proposed. These community meetings were held as follows:

- October 22, 2002,
- November 11, 2002,
- January 9, 2003,
- January 16, 2003, and
- June 18, 2003.

Summaries of these meetings are provided below.

4.2.1 October 22, 2002: Friends of Atwater Community Meeting

On the evening of Tuesday, October 22, 2002, the Friends of Atwater Village sponsored a Community Meeting to address public questions and concerns about the Glendale-Hyperion Bridge Rehabilitation Project. Representatives from the Project Team were invited to provide information about the Project. Approximately 30 to 40 community members attended, as well as representatives of Councilmember Tom LaBonge’s office and Councilmember Eric Garcetti’s office.

The then-proposed retrofitting and widening of Glendale-Hyperion Bridge was described, and characterized as necessary in order to meet current federal standards. Construction was to be accomplished in three phases, over a period of 18+ months. Sidewalks were to increase from 5 feet to 10 feet, and only 3 feet would have been added on both sides of the road (for a total of 16 feet). The median of the street was not to change in size.

The feedback received at the meeting included the following:

a. Safety: the Viaduct is currently unsafe for pedestrians and drivers
b. **Sidewalks**: wider sidewalks would not provide many benefits.

c. **Traffic**: vehicle speeds too high.

d. **Lighting**: current lighting is inadequate.

e. **Widening**: the community preferred no widening or taking of the greenspace at the north end of the viaduct complex.

### 4.2.2 November 11, 2002: Friends of Atwater Village Bridge Walk

### 4.2.3 January 9, 2003: Atwater Village Neighborhood Council Meeting

At the invitation of the Atwater Village Neighborhood Council (AVNC), members of the Glendale-Hyperion Bridge Project Team attended AVNC’s monthly meeting on January 9, 2003, to provide an update of changes that have been made to the plans to retrofit and widen the Bridge. The changes particularly reflect the community input gathered by the Project Team at the Friends of Atwater Village Bridge Walk, which was held on November 11, 2002.

The feedback received at the meeting included the following:

a. **I-5 Glendale Boulevard Off-ramp**: the community asked if the project addresses the need to reconfigure the I-5 Glendale Boulevard off-ramp to accommodate travelers who want to travel south on Glendale Boulevard, instead of proceeding north and then having to make a U-turn at the traffic signal.

b. **Safety**: the community expressed concerns about personal safety beneath the Viaduct.

c. **Widening**: the community questioned the need to widen the bridge and taking of greenspace. The community also felt that the Viaduct widening and straightening would allow traffic to flow more quickly, which would not lead to greater pedestrian safety.

### 4.2.4 January 16, 2003: Atwater Village Residents Association Town Hall Meeting

On January 16, 2003, members of the Project Team attended the Town Hall Meeting that was organized by the Atwater Village Residents Association. Approximately 25 to 30 community members attended.

The discussion at the town hall meeting centered on clarifying the need for widening the Glendale-Hyperion Viaduct. During the meeting, four or five community members forcefully expressed their opposition particularly to the widening and to the seismic retrofit as well. They expressed the opinion that neither improvement was needed because “the Bridge has held up” during several earthquakes in the past and it would continue to do so; they also expressed the view that “few pedestrians use the Bridge.”

Opposition to the widening appeared to focus on the following key themes:

a. **Traffic speed would increase**: drivers would gain the ability to drive faster on the Bridge (thereby making it even more hazardous for pedestrians).

b. **Potential loss of the grass knoll (or any portion of it)** on Glendale Boulevard and Ferncroft to accommodate the widening was unacceptable.
4.2.5 June 18, 2003: Summary of a General Community Meeting

On the evening of Wednesday, June 18, 2003, the City of Los Angeles sponsored a Community Meeting at Silver Lake Community Church to provide up-to-date information about the plans to retrofit and rehabilitate the Glendale-Hyperion Bridge, including a revised project description developed based on prior community input. Approximately 20 community members were present, including a representative from Councilmember Eric Garcetti’s office.

The feedback received at the meeting included the following:

a. Approval of New Concept: Several participants expressed approval of the concept because of the reduced widening of northbound and southbound Glendale Boulevard that spans the Bridge, and the preservation of existing green space. Gratitude for the willingness of City staff and the Project Team to address community concerns was expressed by several participants.

b. Pedestrian Walkway: the community felt that it might be difficult to keep all pedestrians on the west side of the Bridge and that crossing from the Atwater side to the sidewalk/crosswalk on the east side may be difficult.

c. Los Angeles River: the community asked it diverting pedestrians (providing places to cross) to other places along the Los Angeles River is a possibility.

4.3 Scoping Process

4.3.1 Notices and Scoping Meetings

The CEQ NEPA Regulations (40 CFR Part 1500 *et seq.*) and the CEQA Guidelines (Sections 15082-15083) recommend that federal, state, and local lead agencies use a public scoping process to help identify the various issues to be addressed in the environmental document. Scoping allows public agencies and the general public to learn about the proposed Project and to submit suggestion regarding alternatives and the types of impacts to be evaluated.

The City of Los Angeles prepared and circulated a Notice of Preparation of an Environmental Impact Report on January 25, 2007 (CLA, 2007). During the review and comment periods, the City of Los Angeles held two Community “Scoping” Meetings for the proposed improvements to the Glendale Hyperion Viaduct. The first meeting was held on Thursday, February 8, 2007 at Glenfeliz Boulevard Elementary School, and the second meeting was held on Thursday, February 15, 2007 at Silver Lake Community Church. The two meetings were identical in purpose, format and content.

A newspaper advertisement announcing the NOP was published on January 25, 2007 in the Los Angeles Times. The notice was also posted on the City website.

The purpose was to illustrate and describe the improvements in detail, and to solicit and capture community comments regarding the project and content of the environmental document. Appendix E contains a copy of the NOP and its distribution list.

The meeting was structured to facilitate dialogue between City staff, consultant team members, and the community, beginning with a brief “Open House” session during which community members could view plans displayed on easels as well as “before and after” images of the

1  http://eng.lacity.org/techdocs/emg/GlendaleHyperionViaductBridges_NOP.pdf
existing and proposed conditions. They could also talk informally with City staff and consultant team members and ask questions about the improvements. That session was followed by a brief PowerPoint presentation provided jointly by City staff and consultants, which illustrated the proposed improvements, along with the project’s environmental review process, community involvement opportunities, and the proposed schedule. Community members were then encouraged to ask questions and offer their comments, which were recorded graphically by a project team member on large sheets of paper and viewed throughout the meeting. It was emphasized that these comments would be considered during the environmental review process. Meeting participants were also asked to provide written comments, either during the meeting, or at a later more convenient time, if they wished.

Approximately 25 community members attended the February 8, 2007 meeting, including a representative of Council President Eric Garcetti. Approximately 55 community members attended the February 15, 2007 meeting, including Councilmember Tom LaBonge and his representatives, as well as a representative of Council President Eric Garcetti.

4.3.2 Summary of Comments Received during the Scoping Process

Comments received at the scoping meetings and in response to the Notice of Preparation included the following issues (CLA, 2007):

- **Construction Concerns**
  - Traffic congestion, phasing, and access.
  - Concurrent construction of other projects.
  - Lighting and noise.
  - Put a left turn in immediately at the I-5 off-ramp (onto Glendale Boulevard). It will help mitigate traffic impacts during construction.

- **Physical Changes to the Viaduct Complex**
  - Visual changes to the Viaduct Complex.
  - Concrete barriers may hide the replica balustrades.
  - Add ramps on the stairways to facilitate bike movements.

- **Pedestrian and Vehicular Safety**
  - Install a smart crosswalk at the northern pedestrian crossing.
  - Slow down traffic on the viaduct complex.
  - Options for the median on Hyperion Avenue

- **Los Angeles River**
  - Add a pedestrian walkway over the Los Angeles River using the old Red Car piers.

- **Traffic Impacts**
  - Related to the I-5 off-ramp reconfiguration.
  - Center barrier may cause more accidents.
Various alternatives were suggested by members of the public or other agencies to improve the proposed project. Many of these suggestions have been incorporated into the proposed project.

### 4.3.3 Suggestions Received During the Scoping Process

#### 4.3.3.1 Salvage and Reuse Existing Lights

The careful salvage, restoration, and reuse of the existing light poles and globes appear viable and have been incorporated into the proposed project.

#### 4.3.3.2 Improve the Pedestrian Crosswalk Proposal

The City’s Department of Transportation (LADOT) is evaluating different options for the pedestrian crosswalk proposed across southbound Glendale Boulevard from Hyperion Avenue at the north end of the viaduct complex. Options under consideration include, but are not limited to, a painted designated crosswalk, a designated crosswalk that is also supplemented with traffic warning lights that are initiated by pedestrians, and a controlled crosswalk such as a smart crosswalk that is linked to the signal at Glenfeliz Boulevard. The specific option has not yet been determined; however, none of these options is expected to result in physical changes that could significantly affect the environment. LADOT will make a determination during the design process, if the project is approved.

#### 4.3.3.3 Reuse and Restore the Existing Balustrades

Many of the complex’s original balustrade railings were covered with concrete in 1962 as part of a rail repair project. Discussions with City engineering staff knowledgeable of the rail repair project have indicated that poor construction quality of the original balustrades necessitated the covering of the rails. Balustrade quality problems often occurred when concrete was not adequately vibrated during casting, thereby allowing the elements to cause deterioration of the concrete. The rail covering repair project was intended to protect the balustrades from the elements to stop further deterioration (such as spalling and cracking exacerbated by water exposure). In addition, as part of the 1962 rail repair project, the inner and outer edges of the top rail were chipped away to accommodate the concrete covering.

The removal of the concrete covering from the railings and the rehabilitation of the existing balustrades are not considered viable due to past deterioration and the currently damaged condition beneath the rail coverings.

The proposed replica replacement balustrades would be constructed using state-of-the-art concrete casting methods, including methods to ensure proper concrete densities. In addition, the City would specify the use of concrete meeting quality and strength standards suitable for balustrade railings.

#### 4.3.3.4 Revisit the Need to Widen the Glendale Boulevard Bridges

The suggestion to revisit the need to widen the Glendale Boulevard bridges was considered but withdrawn because this alternative fails to meet project purpose and need.

#### 4.3.3.5 Complete the I-5 Off-ramp Reconfiguration in Phase I

The suggestion to complete the reconfiguration of the I-5 off-ramp to Glendale Boulevard before the construction of the main improvements to the viaduct complex would have the effect of reducing the amount of traffic on northbound Glendale Boulevard (north of the off-ramp) and southbound Glendale Boulevard (south of Glenfeliz Boulevard) during construction. Because of
this, the construction staging plans have been modified to perform this reconfiguration in the first construction phase.

4.3.3.6 Eliminate Proposed Center Median
The original proposal to provide a one-foot-high median separating opposing traffic along Hyperion Avenue was discussed at both scoping meetings and amongst City staff (Department of Transportation and Bureau of Engineering). These discussions initially led to a decision to eliminate the median barrier entirely because it was felt that a one-foot median would not provide a reliable physical barrier between opposing traffic, and could cause traffic problems if vehicles cross over such a low median. Because of this concern, and the occurrence of a recent fatal accident on Hyperion Avenue in which a vehicle crossed over the existing striped median and became engaged in a head-on collision, a standard barrier similar to Type 60S or Type 60SC of the Caltrans Standard Plan is now being proposed. Such median barrier would facilitate the safety improvement associated with the modification of the roadway cross-section from crown to super-elevation.

4.3.3.7 Eliminate the Proposed Crash Barrier in front of the Balustrades
The suggestion to eliminate the proposed crash barrier along the replica balustrades was considered but withdrawn because without crash-rated barriers to protect the proposed decorative railing, the project would not qualify for federal funding assistance. Caltrans requires minimal crash standards for bridges over freeways and neither the existing nor proposed replica balustrades meet the Caltrans crash standards. It should be noted that the major view of the replica balustrade would be from the outside of the bridge and the crash barrier only partially obstructs the drive-through view. The proposed barrier in conjunction with the replicated balustrades will represent an improvement over existing conditions, which are fully covered railings along both sides of Hyperion Avenue.

4.3.3.8 Add Lights near the Viaduct Stairs
The City has considered the recommendation to add lighting near the stairs that connect Glendale Boulevard to Hyperion Avenue. Because the staircase landing is set back from the street, the addition of lighting around the landing has been added to the project.

4.3.3.9 Crossing over the Los Angeles River on the Red Car Piers
During one of the several community scoping meetings conducted following release of the NOP for this document, a suggestion was received that a crossing over the Los Angeles River utilizing the existing Red Car piers be included in the proposed project. City staff reviewed this recommendation and determined that such a river crossing would provide pedestrian and bicycle access benefits to the local residents, pedestrians, students, and bicyclists that use the viaduct complex and the Los Angeles River bike path. City staff also determined that such a crossing could help offset potential access impacts during construction of improvements to the Glendale Boulevard bridges over the Los Angeles River. As a consequence, a crossing over the Los Angeles River along the Red Car piers has been applied to the proposed project as mitigation.

4.3.3.10 Improve Bicycle Access to the Bike Path
The proposed project includes a new access ramp to the Los Angeles River bike path from northbound Glendale Boulevard. A direct bike ramp from the viaduct complex to the Los Angeles River bike path was considered, but withdrawn due to the potential for impacts and constructability issues. Given the historic nature of the bridge, building a ramp to connect from
the Hyperion Bridge to the river is likely to require substantial modifications to the bridge and could significantly affect its historic status. Such an alternative would also pose constructability difficulties given the proximity of the Los Angeles River, I-5, the off-ramp, and viaduct structures, as well as the height differences between the Hyperion viaduct structure and the bike path.

### 4.3.3.11 Eliminate Right Turns to Ettrick Street (from Hyperion Avenue)

The City’s Department of Transportation will consider eliminating right turns from southbound Hyperion Avenue onto Ettrick Avenue during peak hours.

### 4.3.3.12 Correct Roadway Banking along Hyperion Avenue

The proposed project would include improvements to Hyperion Avenue, including roadway banking (superelevation, or cross-slope) along the curve over I-5 and beneath the Waverly Drive Bridge.

### 4.3.3.13 Reduce Speeding on Hyperion Avenue

The City’s Department of Transportation is considering measures that can be implemented to reduce excessive speeding along Hyperion Avenue on the viaduct complex.

### 4.3.3.14 Sidewalk on the East Side of Hyperion Avenue

The placement of a sidewalk along the east side of the Hyperion Avenue structure instead of the west side was considered but withdrawn because it would result in the elimination of pedestrian access to Hyperion Avenue via staircases from Riverside Drive and Glendale Boulevard, as the existing staircases currently connect with only the sidewalk along the west side of the Hyperion Avenue structure. In addition, it is not possible to place a sidewalk along both sides of the Hyperion Avenue structure due to the limited width of Hyperion Avenue, which is dictated by the retaining walls and the Waverly Drive Bridge at this location. For these reasons, this sidewalk along the east side of Hyperion Avenue has been eliminated from further consideration.

Through this coordination, city staff was also able to incorporate design features desired by members of the community, as indicated below in Table 4-1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative/Enhancement</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Refurbish, improve, and reuse the existing light poles and globes</td>
<td>Incorporated into the Proposed Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Improve the proposed pedestrian crossing at the north end of the viaduct to increase safety for pedestrians.</td>
<td>Incorporated into the Proposed Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Reuse and restore the existing balustrades instead of replicating them.</td>
<td>Withdrawn from further consideration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Revisit the need to widen the Glendale Boulevard bridges over the Los Angeles River.</td>
<td>Withdrawn from further consideration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Complete the I-5 off-ramp reconfiguration before constructing other elements of the viaduct improvement to minimize traffic impacts during construction.</td>
<td>Incorporated into the Proposed Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Eliminate the proposed center barrier median (as described in the NOP).</td>
<td>Withdrawn from further consideration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Eliminate the barrier in front of the balustrades to avoid blocking the view to the balustrades.</td>
<td>Withdrawn from further consideration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Add lighting near the stairs that provide pedestrian access to Hyperion Avenue from southbound Glendale Boulevard.</td>
<td>Incorporated into the Proposed Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Incorporate a crossing over the Los Angeles River utilizing the existing Red Car</td>
<td>Required as mitigation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.4 Section 106 Coordination

As part of the Section 106 compliance documentation, coordination with various organizations that may have an interest in historic nature of the viaduct complex was initiated (JRP, 2006). This coordination included solicitation of comments from the following individuals and organizations:

- Linda Dishman, Los Angeles Conservancy
- Isabel Rosas, Los Angeles Cultural Heritage Commission
- Eddy Feldman, Los Angeles City Historical Society
- Denise S. Spooner, Historical Society of Southern California

In addition, the City sent a solicitation letter to Joe Linton, Friends of the Los Angeles River, due to the project’s proximity to the Los Angeles River.

The City also hosted a briefing with representatives of the Los Angeles Conservancy on April 13, 2006 to provide an overview of several bridge projects, including the proposed Project. To date, no formal comments have been received from the above organizations.

The viaduct complex is eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic places, and is a City monument. In order to minimize potential impacts to the viaduct complex, City and consulting design staff, and staff of JRP Historical Consulting, LLC have been coordinating on design features that can be included in the project designs. In addition, the City has actively sought public comments on the project design and other areas of community interest, and has incorporated those comments into the current design proposal. Through this coordination, the project design has evolved to become as consistent as possible with the Secretary of Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation, including replacement railings (with replicas of the original balustrade design), the careful removal and reuse of the abutment pylons along northbound and southbound Glendale Boulevard viaducts (over the Los Angeles River), and the reuse of lights standards.

Furthermore, in accordance with Section 106 of the NHPA, a request was made to the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) on May 3, 2004 for a review of the Sacred Lands File, to determine if any known cultural properties are present within or adjacent to the Project APE. The NAHC responded on May 18, 2004 stating that no Native American resources are known to exist within or adjacent to the Project APE; however, the NAHC requested that 11 Native American individuals and organizations be contacted to solicit any information or concerns.
regarding cultural resources issues related to the Project. These 11 individuals and organizations were contacted on May 20, 2004. On May 25, 2004, Mr. Anthony Morales, Chairman of the Gabrieliño/Tongva Tribal Council contacted Applied EarthWorks by phone stating that he had concerns regarding the proposed Project due its proximity to the Los Angeles River where Native peoples often located their villages and cemeteries. Mr. Morales requested that a professional archaeologist be present during any Project-related ground disturbing activities. As well, Mr. Morales wishes to be informed if any prehistoric cultural materials or human remains were inadvertently discovered during Project-related construction. As of June 10, 2004, no other comments have been received from the Native American organizations and individuals contacted.

4.5 Site Visits: August – September 2002

Door-to-door visits to residents along Hyperion Avenue and Waverly Drive and to businesses along Riverside Drive in the project vicinity were undertaken by City representatives in August and September 2002. Concerns expressed by residents and businesses included:

- Construction impacts (noise, dust, access, etc.)
- Personal safety issues related to crime in the area
- Impacts related to widening of Hyperion Avenue
- Loss of on-street parking
- Disruptions to a business that has warehousing and storage operations beneath the bridge.
- Impacts related to the historic status of the viaduct complex.

4.6 Document Circulation

The IS/EA was originally made available for review by the general public, government agencies, and other interested parties for 30 days from September 12, 2013 to October 11, 2013. Due to the level of interest and requests for a public hearing, the comment period was extended to November 7, 2013. Copies of the IS/EA were available at the following locations:

- City of Los Angeles Bureau of Engineering website: http://eng.lacity.org/techdocs/emg
- Caltrans website: http://www.dot.ca.gov/dist7/resources/envdocs/
- Atwater Village Library at 3379 Glendale Boulevard, Los Angeles
- Silver Lake Library at 2411 Glendale Boulevard, Los Angeles
- Edendale Branch Library at 2011 Sunset Boulevard, Los Angeles
- Los Feliz Library at 1874 Hillhurst Avenue, Los Angeles
- Silver Lake Recreation Center at 1850 West Silver Lake Drive
- City of Los Angeles Bureau of Engineering at 1149 South Broadway, Suite 750, Los Angeles
- Caltrans District 7 at 100 South Main Street, Los Angeles
A community meeting was conducted on September 25, 2013 at Friendship Auditorium, 3201 Riverside Drive, Los Angeles. Following substantial comments from the community and requests for a public hearing, the City held a hearing on October 28, 2013 to provide a forum for comments regarding the proposed project.

4.6.1 Comments

Comments were received from the public through the U.S. Mail, electronic mail, comment cards available at the community meeting and public hearing, and verbally at the hearing. Copies of all written public and agency comments and a transcript of the public hearing are contained in Appendix F.

4.6.1.1 Public Comments

Public comments were collected on comment cards during the September 25, 2013 community meeting and October 28, 2013 public hearing. During these two meetings, 46 individual commenters submitted 173 written comments regarding the proposed project. Common topics included traffic safety/vehicle speed reduction, provision of bike lanes on Hyperion, and enhancement of pedestrian facilities. (See Table 4.6-1.)

Table 4.6-1: Distribution of Comments on Comment Cards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Comment Summary</th>
<th>No. of Individuals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Reduce vehicle speed on Hyperion Avenue</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Provide bike lanes on Hyperion Avenue (perhaps protected by barrier)</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Add full-width crosswalk on Atwater Side of Glendale and Hyperion</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Eliminate median and railing barriers, and/or banked turns</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Non-specific approval</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Non-specific disapproval</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>This is not a pedestrian-friendly design</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Do not increase or improve access to cyclists on Hyperion</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Propose a multi-modal design/be consistent with Bike Plan &amp; Caltrans Safety Policy</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Enhance safety for everyone</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>There should be narrower car/traffic lanes and reduce traffic lanes</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>There should be well-marked crosswalks and wayfinding signs</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Preserve the historic bridge design</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>There should be wider sidewalks</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Address traffic congestion</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Consider proposed alternative designs</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Provide accessibility to LA River</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Emergency vehicles possibly will not be able to get through due to crash barrier</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Provide security measures for pedestrian bridge</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>On-demand traffic light at I-5 exit</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>What is the number of lanes on pedestrian bridge/access?</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Will there be a link between pedestrian paths on both sides of the bridge?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
During the October 28, 2013 hearing, 63 individual commenters made 219 comments, which were documented within the hearing transcript. Common topics addressed vehicle speed reduction, provision of bicycle lanes, safety, and consistency with plans and policies. (See Table 4.6-2.)

**Table 4.6-2: Distribution of Comments in October 28, 2013 Hearing Transcript**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Comment Summary</th>
<th>No. of Individuals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Reduce vehicle speed on Hyperion Avenue</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Provide bike lanes on Hyperion Avenue (perhaps protected by barrier)</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Add full-width crosswalk on Atwater Side of Glendale and Hyperion</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Eliminate median and railing barriers, and/or banked turns</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Non-specific approval</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Non-specific disapproval</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>This is not a pedestrian-friendly design</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Do not increase or improve access to cyclists on Hyperion</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Propose a multi-modal design/be consistent with Bike Plan &amp; Caltrans Safety Policy</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Enhance safety for everyone</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>There should be narrower car/traffic lanes and reduced traffic lanes</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>There should be well-marked crosswalks and wayfinding signs</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Preserve the historic bridge design</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>There should be wider sidewalks</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Consider proposed alternative designs</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Provide accessibility to LA River</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Emergency vehicles possibly will not be able to get through due to crash barrier</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>On-demand traffic light at I-5 exit</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Keep the median barriers in the plan</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Reduce the bridge to one lane in each direction</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Provide benches on the sidewalks on the bridge</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Design the center of the bridge for pedestrians and bikes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Create a public space on the bridge for pedestrians.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Implement noise mitigation during construction.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During circulation of the IS/EA, 14 individual commenters (other than public officials) made 93 comments in letters mailed to Caltrans. Common topics concerned vehicle speed reduction, provision of bicycle lanes, the lack of pedestrian-friendly design, inconsistency with plans and policies, and safety. (See Table 4.6-3.)

**Table 4.6-3: Distribution of Comments in Letters**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Comment Summary</th>
<th>No. of Individuals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Reduce vehicle speed on Hyperion Avenue</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Provide bike lanes on Hyperion Avenue (perhaps protected by barrier)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Add full-width crosswalk on Atwater Side of Glendale and Hyperion</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Eliminate median and railing barriers, and/or banked turns</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Non-specific approval</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>This is not a pedestrian-friendly design</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Do not increase or improve access to cyclists on Hyperion</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Propose a multi-modal design/be consistent with Bike Plan &amp; Caltrans Safety Policy</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Enhance safety for everyone</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>There should be narrower car/traffic lanes and reduce traffic lanes</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>There should be well-marked crosswalks and wayfinding signs</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Preserve the historic bridge design</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>There should be wider sidewalks</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Address traffic congestion</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Consider proposed alternative designs</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Provide accessibility to LA River</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Review related projects, specifically the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers document, Los Angeles River Ecosystem Restoration Integrated Feasibility Study that could potentially impact the detention/infiltration basin</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Emergency vehicles possibly will not be able to get through due to crash barrier</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>We would like to participate in advisory board</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Be consistent with Caltrans Complete Streets Policy (DD-64-R1) and/or FHWA Routine Accommodations Policy (23 C.F.R. § 652.5)-elderly and handicapped</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Provide a signalized crosswalk with refuge areas at both sides of street at east end of bridge complex</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Caltrans and the City of Los Angeles cannot certify the IS/EA if a fair argument can be made that the project will create significant impacts for bicyclists</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>A wide shoulder/shoulder is not a bike lane</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Review flood maps</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During the IS/EA comment period, 285 individual commenters made 1,785 comments through e-mail to Caltrans. The majority of comments concerned vehicle speed reduction, provision of bicycle lanes, addition of a full-width crosswalk, elimination of the median/railing barriers, consistency with plans and policies, safety, size reduction of traffic lanes, and increased sidewalk size. (See Table 4.6-4.)
Table 4.6-4: Distribution of Comments from E-mail

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Comment Summary</th>
<th>No. of Individuals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Reduce vehicle speed on Hyperion Avenue</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Provide bike lanes on Hyperion Avenue (perhaps protected by barrier)</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Add full-width crosswalk on Atwater Side of Glendale and Hyperion</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Eliminate median and railing barriers, and/or banked turns</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Non-specific approval</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Non-specific disapproval</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>This is not a pedestrian-friendly design</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Do not increase or improve access to cyclists on Hyperion</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Propose a multi-modal design/be consistent with Bike Plan &amp; Caltrans Safety Policy</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Enhance safety for everyone</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>There should be narrower car/traffic lanes and reduce traffic lanes</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>There should be well-marked crosswalks and wayfinding signs</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Preserve the historic bridge design</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>There should be wider sidewalks</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Address traffic congestion</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Consider proposed alternative designs</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Provide accessibility to LA River</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Provide a public hearing</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Emergency vehicles possibly will not be able to get through due to crash barrier</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Provide security measures for pedestrian bridge</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Implement noise mitigation during construction</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.6.1.2 Response to Public Comments

The comments summarized in the tables in Section 4.6.1 have been grouped into categories for efficiency in responding. Responses are contained in Tables 4.6-5 through 4.6-7 below.

4.6.1.2.1 Response to Public Comments on the Environmental Document

Of the more than 300 comments received, only two were related to the environmental analysis. The responses to these are provided in Table 4.6-5 below.
Table 4.6-5 Comment Category: Environmental Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Comment Summaries and Responses</th>
<th>No. of individuals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 31  | **Comment:** Provide noise mitigation during construction.  
     **Response:** Section 2.11.3.1 of the Environmental Document discusses construction noise and its impacts. Contract specifications would include certain practices that would reduce exposure of sensitive receivers (residences, schools, etc.) to construction noise. These include requiring construction equipment to have noise-suppressing devices and requiring noise controls such as placement of noise barriers, use of low-noise-generating equipment, maintenance of mufflers and ancillary noise-abatement equipment, scheduling of high-noise-producing activities during periods that are least sensitive, routing of construction-related truck traffic away from noise-sensitive areas, and reduction of construction vehicle speeds. In cases in which evening or nighttime construction is necessary, the Board of Police Commissioners would grant a variance which would impose conditions on the work to protect nearby residents from noise impacts.  
     The construction project may last three years, but noise exposures will vary from place to place and with construction phases. Additionally, a contact name and telephone number will be provided should someone have a question or concern during construction. | 1 |
| 37  | **Comment:** Caltrans and the City of Los Angeles cannot certify the IS/EA if a fair argument can be made that the project will create significant impacts for bicyclists  
     **Response:** The argument that a significant impact would result from a project must be based on substantial evidence. As explained above, the absence of additional facilities desired by the commenter in a proposed project does not constitute substantial evidence of an environmental impact of that project. Note: this comment is also included below in the category “Add bike lanes” [Table 4.6-6(c)] under the heading “Response to comments not related to the environmental analysis.” | 1 |

4.6.1.2.2 Response to Public Comments Not Related to the Environmental Analysis

The vast majority of comments expressed a desire for additional bicycle and pedestrian facilities and traffic calming/safety-improvement measures on Hyperion Avenue that were not included in the proposed project. The absence of the requested additional facilities and measures in the project plans is not an environmental impact of the project. Nevertheless, due to the volume of such requests, the project has been revised to add bicycle lanes\(^2\) to the roadway of the Hyperion Avenue Viaduct (comprising three structures: Caltrans bridge numbers 53C-1882, 53-1069, and 53C-1881) as a design option. The bike lanes would be created by means of striping and symbols painted on the paved roadway. The addition of bicycle lanes will not involve any change to any of the historic features of the viaduct nor affect those features in any way. The viaduct (aka

\(^2\) Bicycle facilities are defined in the City’s 2010 Bicycle Plan, a component of the Transportation Element of the General Plan. A “bicycle lane” (aka “bike lane”) is defined as “a striped lane for one-way bicycle travel on a street or highway.” Caltrans refers to this facility as a “Class II bikeway.” Striping, other pavement markings, and signage on City bike lanes follow the Caltrans Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices.
“bridge”) will not be widened. The approaches will not be widened. The space for the bike lanes will be accommodated by adjusting the width (or possibly the number) of the traffic lanes and/or adjusting the width of the median of the roadway. The environmental assessment (Sec. 1.3) describes the proposed roadway of the viaduct as having two 12-foot lanes, two 14-foot lanes, a 7-foot median and a 7-8-foot sidewalk along most of the viaduct length, all narrowing under the Waverly Drive Bridge (Caltrans bridge number 53C-1179). For the design option, various configurations are being considered; no decision has been made on which configuration to adopt. One preliminary, possible configuration could include 5-foot bike lanes, 11-foot traffic lanes, a 5-foot sidewalk and a 4-foot median for most of the bridge length, all narrowing under the Waverly Drive Bridge. Appendix K shows three possible configurations under consideration; other configurations may also be considered.

While the exact configuration has not yet been decided (the City is collaborating with a citizens’ advisory committee to develop the final configuration), the City has committed to including the bike lanes without any widening of the viaduct or changes to the design of the new barriers (aka “bridge railings”). No change to any historic features would be required under any configuration. The inclusion of bike lanes will not affect the ability of Caltrans to comply with any of the stipulations agreed to by Caltrans and the SHPO in the executed memorandum of agreement (MOA), prepared in compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, for this project.

The addition of bike lanes will not require widening or other structural changes to the viaduct or the approaches. The addition of the bike lanes will not require additional safety features that could affect the historic integrity or significance of the viaduct or the stipulations of the MOA.

To involve the community in addressing the primary requests expressed in the public comments, the City formed a citizens’ advisory committee. The City will conduct traffic studies to inform the evaluation of various options for improving facilities for pedestrians, bicyclists and motorists and will work with the committee to develop the final design. The committee has thus far met on December 12, 2013 and January 23, 2014.

Tables 4.6-6(a-c) below group the comments described in Section 4.6.1 above into categories with responses applicable to each category as a whole.

Table 4.6-6(a): Comment Category – Enhance Pedestrian Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Comment Summaries and Responses</th>
<th>No. of individuals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Add full-width crosswalk on Atwater Side of Glendale and Hyperion</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>This is not a pedestrian-friendly design</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>There should be well-marked crosswalks and wayfinding signs</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>There should be wider sidewalks</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Security measures for pedestrian bridge</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>What is the number of lanes on pedestrian bridge/access?</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Will there be a link between pedestrian paths on both sides of the bridge?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Provide benches on the sidewalks on the bridge</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Create a public space on the bridge for pedestrians.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provide a signalized crosswalk with refuge areas at both sides of street at east end of bridge complex</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Response:** The project as proposed does not cause significant environmental impacts related to pedestrian facilities. Nevertheless, to address the concerns raised by the community, a citizens’ advisory committee has been formed to provide input to the City regarding design options for enhancements to the project. The City will conduct traffic and other studies to provide a basis for assessing the feasibility and effectiveness of various design options for pedestrian enhancements, including but not limited to crosswalk improvements at the Atwater Village end of the viaduct complex, improved sidewalks, etc., to be considered.
### Table 4.6-6(b): Comment Category – Make the Road Safer (Slow the Traffic)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Comment Summaries and Responses</th>
<th>No. of individuals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Reduce vehicle speed on Hyperion Avenue</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Eliminate median and railing barriers, and/or banked turns</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>There should be narrower car/traffic lanes and reduce traffic lanes</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Emergency vehicles possibly will not be able to get through due to crash barrier</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Keep the median barriers in the plan</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Reduce the bridge to one lane in each direction</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Response:** The project as proposed does not accommodate an increase in traffic speed or cause significant environmental impacts to traffic safety. Due to the concerns raised by the community regarding speed and other safety issues, the citizens’ advisory committee described above has been formed to provide input to the City regarding design options for the project. The City will conduct traffic and other studies to provide a basis for assessing the feasibility and effectiveness of various design options for traffic calming and/or other roadway safety improvements to be considered.

### Table 4.6-6(c): Comment Category – Add Bike Lanes on Hyperion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Comment Summaries and Responses</th>
<th>No. of individuals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Provide bike lanes on Hyperion Avenue</td>
<td>294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Propose a multi-modal design/be consistent with Bike Plan &amp; Caltrans Complete Streets Policy</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Design the center of the bridge for pedestrians and bikes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Caltrans and the City of Los Angeles cannot certify the IS/EA if a fair argument can be made that the project will create significant impacts for bicyclists</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Be consistent with Caltrans Complete Streets Policy (DD-64-R1) and/or FHWA Routine Accommodations Policy (23 C.F.R. § 652.5)-elderly and handicapped</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>A wide shoulder/shoulder is not a bike lane</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Response:** As explained in Ch. 2.1.2.2 of the IS/EA, the project as proposed is not inconsistent with the City’s 2010 Bicycle Plan because the plan is intended to be implemented in 5-year increments over a 35-year period, with the Hyperion bike lane not included in the current 5-year programming plan for environmental and feasibility studies. Caltrans owns the Hyperion Avenue Bridge over Interstate 5. Caltrans’ Complete Streets Policy is based on FHWA’s Routine Accommodation Policy. While not specifically discussed in the IS/EA, the project as proposed is consistent with FHWA’s Routine Accommodation Policy because it includes safety improvements for pedestrians and the handicapped and includes bicycle travel improvements on the Hyperion Viaduct. Nevertheless, the project has been revised to include bike lanes on the Hyperion Avenue Viaduct as part of this project, as described above and in Chapter 1.3. A citizens’ advisory committee has been formed to provide input to the City regarding design options to accommodate the bike lanes in the Hyperion Viaduct roadway. The City will conduct traffic and other studies to assist in the development of design options that include bike lanes while accommodating other uses (pedestrians and motorists) as well.
4.6.1.2.3 Response to Miscellaneous Comments

Table 4.6-7 below contains comments not related to the environmental analysis or the topics discussed above, and responses thereto.

**Table 4.6-7: Comment Category – Miscellaneous**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Comment Summaries and Responses</th>
<th>No. of individuals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 5   | **Comment**: Non-specific approval  
     **Response**: The comment is acknowledged.                                                   | 22                 |
| 6   | **Comment**: Non-specific disapproval  
     **Response**: The comment is acknowledged.                                                   | 36                 |
| 8   | **Comment**: Do not increase or improve access to cyclists on Hyperion  
     **Response**: The comment is acknowledged, but bike lanes will be added to Hyperion in response to other comments. | 13                 |
| 13  | **Comment**: Preserve the historic bridge design  
     **Response**: Historic preservation of the bridges is an integral part of the project, as described in Section 1.3.1 and the Memorandum of Agreement between the State Historic Preservation Officer and Caltrans. | 12                 |
| 15  | **Comment**: Address traffic congestion  
     **Response**: Traffic counts did not indicate unacceptable levels of service. (Chapter 2.4) The project will not increase capacity and is not anticipated to attract additional traffic. Traffic on both northbound and southbound Glendale Boulevard bridges is anticipated to decrease. | 18                 |
| 16  | **Comment**: Consider proposed alternative designs  
     **Response**: Design options are being considered, with input from a citizens’ advisory committee, to address concerns expressed by the community. | 18                 |
| 17  | **Comment**: Provide accessibility to LA River  
     **Response**: A new access ramp to the Los Angeles River Bike Path and pedestrian bridge is included. | 14                 |
| 18  | **Comment**: Provide a public hearing  
     **Response**: A public hearing was held on October 28, 2013 in response to public requests. | 4                  |
| 19  | **Comment**: Review related projects, specifically L A River Ecosystem Restoration Integrated Feasibility Study that could potentially impact the detention/infiltration basin  
     **Response**: A review of the USACE’s L A River Ecosystem Restoration Integrated Feasibility Study, which was not available when the IS/EA was prepared, was subsequently conducted. No impact to the proposed detention/infiltration basin was found. Additionally, the City participated in the USACE study and coordinates with the USACE on development plans related to the L. A. River (including the proposed project) to ensure that any potential conflicts are averted or resolved. | 1                  |
| 21  | **Comment**: We would like to participate in advisory board  
     **Response**: A citizens’ advisory committee was formed. Participants were selected by the council district offices to represent the diverse interests of the community. | 1                  |
4.6.1.3 Agency Comments and Responses

A Notice of Availability (NOA) was distributed to public agencies during circulation of the IS/EA. Four comment letters were received from public agencies. (See Table 4.6-8). They are reproduced below and in Appendix F-6, with responses below.

**Table 4.6-8: Distribution of Agency Comments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Comment Category</th>
<th>No. of Individuals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Provide bike lanes on Hyperion Avenue (perhaps protected by barrier)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Non-specific approval</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Propose a multi-modal design/be consistent with Bike Plan &amp; Caltrans Safety Policy</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Enhance safety for everyone</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Will project provide proper bike/pedestrian detours, signage, and safe alternative routing if existing bike facility is impacted by construction?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Must maintain Metro facilities and services during project</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Will bus shelters, benches and other amenities be installed?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Review flood maps</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.6.1.3.1 Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

October 11, 2013

Tami Podesta, Branch Chief
Division of Environmental Planning
California Department of Transportation District 7
100 S. Main Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012

RE: Initial Study/Environmental Assessment and Mitigated Negative Declaration - The Glendale Boulevard-Hyperion Avenue Complex of Bridges Improvement Project

Dear Ms. Podesta:

The Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (LACMTA) is in receipt of the Notice of Availability of the Initial Study / Environmental Assessment (IS/EA) and Notice of Intent to Adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) for the proposed Glendale Boulevard-Hyperion Avenue Complex of Bridges Improvement Project. This letter conveys comments concerning issues in relation to the proposed project that may impact LACMTA’s operations and facilities, as well as LACMTA’s interests in promoting mobility of all modes within LA County.

The proposed bicycle and pedestrian improvements of the project including a new bike access ramp to the LA River, widened sidewalks, and improved crossings are good examples of integrating active transportation. The study further mentions that the Project may include wide outside shoulder lanes on Glendale Boulevard-Hyperion Avenue that are usable by cyclists. Due to high speeds and volumes of auto vehicles, LACMTA would support potential opportunities for this project to include a bikeway facility that provides a higher level of safety, comfort, and convenience for bicyclists on Glendale Boulevard-Hyperion Avenue.

We also encourage the Project to achieve compliance with the Caltrans Complete Streets Policy, meeting the needs of multi-modal transportation users while increasing safety for all roadway users. Furthermore, this corridor is a main connection linking the communities on both sides of the LA River between Glendale and Los Angeles. LACMTA encourages agencies to continue to expand bikeways throughout the region particularly with innovative facilities that increase bicycle ridership, safety, and connectivity.

It is also noted that the LA River Bike Path that runs under the project bridges is a major bicycle facility for the region. If the construction of the project is expected to impact the bicycle facility, the applicant should provide adequate detours for bicycles and pedestrians including proper signage and safe alternative routing.
In addition, Metro bus lines operate on Glendale Boulevard, San Fernando Boulevard and Fletcher Drive, near or within the proposed project. The following comments relate to bus operations and bus stops:

1. Although the project is not expected to result in any long-term impacts on transit, the contractor should be aware of the bus facilities and services that are present. Existing Metro bus stops must be maintained as part of the final project.

2. During construction, the stops must be maintained or relocated consistent with the needs of Metro Bus Operations. Metro Bus Operations Control Special Events Coordinator should be contacted at 213-922-4632 regarding construction activities that may Impact Metro bus lines. Other municipal bus service operators may also be impacted and should be included in construction outreach efforts.

3. LACMTA encourages the installation of bus shelters, benches and other amenities that improve the transit rider experience. Caltrans should consider the installation of such amenities as part of the bridge improvements if possible.

4. Final design of any bus stops and surrounding sidewalk areas must be Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) compliant and allow passengers with disabilities a clear path of travel to the bus stop from the proposed development.

If you have any questions regarding this response, please contact Marie Sullivan at 213-922-5667 or by email at sullivanma@metro.net.

Sincerely,

Nick Saponara
Development Review Manager, Countywide Planning

The following summarizes the comments made by the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority LACMTA (Metro) for the proposed project:

- Support potential opportunity to include a bikeway facility.
  **Response:** This support is noted. Bikeway facilities are included in the project.

- Project should comply with Caltrans' Complete Streets Policy.
  **Response:** The portion of Hyperion Avenue that is above Interstate 5 is owned by Caltrans and is thus part of the state highway system. This section of the roadway is
approximately 200 feet in length. The project is consistent with Caltrans’ Complete Streets Policy because it improves safety, access, and mobility for all travelers. Caltrans’ Highway Design Manual, Chapter 80, states in part, “The Project Development process seeks to provide a degree of mobility to users of the transportation system that is in balance with other values.” Caltrans’ Complete Streets Policy is based on FHWA’s Routine Accommodation Policy. While not specifically discussed in the IS/EA, the project as proposed is consistent with FHWA’s Routine Accommodation Policy because it includes safety improvements for pedestrians and the handicapped and includes bicycle travel improvements on the Hyperion Viaduct. Nevertheless, the project has been revised to include bike lanes on the Hyperion Avenue Viaduct as part of this project, as described above and in Chapter 1.3.

- Safe alternative routing for bicycles and pedestrians, including signage, should be implemented during construction.
  **Response:** Safe alternative routing for bicycles and pedestrians, including signage during construction, will follow all applicable guidelines, regulations, and other standard specifications, including MUTCD, AASHTO, WATCH, Bureau of Engineering special orders, etc. Traffic management during construction is discussed in Section 2.4.1.

- Existing Metro bus stops must be maintained during operation.
  **Response:** As explained in Section 2.4.2.4, there are no Metro bus stops in the project construction area.

- During construction, bus stops must be maintained or relocated consistent with the needs of Metro Bus Operations.
  **Response:** As explained in Section 2.4.2.4, there are no Metro bus stops in the project construction area.

- Installation of bus shelters, benches, and other amenities should be considered as part of the proposed project.
  **Response:** As explained in Section 2.4.2.4, there are no Metro bus stops in the project area. Therefore, bus shelters, benches and other amenities will not be included in the project.

- Bus stops and sidewalks must be Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) compliant.
  **Response:** As explained in Section 2.4.2.4, there are no Metro bus stops in the project construction area. As discussed in Section 2.4.1, sidewalks will be compliant with ADA.
We completed our review of the IS/MND associated with the proposed Glendale Boulevard-Hyperion Avenue Complex of Bridges Improvement Project (referred to as viaduct complex). The proposed project is located between Atwater Village to the north and Silver Lake and Los Feliz to the south, on Glendale Boulevard and Hyperion Avenue between Glenfeliz Boulevard and Ettrick Street, in the City of Los Angeles. The City of Los Angeles, in conjunction with the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) and Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), is proposing to modify the existing viaduct complex in order to correct existing safety and operational deficiencies, address pedestrian safety issues, meet current seismic performance standards, and to restore original design details to the railings. The major project features include widening of the Glendale Boulevard bridges by eight feet on each side, realignment of the I-5 northbound off-ramp to allow left turns onto southbound Glendale Boulevard, addition of a median barrier on the Hyperion Avenue viaduct roadway, construction of a wider sidewalk on the northwest side of Hyperion Avenue, and elimination of the southeastern sidewalk.

The following comments are for your consideration and relate to the environmental document only:

Permits and Approvals needed

1. Chapter 1, Proposed project, section 4, Permits and Approval Needed, table 1-3, List of Agency Approvals and Permits, page 1-32; Revise the permits needed from County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works as follows.

The document only includes obtaining easement from Los Angeles Flood Control District (LAFCD) to enter and work within LAFCD right-of-way. Revise the statement to include the following: “For any improvements within the Los Angeles County Flood Control District (LACFCD) right-of-way, a Use Agreement will be required if there is no existing easement permitting the work. In addition to this agreement, a responsible party must also be identified for the long term maintenance of such facilities”.

Summary: The County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works requested that Table 1-3 be revised to say, “For any improvements within the Los Angeles County Flood Control District (LACFCD) right-of-way, a Use Agreement will be required if there is no existing easement permitting the work. In addition to this agreement, a responsible party must also be identified for the long term maintenance of such facilities.”

Response: This requirement is acknowledged and will be complied with.
4.6.1.3.3 Federal Emergency Management Agency

September 18, 2013

Tami Podesta, Branch Chief
Division of Environmental Planning
California Department of Transportation District 7
100 South Main Street
Los Angeles, California 90012

Dear Ms. Podesta:

This is in response to your request for comments on Notice of Availability of Initial Study/Environmental Assessment, Notice of Intent to Adopt Mitigated Negative Declaration Invitation to Community Workshop and Opportunity for Public Hearing for the Proposed Glendale Boulevard-Hyperion Avenue Complex of Bridges Improvement Project.

Please review the current effective countywide Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRMs) for the County of Los Angeles (Community Number 065043) and City of Los Angeles (Community Number 060137, Maps revised September 26, 2008. Please note that the City of Los Angeles, Los Angeles County, California is a participant in the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP). The minimum, basic NFIP floodplain management building requirements are described in Vol. 44 Code of Federal Regulations (44 CFR), Sections 59 through 65.

A summary of these NFIP floodplain management building requirements are as follows:

- All buildings constructed within a riverine floodplain, (i.e., Flood Zones A, AO, AH, AE, and A1 through A30 as delineated on the FIRM), must be elevated so that the lowest floor is at or above the Base Flood Elevation level in accordance with the effective Flood Insurance Rate Map.

- If the area of construction is located within a Regulatory Floodway as delineated on the FIRM, any development must not increase base flood elevation levels. The term development means any man-made change to improved or unimproved real estate, including but not limited to buildings, other structures, mining, dredging, filling, grading, paving, excavation or drilling operations, and storage of equipment or materials. A hydrologic and hydraulic analysis must be performed prior to the start of development, and must demonstrate that the development would not cause any rise in base flood levels. No rise is permitted within regulatory floodways.
• All buildings constructed within a coastal high hazard area, (any of the “V” Flood Zones as delineated on the FIRM), must be elevated on pilings and columns, so that the lowest horizontal structural member, (excluding the pilings and columns), is elevated to or above the base flood elevation level. In addition, the posts and pilings foundation and the structure attached thereto, is anchored to resist flotation, collapse and lateral movement due to the effects of wind and water loads acting simultaneously on all building components.

• Upon completion of any development that changes existing Special Flood Hazard Areas, the NFIP directs all participating communities to submit the appropriate hydrologic and hydraulic data to FEMA for a FIRM revision. In accordance with 44 CFR, Section 65.3, as soon as practicable, but not later than six months after such data becomes available, a community shall notify FEMA of the changes by submitting technical data for a flood map revision. To obtain copies of FEMA’s Flood Map Revision Application Packages, please refer to the FEMA website at http://www.fema.gov/business/nfip/forms.shtml.

Please Note:

Many NFIP participating communities have adopted floodplain management building requirements which are more restrictive than the minimum federal standards described in 44 CFR. Please contact the local community’s floodplain manager for more information on local floodplain management building requirements. The Los Angeles floodplain manager can be reached by calling Gary L. Moore, City Engineer, at (213) 485-4835. The Los Angeles County floodplain manager can be reached by calling George De La O, Senior Civil Engineer, at (626) 458-7155.

If you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to call Michael Hornick of the Mitigation staff at (510) 627-7260.

Sincerely,

Gregor Blackburn, CFM, Branch Chief
Floodplain Management and Insurance Branch

cc:
Gary L. Moore, City Engineer, City of Los Angeles
George De La O, Senior Civil Engineer, Los Angeles County
Garret Tam Sing/Salomon Miranda, State of California, Department of Water Resources, Southern District
Michael Hornick, NFIP Planner, DHS/FEMA Region IX
Alessandro Amaglio, Environmental Officer, DHS/FEMA Region IX

Summary: The U.S. Department of Homeland Security, Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) noted that the City of Los Angeles is a participant in the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) and therefore must follow the NFIP floodplain management building requirements in 44 CFR §§59 through 65. These requirements are summarized as follows:
• All structures within a riverine floodplain must be elevated so that their lowest levels are at or above the base flood elevation, as determined from the effective flood insurance rate map (FIRM).
  
  **Response:** As explained in Section 2.8.3.2, the base flood is contained within the river channel and the project will not encroach upon the base floodplain.

• The project may not increase base flood elevation levels.
  
  **Response:** As explained in Section 2.8.3.2, the project will not increase base flood elevation levels.

• Special requirements apply to structures in coastal high hazard areas.
  
  **Response:** The project is not located in a coastal high hazard area.

• If the project results in changes to a special flood hazard area, appropriate data must be submitted to FEMA so that the agency can revise the FIRM.
  
  **Response:** The project is not located in a special flood hazard area.
October 14, 2013

Linda Moore
City of Los Angeles - Bureau of Engineering
1149 S. Broadway, Suite 750
Los Angeles, CA 90015

Subject: Glendale Boulevard-Hyperion Avenue Viaduct Improvement Project
SCH#: 200701107

Dear Linda Moore:

The State Clearinghouse submitted the above named Mitigated Negative Declaration to selected state agencies for review. The review period closed on October 11, 2013, and no state agencies submitted comments by that date. This letter acknowledges that you have complied with the State Clearinghouse review requirements for draft environmental documents, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act.

Please call the State Clearinghouse at (916) 445-0613 if you have any questions regarding the environmental review process. If you have a question about the above-named project, please refer to the ten-digit State Clearinghouse number when contacting this office.

Sincerely,

Scott Morgan
Director, State Clearinghouse
# CHAPTER 4: COMMENTS AND COORDINATION

## State Clearinghouse Data Base

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCH#</th>
<th>200701107</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Title</td>
<td>Glendale Boulevard-Hyperion Avenue Viaduct Improvement Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead Agency</td>
<td>Los Angeles, City of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>MND Mitigated Negative Declaration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>The Glendale Blvd.-Hyperion Ave. Viaduct Complex is located on Glendale Blvd. and Hyperion Ave. between Eltrick St. and Glenfeliz Blvd. in the City of Los Angeles. The proposed project would modify the viaduct complex to correct safety and operational deficiencies, meet current seismic performance standards and restore original design details to the railings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Lead Agency Contact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Linda Moore</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>City of Los Angeles - Bureau of Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>213 465 5751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fax</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zip</td>
<td>90015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Project Location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Los Angeles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>Los Angeles, City of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lat / Long</td>
<td>34° 6' 49.8&quot; N / 118° 15' 55.5&quot; W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross Streets</td>
<td>Glendale Boulevard and Hyperion Avenue between Eltrick St. and Glenfeliz Blvd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcel No.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Proximity to:

- **Highways**: I-5
- **Airports**: 
- **Railways**: 
- **Waterways**: Los Angeles River
- **Schools**: Glenfeliz & Ivanhoe ES
- **Land Use**: Circulation / Transportation

### Project Issues

- Aesthetic/Visual
- Air Quality
- Archaeologic-Historic
- Biological Resources
- Drainage/Absorption
- Flood Plain/Flooding
- Noise
- Public Services
- Recreation/Parks
- Schools/Universities
- Sewer Capacity
- Soil Erosion/Compaction/Grading
- Solid Waste
- Toxic/Hazardous
- Traffic/Circulation
- Vegetation
- Water Quality
- Water Supply
- Wetland/Riparian
- Growth Inducing
- Landuse
- Cumulative Effects

### Reviewing Agencies

- Resources Agency
- Department of Conservation
- Department of Fish and Wildlife, Region 5
- Office of Historic Preservation
- Department of Parks and Recreation
- Department of Water Resources
- Office of Emergency Management Agency, California
- Resources, Recycling and Recovery
- California Highway Patrol
- Caltrans, District 7
- Air Resources Board
- Transportation Projects
- Regional Water Quality Control Board, Region 4
- Native American Heritage Commission
- State Lands Commission

### Date Received

- 09/11/2013

### Start of Review

- 09/12/2013

### End of Review

- 10/11/2013
Summary: No comments were received by the Clearinghouse from state agencies.

Response: No response is necessary.

4.6.1.4 Public Official Comments

During the comment period of the IS/EA circulation, 2 public officials made 13 comments through letters to Caltrans (copies below). The comments included the provision of bicycle lanes, elimination of median/railing barriers, the lack of pedestrian-friendly design, and safety. (See Table 4.6-9.) Responses are included in various tables above.

Table 4.6-9: Distribution of Public Official Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Comment Category</th>
<th>No. of Individuals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Reduce vehicle speed on Hyperion Avenue</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Provide bike lanes on Hyperion Avenue (perhaps protected by barrier)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Eliminate median and railing barriers, and/or banked turns</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>This is not a pedestrian-friendly design</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Propose a multi-modal design/be consistent with Bike Plan &amp; Caltrans Safety Policy</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Enhance safety for everyone</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>There should be narrower car/traffic lanes and reduce traffic lanes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Consider proposed alternative designs</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Provide a signalized crosswalk with refuge areas at both sides of street at east end of bridge complex</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
November 1, 2013

Ms. Tami Podesta
Branch Chief, Division of Environmental Planning
California Department of Transportation, District 7
100 S. Main Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Re: Glendale Boulevard-Hyperion Avenue Complex of Bridges Improvement Project

Dear Ms. Podesta,

The Glendale Boulevard-Hyperion Avenue Viaduct is an important bridge complex that links the neighborhoods of Atwater Village, Silver Lake and Los Feliz. It is an integral thoroughfare for vehicles, pedestrians and bicycles and should continue to serve all multimodal needs.

The City of Los Angeles Department of Public Works, Bureau of Engineering, is the lead agency for this improvement project and began community outreach in October 2002. Now, approximately 11 years later, the project has progressed and an initial Community Workshop was held on the evening of Wednesday September 25, 2013, at which varying issues regarding speed and access were expressed. A subsequent public hearing was held the evening of Monday, October 28th, 2013. Community stakeholders have expressed great interest in this project and it is in the spirit of civic engagement that I write this letter.

The improvement project includes a seismic retrofit, the resolution of design deficiencies, traffic circulation improvements and the restoration of the bridge’s historic balustrades. Additionally, the improvement project proposes to widen traffic lanes, install a median barrier to separate northbound and southbound traffic lanes and to consolidate the two existing sidewalks into a single sidewalk on the west side of the Hyperion Bridge. The restored balustrades are to be protected from auto collisions with a 3-ft. crash barrier, which will interrupt the interior view.

Project mitigations include the construction of an alternate pedestrian and bicycle crossing over the Los Angeles River across the existing Red Car piers and an adjacent green space that will help infiltrate stormwater before it is discharged into the River. The new pedestrian crossing is to be completed before pedestrian access is temporarily disallowed on the bridge during the construction period. The bridge will remain operational for vehicles throughout construction with at least one operational traffic lane in each direction at all times.

The design phase of the proposed project is currently only at 35%, and as the design further evolves, I want to express my willingness to explore options that would include dedicated bicycle lanes on the Hyperion and Glendale sections, modification to traffic lane widths as currently proposed, a signalized...
crosswalk that would span the entire width of the bridge, the removal of the center median barrier and/or decorative treatment and the removal and/or alternative placement of the 3-ft. roadway-edge crash barriers, which are intended to protect the balustrades. I believe it is important to fully explore these options to ensure that the bridge is safe, respects the surrounding neighborhoods and serves vehicles, pedestrians and bicycles.

To that end, as the proposed project progresses I will continue to engage community stakeholders and will form a citizens advisory group to ensure accountability and transparency in the design process. I believe that through a coordinated effort, the Glendale Boulevard-Hyperion Avenue Complex of Bridges Improvement Project can be completed in a manner that is timely and responsive to community stakeholder input.

With kind regards,

MITCH O'FARRELL
Councilmember, District 13
Los Angeles City Council
City of Los Angeles

CC: Mayor Eric Garcetti
    Councilmember Tom LaBonge, District 4
    Deborah Weintraub, Bureau of Engineering
October 9, 2013

Ms. Tami Podesta, Branch Chief
Division of Environmental Planning
California Department of Transportation District 7
100 South Main Street
Los Angeles, California 90012

Dear Ms. Podesta,

I am writing as an elected official and concerned citizen to support the inclusion of bicycle lanes in the proposed project to modernize the Hyperion Avenue viaduct. The Hyperion Avenue viaduct and the surrounding communities of Atwater Village, Silver Lake, Los Feliz, and Glendale are within the boundaries of the 43rd Assembly District, which I represent. The Hyperion Avenue Bridge plays a critical role in connecting these communities.

I am concerned that the current project proposal would create something freeway-like, in an area where such a structure is not needed, wanted, or safe. A freeway-like bridge would also encourage unsafe automobile speeds and would fail to create a multi-modal transit route, which locals want and deserve.

I applaud the current proposal for its improvements to the LA River Bike Path, particularly the completion of the interchange between the Bike Path and Glendale Boulevard. However, local access improvements on one end of a project area are insufficient without a bridge project that provides safe accommodation between Silver Lake and Atwater Village. Without accommodations on Hyperion Avenue, cyclists who wish to travel east-west and cross the Los Angeles River and the 5 Freeway, will continue to face dangerous obstacles and significant inconvenience.

The Los Angeles County Bicycle Coalition has proposed an alternative design that provides a safer facility for all users and creates space for increased cycling and pedestrian facilities without decreasing automobile capacity. By lowering the design speed, removing the median crash barrier, not super-elevating turns, and stripping urban lane widths, motorists will not be encouraged to pick up speed before entering the residential neighborhoods on either end of the viaduct. Community stakeholders consistently reiterated the need for calmer traffic conditions on the viaduct during project scoping, and I agree. As long as we can keep automotive traffic moving and provide safe bike lanes, we will have succeeded in the redesign.
As a state legislator and community member, I look forward to working with you to create a proposal that meets the needs of this modern urban transit route for automobiles, cyclists, and pedestrians. Thank you for your consideration of these comments. If my office can be of assistance during these processes, please do not hesitate to call.

Sincerely,

Mike Gatto
Assemblyman, 43rd District
Chapter 5  List of Preparers

California Department of Transportation
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Chapter 7 Distribution List

7.1 IS/EA

The IS/EA was made available for review by the general public, government agencies, and other interested parties. The public notification process announcing availability of the IS/EA is summarized below.

7.1.1 Locations Where IS/EA Can Be Viewed

Copies of the IS/EA were made available for viewing at the following locations:

- Bureau of Engineering, Bridge Improvement Division
  1149 S. Broadway, Suite 750
  Los Angeles, CA 90015

- Caltrans District 7
  100 S. Main Street
  Los Angeles, CA 90012

- Atwater Village Branch Library
  3379 Glendale Boulevard
  Los Angeles, CA 90039

- Elendale Branch Library
  2011 West Sunset Boulevard
  Los Angeles, CA 90026

- Los Feliz Branch Library
  1874 Hillhurst Avenue
  Los Angeles, CA 90027

- Silver Lake Branch Library
  2411 Glendale Blvd
  Los Angeles, CA 90039

- Silver Lake Recreation Center
  1850 West Silver Lake Drive
  Los Angeles, CA 90026
The City of Los Angeles website: http://eng.lacity.org/techdocs/emg
Caltrans website: http://www.dot.ca.gov/dist07/resources/envdocs/

7.1.2 IS/EA Distribution List

The following officials, agency representatives, and interested parties received either a copy of the draft environmental document or a notice informing them of its availability.

7.1.2.1 Elected Officials

Federal
Congressman Adam Schiff, District 28
Senator Barbara Boxer
Senator Diane Feinstein

State
Senator Carol Liu, District 25
Senator Kevin de Leon, District 22
Assembly Member Mike Gatto, District 43

County
Los Angeles County Supervisor Zev Yaroslavsky, District 3

City of Los Angeles
Mayor Eric Garcetti
Council Member Tom LaBonge, Council District 4
Council Member Mitch O’Farrell, Council District 13

City of Glendale
Mayor Dave Weaver
Council Member Laura Friedman
Council Member Ara Najarian
Council Member Zareh Sinanyan
Council Member Frank Quintero

7.1.2.2 Governmental Agencies

Federal
Advisory Council on Historic Preservation
Native American Tribal Councils
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers – Los Angeles District
U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), Office of Sustainable Housing and Communities
U.S. Department of the Interior
U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Region 9
U.S. Federal Emergency Management Agency
U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service – Carlsbad Office

**State**
- California Air Resource Board
- California Department of Fish and Wildlife – South Coast Region (5)
- California Highway Patrol
- California Native American Heritage Commission
- California Regional Water Quality Control Board – Los Angeles Region (4)
- California Transportation Commission
- Office of Planning and Research, State Clearinghouse

**Regional**
- Southern California Association of Governments
- South Coast Air Quality Management District

**Los Angeles County**
- Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
- County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works/ Los Angeles River Cooperation Committee

**City of Glendale**
- City of Glendale Department of Public Works

**7.1.2.3 Local**

**Other Interested and Potentially Affected Parties**
- Archstone Los Feliz Apartments
- Atwater Village Chamber of Commerce
- Atwater Village Neighborhood Council
- Los Angeles County Bicycle Coalition
- Echo Park Improvement Association
- Elysian Valley-Riverside Neighborhood Council
- Franklin Hills Residents Association
- Friends of Atwater Village
- Friends of Griffith Park
- Friends of the Los Angeles River
- Greater Echo Park-Elysian Neighborhood Council
- Griffith Park Neighborhood Council
- Historical Society of Southern California
- Los Angeles River Kayak Safari
- Los Angeles City Historical Society
- Los Angeles Conservancy
- Los Angeles River Center and Gardens
Los Angeles River Cooperation Committee
Los Feliz Estates Owners Association
Los Feliz Improvement Association
Los Feliz Square Neighborhood Association
Los Angeles Conservation Corps
Los Angeles Riverfront Collaborative
Los Angeles River Revitalization Corporation
Northeast Trees
Northeast Los Angeles Riverfront Collaborative (NELA RC)
Riverglen Apartments
Silver Lake Chamber of Commerce
Silver Lake Improvement Association
Silver Lake Neighborhood Council, Mr. Rusty Millar
Silver Lake Neighborhood Council, Mr. Scott Crawford
Silver Lake Neighborhood Council, Ms. Courtney Blackburn
Silver Lake Neighborhood Council/Echo Park, Mr. Peter Lassen
Silver Lake Reservoirs Conservancy
Silver Lake Residents Association
Silver View II Homeowners Association
The Committee to Save Silver Lake Reservoir
The River Project

**Recreation, Senior, and Youth Centers**
Chevy Chase Recreation Center
Glassell Park Recreation Center
Glassell Park Youth Center
Glassell Senior Citizen Center
Griffith Park Adult Community Center
Silver Lake Recreation Center

**Libraries**
Atwater Village Branch Library
Echo Park Branch Library
Edendale Branch Library
Los Feliz Branch Library
Silver Lake Branch Library

**Schools**
Allesandro Elementary School
Atwater Avenue Elementary School
Bellevue Primary school
Clifford Street Elementary School
Franklin Avenue Elementary School
Glenfeliz Boulevard Elementary School
Holy Trinity Prep School
Holy Trinity Academy
Immaculate Heart High School
Ivanhoe Elementary School
John Marshall High School
Kids’ World School
LACCD Van de Kamp Innovation Center
Los Feliz Elementary School
Lycee International de Los Angeles
Mayberry Street Elementary School
Micheltorena Street Elementary School
Our Mother of Good Counsel School
St. Teresa of Avila School
St. Francis of Assisi Elementary School
Thomas Starr King Middle School
Washington Irving Middle School

7.1.2.4 Businesses and Residents

**Adjacent Parcels**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessor’s Parcel No.</th>
<th>Property Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5434022900</td>
<td>2947 North Hyperion Avenue, Los Angeles, CA 90027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5437037901</td>
<td>Not available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5434023028</td>
<td>3019 Hyperion Avenue, Los Angeles, CA 90027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5434023029</td>
<td>3015 Hyperion Avenue, Los Angeles, CA 90027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5437021003</td>
<td>2992 Glendale Boulevard, Los Angeles, CA 90039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5435027020</td>
<td>3111 Glendale Boulevard, Los Angeles, CA 90039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5437018002</td>
<td>3040 Glendale Boulevard, Los Angeles, CA 90039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5434023032</td>
<td>3001 Hyperion Avenue, Los Angeles, CA 90027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5437021023</td>
<td>2974 Glendale Boulevard, Los Angeles, CA 90039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5435028008</td>
<td>3003 Glendale Boulevard, Los Angeles, CA 90039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5434026046</td>
<td>2998 Hyperion Avenue, Los Angeles, CA 90027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5437018001</td>
<td>3540 Hollydale Drive, Los Angeles, CA 90039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5435028028</td>
<td>2973 North Glendale Boulevard, Los Angeles, CA 90039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5434024017</td>
<td>Not available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5434024018</td>
<td>3041 Waverly Drive, Los Angeles, CA 90039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5435028026</td>
<td>2977 North Glendale Boulevard, Los Angeles, CA 90039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5437021022</td>
<td>2978 North Glendale Boulevard, Los Angeles, CA90039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5434023027</td>
<td>3023 Hyperion Avenue, Los Angeles, CA 90027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5434026013</td>
<td>3040 Waverly Drive, Los Angeles, CA 90039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5435028037</td>
<td>3047 Glendale Boulevard, Los Angeles, CA 90039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5437018032</td>
<td>3036 Glendale Boulevard, Los Angeles, CA 90039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessor’s Parcel No.</td>
<td>Property Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5434024901</td>
<td>Not available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5434026045</td>
<td>2996 Hyperion Avenue, Los Angeles, CA 90027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5434023026</td>
<td>3100 Waverly Drive, Los Angeles, CA 90027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5437018031</td>
<td>3010 Glendale Boulevard, Los Angeles, CA 90039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5434023030</td>
<td>3009 Hyperion Avenue, Los Angeles, CA 90027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5435028017</td>
<td>2985 Glendale Boulevard, Los Angeles, CA 90039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5434017022</td>
<td>3101 Waverly Drive, Los Angeles, CA 90027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5435028030</td>
<td>2965 Glendale Boulevard, Los Angeles, CA 90039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5434026042</td>
<td>3004 Hyperion Avenue, Los Angeles, CA 90027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5437021026</td>
<td>2992 Glendale Boulevard, Los Angeles, CA 90039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5435028027</td>
<td>2975 North Glendale Boulevard, Los Angeles, CA 90039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5435028010</td>
<td>3015 Glendale Boulevard, Los Angeles, CA 90039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5437017025</td>
<td>3068 Glendale Boulevard, Los Angeles, CA 90039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5435028024</td>
<td>2983 North Glendale Boulevard, Los Angeles, CA 90039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5434024026</td>
<td>3044 Riverside Drive, Los Angeles, CA 90027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5434026005</td>
<td>2962 Hyperion Avenue, Los Angeles, CA 90027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5437036902</td>
<td>Not available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5437022021</td>
<td>2960 Glendale Boulevard, Los Angeles, CA 90039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5437017026</td>
<td>3056 Glendale Boulevard, Los Angeles, CA 90039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5434026006</td>
<td>2966 Hyperion Avenue, Los Angeles, CA 90027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5434026047</td>
<td>3000 Hyperion Avenue, Los Angeles, CA 90027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5437021021</td>
<td>2980 Glendale Boulevard, Los Angeles, CA 90039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5435039006</td>
<td>Not available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5437018034</td>
<td>3028 Glendale Boulevard, Los Angeles, CA 90039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5434023031</td>
<td>3005 Hyperion Avenue, Los Angeles, CA 90027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5435028036</td>
<td>2953 Glendale Boulevard, Los Angeles, CA 90039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5435028011</td>
<td>3031 Glendale Boulevard, Los Angeles, CA 90039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5434017029</td>
<td>3100 Riverside Drive, Los Angeles, CA 90027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5434026044</td>
<td>2994 Hyperion Avenue, Los Angeles, CA 90027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5435028029</td>
<td>2973 Glendale Boulevard, Los Angeles, CA 90039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5435027011</td>
<td>3609 Glenfeliz Boulevard, Los Angeles, CA 90039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5435039003</td>
<td>2960 Glenmanor Place, Los Angeles, CA 90039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5437017020</td>
<td>3060 Glendale Boulevard, Los Angeles, CA 90039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5435028025</td>
<td>2979 North Glendale Boulevard, Los Angeles, CA 90039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5437021004</td>
<td>2982 Glendale Boulevard, Los Angeles, CA 90039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5434040014</td>
<td>3061 Riverside Drive, Los Angeles, CA 90039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5435028031</td>
<td>2961 Glendale Boulevard, Los Angeles, CA 90039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5435028009</td>
<td>3007 North Glendale Boulevard, Los Angeles, CA 90039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5434026043</td>
<td>3006 Hyperion Avenue, Los Angeles, CA 90027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5435039903</td>
<td>Not available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5437021024</td>
<td>2972 Glendale Boulevard, Los Angeles, CA 90039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessor’s Parcel No.</td>
<td>Property Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5434026026</td>
<td>3012 Hyperion Avenue, Los Angeles, CA 90027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5437018005</td>
<td>3032 Glendale Boulevard, Los Angeles, CA 90039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5437022022</td>
<td>Not available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5437018028</td>
<td>3020 Glendale Boulevard, Los Angeles, CA 90039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5437008025</td>
<td>3140 Glendale Boulevard, Los Angeles, CA 90039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5437018033</td>
<td>3028 Glendale Boulevard, Los Angeles, CA 90039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5434026041</td>
<td>3002 Hyperion Avenue, Los Angeles, CA 90027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5437021025</td>
<td>3531 Ferncroft Road, Los Angeles, CA 90039</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX A: CEQA Checklist
Supporting documentation of all CEQA checklist determinations is provided in Chapter 2 of this Initial Study/Environmental Assessment. Documentation of "No Impact" determinations is provided at the beginning of Chapter 2. Discussion of all impacts, avoidance, minimization, and/or compensation measures under the appropriate topic headings in Chapter 2.
CITY OF LOS ANGELES
CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT
INITIAL STUDY
(Article I – City CEQA Guidelines)

Council District: 4 &13

Date: January 2007

Lead City Agency: Department of Public Works, Bureau of Engineering

Project Title: Glendale Boulevard-Hyperion Avenue Viaduct Improvement Project

I. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

A. Location

The proposed project would be located between Atwater Village in the Northeast Los Angeles Community and the Hollywood community planning area of the City of Los Angeles. Figure 1 shows the overall project vicinity. The Glendale-Hyperion Viaduct complex, built in 1929, spans the Los Angeles River, Interstate 5 (I-5), and Riverside Drive. This viaduct complex connects Hyperion Avenue in the Griffith Park area of the Hollywood community with Glendale Boulevard in the Atwater area of the Northeast Los Angeles community. Figure 2 shows the project location and depicts the Hyperion Viaduct complex and the immediate area.

The Glendale-Hyperion Viaduct complex consists of the following structures:

- Hyperion Avenue viaduct over the Los Angeles River (53C-1881)
- Hyperion Avenue Bridge over Riverside Drive (53C-1882)
- Hyperion Avenue Bridge over I-5 (53-1069)
- Southbound Glendale Boulevard Bridge over the Los Angeles River (53C-1883)
- Northbound Glendale Boulevard Bridge over the Los Angeles River (53C-1884)
- Waverly Drive Bridge (Bridge Number 53C-1179)

The Viaduct complex is generally aligned along a southwest-northeast axis and is, bounded by Ettrick Street and Glenhurst Avenue, respectively. The photograph below shows a northern view of the complex as seen from the bluff to the southeast. The Hyperion Avenue Viaduct (53C-1069) spans I-5 and is under the jurisdiction of the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) and, of the five structures comprising the Complex, is the only component that is part of the State Highway System (see project footprint in Figure 3).
Photograph 1: Northern view of the Glendale-Hyperion Viaduct Complex

Figure 3A and Figure 3B present a schematic overview of the proposed project's major components and identify the reaches of each of the complex components listed above. Glendale Boulevard provides both access to and egress from the I-5 freeway, which passes beneath the complex.

The Glendale Boulevard exit from northbound I-5 connects with north Glendale Boulevard, and cars exiting I-5 at this ramp currently can only continue north on Glendale Boulevard. Access to northbound I-5 is provided from southbound Glendale Boulevard. As Hyperion Avenue merges with Glendale Boulevard, it separates Glendale Boulevard into two roadways (one northbound and the other southbound). Sidewalks on either side of Hyperion Avenue terminate at the northern extent of the viaduct complex, with no established pedestrian crosswalks across northbound Glendale Boulevard or southbound Glendale Boulevard.
B. Purpose

The purpose of the Glendale Boulevard-Hyperion Avenue Viaduct Project is to remove the complex from the Highway Bridge Program(s) (HBP) Eligible Bridge List (EBL) by improving operational safety for vehicular and pedestrian traffic and by updating the complex to meet seismic safety standards under current Maximum Credible Event (MCE) expectation.

Each of the structures comprising the viaduct complex, except the Waverly Bridge, requires seismic retrofitting to meet current Caltrans design standards, which is based upon a MCE assumption of a magnitude 7.5 event. The existing viaduct was not designed to withstand such earthquake magnitudes and is therefore seismically deficient. Thus, there is a need to seismically strengthen the viaduct complex to minimize associated risks to public safety.

The existing geometric configuration and physical condition of several complex components fail to meet current design standards for operational safety. In most cases, these deficiencies are related to inadequate lane widths, horizontal and vertical clearance restrictions, and pedestrian safety, which include:

- Inadequate curb-to-curb width to meet major highway design standards
- Inadequate lateral clearance beneath the Hyperion Bridge.
- Inadequate lateral and vertical clearance for the u-turn lane beneath the Bridge.
- Absence of shoulders (on either structure).
- Deteriorated railings.
- Missing or inadequate sidewalks.

Moreover, the existing, stop sign controlled, northbound approach exit from I-5 to northbound Glendale Boulevard terminates in a semi-blind curve where only a right-turn movement is permitted. This maneuver presents a safety hazard to motorists due to the limited sight distances caused by the existing curve.

Finally, pedestrians attempting to traverse the complex using Hyperion Avenue face several safety hazards. Currently, sub-standard narrow sidewalks are extended along both (east and west) sides of the viaduct structure. These sidewalks terminate near the northern end of the complex where Hyperion Avenue merges between the northbound and southbound Glendale Boulevard viaducts, and pedestrians are left in the middle of the roadway where they are exposed to significant hazards as they cross to adjacent Glendale Boulevard sidewalks. In addition, the sub-standard Hyperion Avenue sidewalks narrow even further at the south end near the Waverly Avenue over crossing, and east side sidewalk abruptly ends and pedestrians unfamiliar with this unusual configuration are exposed to significant risk of harm from northbound vehicles.

C. Description

The proposed Project would modify the existing Glendale-Hyperion Viaduct complex to address existing safety and operational deficiencies, improve pedestrian linkage with the surrounding system, and to meet current seismic performance standards. The following descriptions of proposed project modifications are organized by Viaduct components.
Hyperion Avenue from south of Waverly Drive to Glendale Boulevard (Includes Hyperion Avenue Bridges 53C-1881, 53C-1882, & 53C-1069)

Modifications to this section of the Hyperion Bridge Complex would include the following:

**Curb Replacement – East Side.** The existing 2-foot curb along the east side of Hyperion Avenue (along the bridge beneath Waverly Drive) and the 4-foot curb along the east side of Hyperion Avenue (north of Waverly Drive) would be replaced with a concrete rail barrier. Figure 4 shows a typical cross-section this portion of Hyperion Avenue.

**Curb Widening – West Side.** The existing 5-foot wide sidewalk along the west side of the Hyperion Bridge (approximately 2-feet wide beneath the Waverly Bridge) would be widened to 8 feet, tapering to 4 feet beneath the Waverly Drive Bridge. A concrete barrier would be constructed between the widened sidewalk and the southbound traffic lanes for pedestrian safety (see Figure 4 for the cross-sectional drawing).

**Pedestrian Features.** A pedestrian crosswalk across southbound Glendale Boulevard at the northern end of the bridge would be added for safety (see Figure 3B above).

**Center Median.** A 2-foot (1.2 m) wide and 1-foot (30 cm) high concrete center median would be installed along Hyperion Avenue to improve motorist safety. The centerline of the roadway over the Hyperion structure would be shifted slightly to the south to accommodate the sidewalk widening on north side of the structure and the elimination of the walkway on the south side of the structure (see Figure 4).

**Traffic Lane Restriping.** The existing four travel lanes would be restriped to provide new lane widths (12-foot (3.7 m)-wide inner lanes and 14-foot-(4.3 m) wide curb lanes) along northbound and southbound Hyperion Avenue.

**Bridge Rail Replacement.** The existing, non-original railings along Hyperion Avenue (visible in Photograph 1 above and Photograph 2 below) would be replaced with new railings that more closely follow the original design (Photograph 3).

**Waverly Drive Bridge (Bridge Number 53C-1179)**

**Bridge Rail Replacement.** The existing, non-original railings along the Waverly bridge over Hyperion Avenue would be replaced with new railings that more closely follow the original design (Photograph 3).
Glendale Boulevard - Hyperion Avenue Viaduct Improvement Project

Source: CH2MILL, 65% design plans, Sheet X-1.

Figure 4
Hyperion Avenue Cross Sections

EnviCraft LLC
Northbound Glendale Boulevard Bridge over the Los Angeles River (53C-1884)

Bridge Widening. The Northbound Glendale Boulevard Bridge over the Los Angeles River would be widened by eight feet to the east. The existing piers would be extended eastward to support the widened deck. Existing abutment edges would be removed and reconstructed approximately eight feet to the east. Photograph 2 below shows the existing piers and abutments. No additional travel lanes would be added; rather, the structure's widening would permit reconfiguration of the road to meet City standards, including the provision of a road shoulder.

Photograph 2: Northbound Glendale Boulevard over the Los Angeles River

Bridge Rail Replacement. The existing, non-original railings along the northbound Glendale Boulevard (see Photograph 2) would be replaced with new railings that more closely follow the original design (see Photograph 3 below).

I-5 Off-Ramp Reconfiguration. The existing I-5 northbound off-ramp to Glendale Boulevard would be realigned southward to connect with northbound Glendale Boulevard south of the current exit (see Figure 3B). This improvement would improve sight lines and operational safety for motorists exiting northbound I-5 at this location. In addition, the realigned off-ramp would be signalized and permit northbound motorists exiting the I-5 to enter southbound Glendale Avenue via a controlled intersection. The exact signal configuration has not been determined but would be designed and implemented in accordance with LADOT requirements. After the ramp reconfiguration, the former ramp area would be landscaped.
Photograph 3: Original railing to be replicated along the Glendale Boulevard viaducts.

**Bicycle and Pedestrian Ramp.** A bicycle and pedestrian ramp would be constructed to connect northbound Glendale Boulevard with the existing bike and pedestrian path along the Los Angeles River (see Figure 3B). In addition, a Los Angeles River overlook would be constructed from the bike path south of the viaduct and would utilize an existing abandoned railroad abutment for support. Figure 5 shows a photo-simulation of the proposed overlook.

**Traffic Lane Restriping.** The travel lanes would be restriped to provide new lane widths (12-foot wide) and curbs and shoulders.
Bridge Widening. The southbound Glendale Boulevard Bridge over the Los Angeles River would be widened by eight feet to the west. Figure 6 shows a cross section of this portion of the viaduct. The existing piers would be extended westward to support the widened deck. Existing abutment edges would be removed and reconstructed approximately eight feet to the east. Photograph 4 below shows the existing piers and abutments. No additional travel lanes would be added; rather, the widening would permit stripping for wider travel lanes and the addition of shoulders to meet current City standards.

Bridge Rail Replacement. The existing, non-original railings along the southbound Glendale Boulevard Bridge (see Photograph 4) would be replaced with new railings that more closely follow the original design (see Photograph 3 above).

Photograph 4: Southbound Glendale Boulevard over the Los Angeles River

Southbound to Northbound Turn-Around. The turn-around lane beneath the Hyperion Bridge that allows cars traveling southbound on Glendale Boulevard to turn around and travel northbound on Glendale Boulevard would either be eliminated for safety reasons (the far left side of Photograph 5 below shows part of the existing turn-around) or restrictions on the vehicle types that could utilize the turn-around would be implemented to address existing horizontal and vertical clearance deficiencies.

Traffic Lane Restriping. The travel lanes would be restriped to provide new lane widths (12-foot-wide) and curbs and shoulders.
Figure 5
Simulation of Reconfigured Off-Ramp, New Bike Path Entrance, and Overlook.

I-5 On-Ramp Modifications. The existing northbound on-ramp approach to the I-5 from southbound Glendale Boulevard would be slightly realigned southward (see Figure 3B). Photograph 5 below shows the existing on-ramp.

Photograph 5: Southbound Glendale Boulevard at the Turn-Around (left) and Northbound I-5 on-ramp

Seismic Improvements

Seismic improvements would primarily involve substructure elements of the Glendale-Hyperion complex (Figure 7 illustrates the proposed seismic retrofit plan) and would include:

**Abutment Transverse Wall Shear Friction Retrofit** - This work would involve the addition of concrete bolsters between the abutment walls and abutment footing. This retrofit would require excavation around the abutment to provide access to the footing. Once the concrete bolsters are constructed, the excavation would be filled and the retrofit would be entirely buried.

**Spandrel Column Ductility Retrofit** - This work would involve wrapping the existing spandrel columns with a carbon-epoxy fiber wrap. Once the columns have been wrapped, a layer of concrete, similar in texture and color would be applied the columns.

**Interior Spandrel Wall Strengthening** - This work involves the addition of concrete bolsters on top of the arches to strengthen the connection between each arch and the wall that rests on top of it. The bolsters would be constructed only on the interior faces of the walls so they would be mostly hidden from view.
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Pier Wall Channel Lining Retrofit - This work would involve cutting the existing channel lining so that it would be free to move out of the way during an earthquake. An inclined saw cut would be placed parallel to the pier wall so that when the pier wall moves back and forth the channel lining would not restrict the movement.

Construction Activities
Construction of the proposed Project would occur in a phased manner in order to maintain traffic and pedestrian flow. While the railing replacement and the sidewalk work are occurring along Hyperion Avenue, temporary pedestrian detours around work zones would be established. In addition, a center work zone would be established for median construction in Hyperion Avenue. At least one travel lane in each direction would be maintained at all times. K-rails would be utilized to protect the temporary pedestrian walkways.

During widening of the Northbound and Southbound Glendale Boulevard Viaducts, one of the two travel lanes on each structure (adjacent to the Los Angeles River) would be converted to work zones, which would be physically separated from the remaining travel lane (most likely with K-rails). At least one travel lane would be maintained at all times. During pier and abutment construction, a work zone would also be established in the river in the immediate area of the piers. This section of the river is concrete lined. Piles would be installed by augering the holes, inserting a support sleeve, and filling the void with concrete. Appropriate BMPs would be utilized. The work in the river would be confined to the dry season, which extends from April to October.

During construction of the realigned northbound I-5 off-ramp approach at Glendale Boulevard, the existing off-ramp would be kept operational. The realigned portion of the off-ramp approach would first be constructed and then connected to the existing off-ramp during off-peak hours. A short-term temporary ramp closure may be required during the connection process. Realigning of the I-5 off-ramp would be coordinated and phased with the widening of the Northbound Glendale Boulevard Viaduct. Following completion of the realigned off-ramp, access to the Los Angeles River bike path from northbound Glendale Boulevard, landscaping of the former off-ramp area, and construction of the river overlook would occur.

Seismic retrofit work along the bridge abutments, columns, and piers would also occur in a staged manner within established work zones to ensure that vehicular traffic (i.e. along Riverside Drive and I-5), pedestrian traffic, and bikeway traffic (along the Los Angeles River) would be safely maintained.

Construction of accessory facilities and project components would similarly occur throughout all phases of the work, and accomplished in a manner that maintains some level of vehicular and pedestrian traffic on Hyperion Avenue and Glendale Boulevard (northbound and southbound) at all times.

The Contractor would be required to comply with all applicable rules, regulations, and Standard Specifications. Requirements would include the preparation of Worker Protection Plan if hazardous materials are expected to be encountered. Imported fill would not be required.
Compliance with Existing Law
The analysis in this document assumes that, unless otherwise stated, the project will be designed, constructed and operated following all applicable laws, regulations, ordinances and formally adopted City standards (e.g., Los Angeles Municipal Code and Bureau of Engineering Standard Plans). Construction will follow the uniform practices established by the Southern California Chapter of the American Public Works Association (e.g., Standard Specifications for Public Works Construction and the Work Area Traffic Control Handbook) as specifically adapted by the City of Los Angeles (e.g., The City of Los Angeles Department of Public Works Additions and Amendments to the Standard Specifications For Public Works Construction (AKA "The Brown Book," formerly Standard Plan S-610)).

II. EXISTING ENVIRONMENT

The Glendale-Hyperion Viaduct, built in 1929, is one of the historic bridges over the Los Angeles River determined to be eligible for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). In October 1976, it was also designated by the City of Los Angeles as Historic-Cultural Monument No. 164.

This viaduct complex traverses Riverside Drive, I-5, and the Los Angeles River. The Los Angeles River in the immediate vicinity of the viaduct complex contains a concrete sill, which extends from approximately 50 to 80 feet west of the southbound Glendale Boulevard bridge. West of the concrete sill, the Los Angeles River is unlined.

III. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT EVALUATION

A brief explanation is presented for all answers except "No Impact" answers for which the referenced sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer is explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis). The location of references not otherwise indicated is the office of the Bridge Improvement Program, Bureau of Engineering, 221 N. Figueroa Street, Suite 350, Los Angeles. Please call Wally Stokes at (213) 202-5580 for an appointment.
1. AESTHETICS -- Would the project:
   a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

Comment: The proposed Project would not result in the disturbance or elimination of open space area or remove an object of aesthetic value. The project would not result in long-term physical adverse changes to the height or bulk of structures or view blockages within the view shed of Glendale Boulevard. Thus, the project is not expected to adversely affect the valued views in the project area. Rather, the project is expected to provide aesthetic benefits through the provision of additional viewing opportunities via an overlook that extends over the abandoned railroad piers east of the bridge. The new views afforded by the proposed overlook would include the Los Angeles River, portions of the Glendale-Hyperion viaduct complex, and the Elysian Hills.

   b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?
Comment: No designated scenic resources aside from the scenic highway are present in the project area. The City’s Northeast Community Plan identifies Glendale Boulevard as a scenic major Highway. The proposed Project would seismically retrofit the Glendale - Hyperion Viaduct complex, but would not introduce features that would adversely affect the use of Glendale Boulevard as a scenic highway.

   c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?
Comment: The proposed project would not substantially change the appearance or massing of the Glendale-Hyperion viaduct complex. The widening of southbound and northbound Glendale Boulevard bridges over the Los Angeles River would be consistent with the existing architecture of the bridge. The proposed project would actually improve the existing aesthetic character of the bridge by installing new railings that replicate the original balustrade design replaced earlier.

   d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?
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Comment: The nearest residential structure to the viaduct complex is an apartment building just northwest of the viaduct along Riverside Drive. The proposed Project would require replacement of the existing railing mounted street lighting on the outer sides of the main viaduct complex, including both Glendale Boulevard structures. The replacement lighting may have slightly higher lumen output in order to meet current foot-candle requirements of the Bureau of Street lighting; however, the new lighting is not expected to substantially intrude on nearby properties because it would be directed onto the roadway and the incidental spillover lighting increment would not exceed intensities of lighting common to representative residential areas throughout the City.

2. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES -- Would the project:
   a) Convert Primo Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?  
   Reference: Field observations.
   Comment: The proposed project would occur in a fully urbanized area of Los Angeles County where prime or unique farmlands do not exist.

   b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?  
   Reference: City of Los Angeles, Zimas
   Comment: The proposed project would occur in a fully urbanized area of the City of Los Angeles that is devoid of agricultural zoning classification or Williamson Act lands.

   c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?  
   Reference: Field observations.
   Comment: The proposed project occurs in a fully urbanized area of Los Angeles that is devoid of agricultural uses

3. AIR QUALITY -- Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:
   a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?  
   Reference: Southern California Association of Governments.
   Comment: The proposed project would be partially funded with federal funds and is located in a non-attainment area for several air pollutants. The Clean Air Act requires that federally funded transportation plans, programs, and projects in non-attainment or maintenance areas be in "conformity" with the State Implementation Plans through the process described in the EPA's Transportation Conformity Rule. The proposed Project is included in TIP: 77-SCAG009, 10/05/1998; and conformity has been demonstrated. Consequently, the proposed Project would not conflict the Air Quality Management Plan.

   b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?  
   Reference:
Comment: Construction of the proposed Project could result in construction emissions that exceed the South Coast Air Quality Management District's significance thresholds for criteria pollutants. No significant air quality impacts are anticipated because no increases in traffic lanes would be provided. In addition, the proposed Project would not introduce new sources of toxic air contaminants. The EIR will evaluate potential construction-related air quality impacts of the proposed Project.

c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?

Comment: The proposed project is a non-capacity enhancing infrastructure project, designed to enhance public safety, which is not expected to contribute to cumulative local or regional adverse air quality effects. The EIR will evaluate potential cumulative impacts to air quality related to construction of the proposed Project.

d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

Comment: The EIR will evaluate the potential for sensitive receptors to be exposed to substantial pollutant concentrations.

e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?


Comment: Neither construction nor operation of the proposed Project would utilize materials generally known to cause objectionable odors. Construction of the proposed project would utilize standard construction equipment that is commonly used throughout the City. The project does not include elements that could produce significant objectionable odors.

4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES – Would the project:

a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

Reference: The EIR will evaluate the potential for the Project to affect sensitive or special status species.

b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?

Reference: Preliminary Environmental Studies Form, April 2005.

Comment: The EIR will evaluate the potential for the Project to affect riparian or other sensitive natural habitat.
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?
Reference: Preliminary Environmental Studies Form, April 2005.
Comment: The proposed project would not involve construction within a marsh, vernal pool, or coastal area defined as wetlands by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act.

d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?
Comment: The proposed project site is largely urbanized, paved, or otherwise disturbed, and there are no known migratory pathways that the project could affect.

e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?
Reference:
Comment: The proposed project would not affect protected trees and would comply with all applicable local policies and ordinances.

f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?
Reference: General Plan Conservation Element
Comment: There are no adopted Habitat Conservation Plans in the vicinity of the project.

5. CULTURAL RESOURCES – Would the project:

a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in California Code of Regulations Section 15064.5?
Reference:
Comment: The Glendale Hyperion Viaduct complex is one of the historic bridges over the Los Angeles River determined to be eligible for listing within the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). In October 1976, it was also designated by the City of Los Angeles as Historic-Cultural Monument No. 164. The proposed project would require the demolition and removal of some of the complex's fabric; particularly, along the outer portions of both Glendale Boulevard viaducts. Removal of fabric could threaten the structure's integrity and disqualify it for NRHP listing. The EIR will fully evaluate the proposed project's potential impacts on the historical character of the complex.

b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to California Code of Regulations Section 15064.5?
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Comment: Work associated with the proposed project would occur in an area previously disturbed for the building of complex components that is not known to contain archaeological materials. Therefore, the proposed project is not expected to significantly or adversely affect archaeological resources because of the disturbed nature of the project site.

c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

Reference:
Comment: Work associated with the proposed project would occur in an area previously disturbed for the building of complex components that is not known to contain paleontological materials. Therefore, the proposed project is not expected to encounter or significantly affect such resources because of the disturbed nature of the project site.

d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

Comment: The proposed project would not occur in an area known to be previously used to inter human remains. Please see also response to Issue 5 b) above.

6. GEOLOGY AND SOILS – Would the project:
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:
   i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault?

References: Draft LA CEQA Thresholds Guide C1, Navigate LA
Comment: The proposed project is situated in an area known to be seismically active and approximately 0.2 miles from the Malibu Coast-Santa Monica-Hollywood-Raymond Fault and is likely to be subjected to a 7.5 magnitude earthquake at some time during the facility's useful life. Such an event would expose persons and property to life-threatening and severe property loss scenarios. The proposed Project includes measures that would seismically strengthen the Glendale-Hyperion viaduct complex, which would lessen, but not totally eliminate, the potential for injury, death, or property loss as the result of the maximum credible event (MCE) seismic occurrence.

   ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?

Reference: Navigate LA
Comment: See response to Checklist Item 6.a)i) above.

   iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

Reference: Navigate LA
Comment: The proposed Project would be located in an area subject to liquefaction as a result of energy release due to a seismic event. During the project design phase, geotechnical studies would be performed to understand the characteristics of the soil so that support considerations can be incorporated into the foundation designs. These design recommendations to avoid the effects of liquefaction, expansive soils, and other geotechnical considerations will be discussed within the EIR.

iv) Landslides? The proposed Project would not include features that could result in unstable geological conditions that could result in landslides.
Reference: Navigate LA
Comment: The proposed project does not appear in an area subject to landslides. The project would not introduce any new facilities or activities likely to contribute to the development of landslides or unstable geologic conditions.

b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?
Reference: Draft LA CEQA Thresholds Guide C2
Comment: The proposed Project would include reconfiguration of the existing off-ramp from northbound I-5 to Glendale Boulevard, which would temporarily expose soils to the erosive effects of wind and water during construction. Best management practices (BMPs) during construction would be employed to minimize soil erosion and landscaping would be promptly placed following construction to prevent erosion over the long term. The EIR will discuss BMPs and landscaping techniques to be employed.

c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?
Reference: Draft LA CEQA Thresholds Guide C2; Navigate LA
Comment: The proposed project would be situated in an area known to be subject to liquefaction as the result of energy release associated with strong seismic events (see response to Item 6 a) iii) above). The proposed project is not known to be subject to or likely to contribute to other soil stability issues.

d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?
Reference:
Comment: Please see response to Item 6 c) above.

e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?
Reference:
Comment: The proposed project would not involve the use of septic systems.

7. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS -- Would the project:
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?
Reference:
Comment: The proposed Project is an infrastructure improvement project that would not result in the routine use, transport, or disposal of hazardous materials.

b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?
Reference: Preliminary Environmental Studies Form, April 2005.
Comment: The proposed Project would require the use of petroleum fueled construction machinery which could occasion spills or leak product that could run off into surface waters, contaminate soils, or eventually contaminate local groundwater. Standard avoidance measures are available, which will be included in the EIR's evaluation of potential impacts related to the release of hazardous materials during construction. In addition, the proposed project would realign the I-5 northbound off-ramp at Glendale Boulevard. There is an unpaved area to the south of the off-ramp, which could be tainted with aerially deposited lead. In addition, groundwater in the Project area could be affected with volatile organic hydrocarbons from nearby potential sources of contamination. Proper management of hazardous materials encountered during construction is expected to keep potential impacts to below significance; however, the EIR will discuss the potential to encounter hazardous materials and the management measures that would be employed.

c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?
Reference: Navigate LA
Comment: The proposed Project is not a stationary source of air pollutants and would not result in the production of hazardous emissions or require the handling of hazardous or acutely hazardous materials. Health risk impacts to schools are not anticipated.

d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?
Los Angeles, CA. 90027
Comment: The project site does not include listed hazardous materials sites based on a search of the standard state and federal sources in accordance with ASTM standard practice. In addition, as discussed under Checklist Item 7b), hazardous materials impacts will be discussed in the EIR.

e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?
Reference:
Comment: The proposed project is not located within an area either
designated or planned for airport use.

f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project
result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project
area?
Reference:
Comment: No private airstrips are located in the Project vicinity.

g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted
emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?
Reference: Draft LA CEQA Thresholds Guide H1
Comment: Construction of the proposed project would be staged to
maintain a minimum of one travel lane in each direction would be
maintained at all times. Following completion of the improvements, a
net benefit would accrue because seismic strengthening of the viaduct
complex would increase the probability that the viaduct complex would
remain functional following an earthquake to serve as an emergency
response or evacuation route.

h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death
involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to
urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?
Reference:
Comment: The proposed Project is located in an urbanized area where
neither wildlands nor the potential for wildland fires exist.

8. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY -- Would the project:
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?
Reference:
Comment: Construction of the proposed Project would include activities
associated with seismic strengthening of the structure and placement of
falsework to support widening of the Glendale Boulevard bridges, which
have the potential to affect water quality in the Los Angeles River.
Standard BMP's during construction would be summarized in the
EIR, would be employed to minimize this potential.
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with
groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer
volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the
production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which
would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits
have been granted)?
Reference: Draft LA CEQA Thresholds Guide D3
Comment: The proposed Project would require the placement of piles in
the River channel, which could, conceivably extend to groundwater;
however, the placement location is concrete lined and neither this
location nor other locations along the Los Angeles River channel are
used for groundwater recharge. Moreover, the construction activities of
the proposed Project are not expected to affect groundwater levels in
the project area because the relative low number of piles to be
constructed would not serve as a barrier to groundwater flow.
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c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?
Reference: Draft LA CEQA Thresholds Guide D1
Comment: The proposed project does not involve modification of a local drainage pattern or in altering the course of either a stream or river. The proposed project would not include components that would permanently contribute to either on- or off-site erosion or siltation. The potential for creating conditions for erosion and/or siltation would be limited to the active construction stage and BMP’s would be employed to minimize this potential (see also response to Issue Item 8 a)).


d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?
Reference: Draft LA CEQA Thresholds Guide D1
Comment: See Checklist Item 8.c) above.


e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?
Reference: Draft LA CEQA Thresholds Guide D1
Comment: As described under Checklist Item 8.c) above, the proposed Project would not result in substantial increases in surface runoff.


f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?

Reference: Draft LA CEQA Thresholds Guide D2
Comment: The proposed project’s potential to degrade water quality is limited to that described previously (see Checklist Item 8 a).


g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?
Reference: 
Comment: The proposed Project is an infrastructure project that would not include new housing.


h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?
Reference: Draft LA CEQA Thresholds Guide D1
Comment: See Checklist Item 8.c) above.


i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?
Reference: Draft LA CEQA Thresholds Guide D1
Comment: See Checklist Item 8.c) above.


j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

Reference:
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Comment: The proposed Project is an inland infrastructure project that would occur in an urbanized river channel. Because the proposed Project is inland and not located in a confined water body, it would not cause inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.

9. LAND USE AND PLANNING -- Would the project:
   a) Physically divide an established community?

   Reference: Draft LA CEQA Thresholds Guide A2
   Comment: The proposed Project involves modification of an existing viaduct complex and would not introduce an aboveground feature that would physically divide an established community.

   b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

   Reference: Draft LA CEQA Thresholds Guide; General Plan
   Comment: The proposed Project is an infrastructure improvement project that is consistent with the City’s General Plan, including its Northeast Community Plan, which supports the investment of public monies to improve transportation infrastructure.

   c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?

   Reference: Conservation Element
   Comment: There are no habitat conservation plans, currently in force, that cover the Project area.

10. MINERAL RESOURCES – Would the project:
   a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?

   Reference: Comment: No known mineral resources are located in the Project vicinity.

   b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?

   Reference: Comment: See Checklist item 10.a) above.

11. NOISE – Would the project result in:
   a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?

   Reference:
Comment: Construction of the proposed project would involve roadway improvements along Hyperion Avenue through the entire length of the viaduct complex and both northbound and southbound Glendale Boulevard. Existing multi-family residential structures are situated (at varying distances) adjacent to each of the construction zones delineated above. The sensitivity of residents occupying each of these locations is dependent upon distance from the noise source (construction activity) and the activity of the residents. The proposed project would be accomplished within the limitations established by the City’s Noise Ordinance and it does not appear, at this juncture, that additional mitigation measures would be required. However, this issue will be further reviewed by the proposed project’s EIR.

The proposed project would slightly modify the existing centerlines along both the northbound and southbound Glendale Boulevard bridges and relocate the northbound I-5 off-ramp connection to Glendale Boulevard; however, it does not appear that this relocation would elevate detected noise levels at nearby receptor locations by 3 dBA (CNEL) or more. Because the proposed Project would not increase the number of travel lanes on the viaduct traffic volume and its concomitant noise by-product, is not expected to substantially increase noise levels. No further operational noise evaluation is recommended.

b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels?

Reference:
Comment: The seismic strengthening and other viaduct complex improvements would utilize standard construction equipment, which generally does not produce groundborne noise or vibrations that could be considered excessive. In addition, the installation of piles would be via drilled hole rather than pile driving or pile hammering. Consequently, significant vibration impacts are not anticipated.

c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

Reference:
Comment: As discussed in Checklist item 11.a) above, the proposed Project would not result in substantial permanent noise increases from project operation.

d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

Reference:
Comment: Temporary elevations of ambient noise levels are anticipated; however, the intensity levels resulting from construction are not expected to rise to the level of significance (see Checklist 11.a) above.

e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

Reference:
Comment: No airports are located within 2 miles of the proposed Project.
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f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

Reference:
Comment: There are no private air strips in the vicinity of the proposed project.

12. POPULATION AND HOUSING -- Would the project:

a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?

Reference: Draft LA CEQA Thresholds Guide B1

Comment: The proposed project is an infrastructure improvement, which would occur within a fully developed urbanized setting and have no direct effect on either population growth or the development of new housing or business.

b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

Reference:

Comment: The proposed Project would not require the acquisition of residences, the displacement of any persons, or the need to construct replacement housing elsewhere.

c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

Reference:

Comment: The proposed Project would not involve the displacement of any persons.

13. PUBLIC SERVICES --

a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

i) Fire protection?

Reference: Navigate LA

Comment: The proposed project would not necessitate the provision of new or physically altered fire protection facilities.

ii) Police protection?

Reference: Navigate LA

Comment: The proposed project would not necessitate the provision of new or physically altered police protection facilities.

iii) Schools?

Reference: Navigate LA
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Comment: The proposed project would not necessitate the provision of new or physically altered public school facilities.

iv) Parks?
Reference: Navigate LA
Comment: The proposed project would not necessitate the provision of new or physically altered park facilities.

v) Other public facilities?
Reference: Navigate LA
Comment: The proposed project would not necessitate the provision of new or physically altered public facilities.

14. RECREATION --
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?
Reference:
Comment: The proposed project would not necessitate the provision of new or physically altered recreational facilities.

b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?
Reference:
Comment: The proposed project includes the provision of expanded recreational (bicycling) opportunities. This project component is deemed to be beneficial and does not involve the generation of adverse physical effects to the environment. In addition, the section of the existing bike path beneath the viaduct complex would be relocated slightly to the south prior to construction to facilitate the seismic upgrades and other improvements. The bike path would remain operational during project construction.

15. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC -- Would the project:
a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?
Reference:
Comment: The proposed Project is not capacity enhancing. While a component of the proposed project would eliminate a semi-blind curve at the northbound I-5 off-ramp to Glendale Boulevard by reconfiguring the off-ramp to allow left turns onto southbound Glendale Boulevard, elimination of this safety hazard is not expected to lead to an appreciably increase in traffic operations.

b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?
Reference:
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Comment: Because the proposed Project would not add new trip to the transportation system, it would individually or cumulatively adversely affect the level of service of a roadway on the congestion management plan.

c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?
Reference: Comment: The proposed Project would not affect air travel.

d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?
Reference: Draft LA CEQA Thresholds Guide F5
Comment: The proposed Project would realign the northbound I-5 off ramp to Glendale Boulevard to the south and add a light-controlled intersection to the ramp terminus, resulting in an improvement to the current semi-blind turning conditions at this off-ramp.

e) Result in inadequate emergency access?
Reference: Comment: Construction of the proposed Project has the potential to marginally affect emergency traffic operations through active construction zones. However, construction would be staged in a manner that at least one travel lane in each direction would be maintained at all times. In addition, construction would be coordinated with emergency response providers to allow for the planning of alternative routes. Proper coordination would keep impacts to emergency access below a level of significance.

f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?

Reference:
Comment: Construction of the proposed Project could require temporary on-street parking restrictions in the vicinity of construction work areas, such as along Riverside Drive or along short sections of Glendale Boulevard. However, parking restrictions would be temporary and are not expected to result in substantial on-street parking constraints.

16. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS – Would the project:

a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?
Reference: Comment: The proposed Project would not generate wastewater.

b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?
Reference: Comment: The proposed Project would not generate wastewater or require new wastewater facilities to be constructed.
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(c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage
facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which
could cause significant environmental effects?
Reference:
Comment: The proposed Project would not substantially increase
impermeable surface area and would therefore not generate demand
for new storm water drainage facilities.

(d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing
entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements
needed?
Reference:
Comment: The proposed Project is an infrastructure improvement project
that would not require potable water for operations.

(e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which
serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve
the project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing
commitments?
Reference:
Comment: See Checklist 16.(d) above.

(f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate
the project’s solid waste disposal needs?
Reference:
Comment: Construction of the proposed Project would generate some
construction debris that would likely be disposed of in a landfill.
However, construction debris would be recycled or reused where
feasible and economic. In addition, much of the construction debris
would be inert material, which could be disposed of, in an inert landfill,
thereby saving valuable landfill capacity in municipal landfills. Once
construction in complete, the proposed Project would not generate solid
waste.

(g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to
solid waste?
Reference:
Comment: All City projects comply with applicable federal, state, and local
laws and regulations.

17. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE --
a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the
environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species,
cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels,
threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or
restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate
important examples of the major periods of California history or
prehistory?
Reference:
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Comment: The proposed project involves the demolition and removal of fabric that is now part of a structure deemed eligible for listing by the National Register of Historic Places and is a designated City of Los Angeles Landmark ( #164). This action may constitute an adverse change in the significance of this resource and pursuant to Section 21084.1 of the California Environmental Quality Act and Section 15064.5 (a)(2), and Section 15064.5 (b)(1) of the Guidelines for the Implementation of CEQA requires a Mandatory Finding of Significance be determined and that and EIR be prepared.

b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?
   Reference:
   Comment: The proposed project does not include effects that could be deemed cumulatively significant.

 c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?
   Reference:
   Comment: Construction of the proposed project has the potential to cause both direct and indirect adverse effect to human beings in the area of noise generation, air quality, the handling of hazardous materials, and accidental injury to workers. However, the proposed project would be constructed in compliance with all applicable laws, regulations, best construction practices, and worker safety measures and is not expected to result in substantial adverse effects to human beings, directly or indirectly.

IV. PREPARATION AND COORDINATION/CONSULTATION

This Initial Study was prepared in coordination with the following individuals:

Prepared by:
Louis Utsumi
Environmental Project Manager
EnviCraft LLC

Coordination/Consultation with:
Ejike Mbaruoguru, P.E.        Wallace E. Stokes, III
Project Manager               Environmental Coordinator
Bridge Improvement Program    Environmental Management Group
Bureau of Engineering, Department of Public Works
Department of Public Works
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Summary

The proposed project would modify the existing Glendale-Hyperion Viaduct complex to address existing safety and operational deficiencies, improve pedestrian linkage with the surrounding system, and strengthen the complex to meet current seismic performance standards. Construction would include:

- Modification to the Hyperion Avenue Viaduct to include removal of the existing eastside curb and sidewalk.
- Restriping to provide shoulders that could be also used by cyclists on each side and a center median.
- Installation of protective concrete rail barriers adjacent to the shoulder lanes on each side.
- Replace the existing 5-foot westside sidewalk with an 8-foot sidewalk.
- Installation of a pedestrian sidewalk across southbound Glendale Boulevard.
- Widening of both northbound and southbound Glendale Boulevard viaducts by approximately 8 feet in the outer direction to meet current design standards.
- Restriping of both northbound and southbound Glendale Boulevard bridges to provide wider traffic lanes and shoulders that could be used by bicyclists.
- Replacement of railings along both Glendale Boulevard viaducts, Hyperion Avenue, and the Waverly Bridge with replicas that more closely resemble the original railing systems.
- Reconfiguration of the northbound I-5 off ramp to northbound Glendale Boulevard.
- Construction of a bicycle and pedestrian ramp connecting northbound Glendale Boulevard with the existing bike and pedestrian path along the Los Angeles River.
- Construction of a viewing outlook that extends from the bike path along the Los Angeles River just east of the viaduct complex.

Recommended Environmental Document

Potentially Significant Impacts, associated with the proposed project, are indicated by the checklist, which follows. Project related effects, for unmarked environmental factors of the checklist are deemed to be insignificant and, in accordance with Section 15128 of the CEQA Guidelines will not be discussed in detail by the Environmental Impact Report (EIR).

- Aesthetics
- Biological Resources
- Hazards & Hazardous Materials
- Mineral Resources
- Public Services
- Utilities/Service Systems
- Agriculture Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Hydrology/Water Quality
- Noise
- Recreation
- Mandatory Findings of Significance
- Air Quality
- Geology/Soils
- Land Use/Planning
- Population/Housing
- Transportation/Traffic
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On the basis of this initial evaluation:

☐ I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☒ I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" on the environment and that an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Prepared By:  
Wallace E. Stokes III  
Environmental Coordinator  
City of Los Angeles

Date 1-18-07

By:  
Ara Kasparian, Ph.D., Manager  
Environmental Management Group

Date 1/8/07
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APPENDIX B1: Programmatic Section 4(f) Evaluation
Glendale Boulevard-Hyperion Avenue Complex of Bridges Improvement Project

PROGRAMMATIC SECTION 4(F) EVALUATION
Submitted Pursuant to: 49 U.S.C. 303

THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Department of Transportation as assigned

Caltrans

December 11, 2014
Date of Approval

Tami Podesta
Branch Chief

The environmental review, consultation, and any other action required in accordance with applicable Federal laws for this project is being, or has been, carried-out by Caltrans under its assumption of responsibility pursuant to 23 USC 327.
1.0 Introduction
Section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act of 1966, codified in federal law at 49 U.S.C. 303, declares that “it is the policy of the United States Government that special effort should be made to preserve the natural beauty of the countryside and public park and recreation lands, wildlife and waterfowl refuges, and historic sites.”

Section 4(f) specifies that the Secretary [of Transportation] may approve a transportation program or project . . . requiring the use of publicly owned land of a public park, recreation area, or wildlife and waterfowl refuge of national, State, or local significance, or land of an historic site of national, State, or local significance (as determined by the federal, state, or local officials having jurisdiction over the park, area, refuge, or site) only if:

- there is no prudent and feasible alternative to using that land; and
- the program or project includes all possible planning to minimize harm to the park, recreation area, wildlife and waterfowl refuge, or historic site resulting from the use.

In an effort to comply with the required regulations in determining Section 4(f) resources, documentation specific to the historic nature of the Glendale Boulevard-Hyperion Avenue Complex of Bridges structures was prepared to address potential impacts related to their rehabilitation and seismic retrofit. Applicable technical reports for this Section 4(f) evaluation include:

- JRP Historical Consulting, LLC (JRP). 2012. Draft Memorandum of Agreement between California Department of Transportation and the California State Historic Preservation Officer Regarding the Glendale Boulevard-Hyperion Avenue Viaduct Complex Improvement Project, October.

2.0 Description of Proposed Project and Alternatives
The City of Los Angeles, in conjunction with Caltrans (the California Department of Transportation) and FHWA (Federal Highway Administration), is proposing to modify the existing Glendale Boulevard-Hyperion Avenue Viaduct (Viaduct Complex) to correct existing safety and operational deficiencies, address pedestrian safety issues, meet current seismic performance standards, and to restore original design details to the railings. Project alternatives are the Proposed Action and the No-Build Alternative.

Proposed Action
A detailed description of the Proposed Project is included in Section 1.3, Project Description and Alternatives, of the Initial Study/Environmental Assessment (IS/EA).

In summary, the Proposed Action would accomplish the following:
• Seismically strengthen vulnerable Viaduct Complex structures.

• Improve the Hyperion Avenue viaduct roadway by adding a center median barrier to physically separate northbound and southbound traffic, consolidate the existing two sidewalks into a single sidewalk along the west side of the complex, add a pedestrian crosswalk across southbound Glendale Boulevard at the northern end of the bridge, and restripe the travel lanes to provide new lane widths (12-foot inner and 14-foot wide curb).

• Widen the northbound and southbound Glendale Boulevard viaducts over the Los Angeles River by approximately eight feet.

• Replace the existing covered railings along both Glendale Boulevard viaducts, along Hyperion Avenue, and along the Waverly Bridge with replica balustrades based on the original railing design.

• Realign the existing I-5 northbound off-ramp to Glendale Boulevard to connect with northbound Glendale Boulevard south of the current exit to allow left hand turns onto southbound Glendale Boulevard.

• Add an access ramp from northbound Glendale Boulevard to the bike path along the Los Angeles River.

• As a mitigation measure, construct a pedestrian crossing over Los Angeles River piers on the east side of the complex to connect with northbound Glendale Boulevard.

### Design Options

In response to public comments received during the review period, the project has been revised to add bicycle lanes\(^1\) to the roadway of the Hyperion Avenue Viaduct (comprising three structures: Caltrans bridge numbers 53C-1882, 53-1069, and 53C-1881) as a design option. The bike lanes would be created by means of striping and symbols painted on the paved roadway. The addition of bicycle lanes will not involve any change to any of the historic features of the viaduct nor affect those features in any way. The viaduct (aka “bridge”) will not be widened. The approaches will not be widened. The space for the bike lanes will be accommodated by adjusting the width (or possibly the number) of the traffic lanes and/or adjusting the width of the median of the roadway. The environmental assessment (Sec. 1.3) describes the proposed roadway of the viaduct as having two 12-foot lanes, two 14-foot lanes, a 7-foot median and a 7-8-foot sidewalk along most of the viaduct length, all narrowing under the Waverly Drive Bridge (Caltrans bridge number 53C-1179). For the design option, various configurations are being considered; no decision has been made on which configuration to adopt. One preliminary, possible configuration could include 5-foot bike lanes, 11-foot traffic lanes, a 5-foot sidewalk and a 4-foot median for most of the bridge length, all narrowing under the Waverly Drive Bridge. Exhibits 1-3 below show three possible configurations under consideration; other configurations may also be considered.

While the exact configuration has not yet been decided (the City is collaborating with a citizens’ advisory committee to develop the final configuration), the City has committed to including the

---

\(^{1}\) Bicycle facilities are defined in the City’s 2010 Bicycle Plan, a component of the Transportation Element of the General Plan. A “bicycle lane” (aka “bike lane”) is defined as “a striped lane for one-way bicycle travel on a street or highway.” Caltrans refers to this facility as a “Class II bikeway.” Striping, other pavement markings, and signage on City bike lanes follow the Caltrans Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices.
bike lanes without any widening of the viaduct or changes to the design of the new barriers (aka “bridge railings”). No change to any historic features would be required under any configuration.

The inclusion of bike lanes will not affect the ability of Caltrans to comply with any of the stipulations agreed to by Caltrans and the SHPO in the executed memorandum of agreement (MOA), prepared in compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, for this project.

The addition of bike lanes will not require widening or other structural changes to the viaduct or the approaches. The addition of the bike lanes will not require additional safety features that could affect the historic integrity or significance of the viaduct or the stipulations of the MOA.

No-Build Alternative
Under the No Build Alternative, no improvements to the Viaduct Complex, including seismic retrofit/rehabilitation, would be undertaken. Existing design deficiencies would remain, including inadequate curb-to-curb widths, inadequate travel lane widths, inadequate lateral clearances for vehicles passing on roadways beneath the structure, and inadequate pedestrian facilities.

ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED BUT ELIMINATED FROM FURTHER DISCUSSION
The following alternatives were considered but eliminated from further consideration.1

Build Alternative 1 - Seismic Retrofit Only
Build Alternative 1 would provide the seismic retrofit improvements associated with the Proposed Project, but would not provide replacement replica balustrades to the Viaduct Complex, would not improve sidewalks along Hyperion Avenue, would not reconfigure the northbound I-5 off-ramp to Glendale Boulevard, would not widen the Glendale Boulevard viaducts over the Los Angeles River, and would not construct an undercrossing along the Los Angeles River beneath the Viaduct Complex.

---

1 The rationale for eliminating Build Alternatives 1 through 5 is presented in Section 1.3.3 of the environmental document.
This Exhibit is strictly a preliminary design alternative under consideration, and does not represent the final design of the bridge.
EXHIBIT 2

HYPERION AVENUE BRIDGE OVER I-5, RIVERSIDE DRIVE AND LA RIVER (LOOKING NORTH)

Caltrans Bridge Numbers 53-1069, 53C-1882, and 53C-1881

1) THREE LANCES (ONE LANE DOWNHILL; TWO LANES UPHILL)
   2) SIDEWALK ON ONE SIDE
   3) 6 FT. MEDIAN (NO BARRIER)

HYPERION AVENUE AT WAVERLY DRIVE (LOOKING NORTH)

Hyperion Avenue here is City street not on bridge; Waverly Bridge is 53C-1179

1) THREE LANCES (ONE LANE DOWNHILL; TWO LANES UPHILL)
   2) SIDEWALK ON ONE SIDE
   3) 6 FT. MEDIAN (NO BARRIER)

This Exhibit is strictly a preliminary design alternative under consideration, and does not represent the final design of the bridge.
EXHIBIT 3

HYPERION AVENUE BRIDGE OVER I-5, RIVERSIDE DRIVE AND LA RIVER (LOOKING NORTH)
Caltrans Bridge Numbers 53-1069, 53C-1882, and 53C-1881

1) THREE-11 FT. LANES (ONE LANE DOWNHILL; TWO LANES UPHILL)
2) SIDEWALK AND BUFFER ON BOTH SIDES
3) 6 FT. MEDIAN (NO BARRIER)

HYPERION AVENUE AT WAVERLY DRIVE (LOOKING NORTH)
Hyperion Avenue here is City street not on bridge; Waverly Bridge is 53C-1179

1) THREE-10 FT. LANES (ONE LANE DOWNHILL; TWO LANES UPHILL)
2) SIDEWALK AND BUFFER ON BOTH SIDES
3) 4 FT. MEDIAN (NO BARRIER)

This Exhibit is strictly a preliminary design alternative under consideration, and does not represent the final design of the bridge.
Construction would take place over one year. The total cost for Build Alternative 1 is estimated to be approximately $5.5 million. The funding source for Build Alternative 1 would be State Seismic Retrofit funds.

Seismic Retrofit Only would sufficiently strengthen the existing Viaduct Complex to meet current seismic performance standards. This alternative would not remove the Viaduct Complex from the Highway Bridge Program (HBP) Eligibility Bridge List (EBL) but would only implement the seismic retrofit improvements previously described as part of the proposed project. Aside from seismic improvement, no other improvements would be provided. The seismically retrofitted bridge structures would retain their current geometric configuration. The improvements would not physically impact any portion of the Viaduct Complex. Therefore, Build Alternative 1 would not cause an adverse effect on the Viaduct Complex.

**Build Alternative 2 – Widen Hyperion Avenue by 44 Feet and Glendale Boulevard Bridges by 24 Feet**

Build Alternative 2 would widen the viaduct structures along Hyperion Avenue by 44 feet and the Glendale Boulevard bridges by 24 feet. This alternative would add four lanes to Hyperion Avenue (two lanes in each direction) and one additional lane each along the southbound Glendale Boulevard Bridge (over the Los Angeles River) and the northbound Glendale Boulevard Bridge.

While this build alternative would meet the project’s purpose and need,\(^2\) it would result in greater impacts on the 4(f) resource than the proposed project. This alternative would widen the bridge to meet current standards, but cause major community and commuter disruptions. It would also require moderate right-of-way acquisition and relocations. Therefore, this alternative is economically inferior and cause far greater impacts on the Viaduct Complex, and has been withdrawn from further consideration.

**Build Alternative 3 – Widen Hyperion Avenue by 24 Feet and Glendale Boulevard Bridges by 16 Feet**

Build Alternative 3 would widen the viaduct structures along Hyperion Avenue by 24 feet and the Glendale Boulevard bridges by 16 feet. This alternative would include full standard shoulders and full standard sidewalks on both sides, and full standard median in the center of the Hyperion Avenue structure. No lanes would be added as part of this alternative. Standard shoulders and sidewalk would also be added to both Glendale Boulevard Bridges.

While this build alternative would meet the project’s purpose and need, it would result in greater impacts on the 4(f) resource than would the proposed project. This alternative would widen the bridge to meet current standards, but cause major community and commuter disruptions. It would also require low-moderate right-of-way acquisition and relocations. Therefore, this alternative is economically inferior and cause far greater impacts on the Viaduct Complex, and has been withdrawn from further consideration.

---

\(^2\) The project’s purpose and need is discussed in Section 2.3.
Build Alternative 4 – New Bridge at Existing Location

Build Alternative 4 would require complete demolition of the existing Viaduct Complex and construction of an entirely new bridge at the same location. The new bridge provided by Build Alternative 4 would meet current standards for seismic performance and geometric design. Build Alternative 4 would result in construction-related impacts substantially greater than those of the other Build Alternatives because the Viaduct Complex is one of four key thoroughfares that cross the Los Angeles River in the extended project vicinity (the other three are Fletcher Avenue, SR-2—known as the Glendale Freeway—and Los Feliz Boulevard). This alternative would require the complete closure of the Viaduct Complex for an extended period of time, which would result in substantial impacts to commuters and the local circulation system during construction. In addition, this alternative would result in substantial economic impact to local businesses along Glendale Boulevard and Hyperion Avenue. Furthermore, Build Alternative 4 would result in the complete demolition of the historic Viaduct Complex, which is eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP).

While this build alternative would meet the project’s purpose and need, it would cause significant adverse impacts by completely demolishing the 4(f) resource. This alternative would cause major community and community disruptions and require some right-of-way acquisitions and relocations. This alternative and economically and environmentally inferior to the proposed project, and has been withdrawn from further consideration.

Build Alternative 5 – New Bridge at an Adjacent New Location

Build Alternative 5 would provide a replacement bridge, for the existing Viaduct Complex, on either side of the Complex. The existing Viaduct Complex would remain in place and retain its historic fabric, but would not be seismically improved. Moreover, Build Alternative 5 would not cure the design or seismic defects of the existing Complex.

This alternative was considered but withdrawn from further consideration because it failed to meet project purpose and need. Moreover, this alternative would require extensive right-of-way acquisition and reconfiguration of the entire street system at both ends of the Viaduct Complex. This alternative does not address the seismic concerns of the 4(f) resource, and is anticipated to result in significant environmental impact and cost.

3.0 Purpose and Need

Purpose

The purpose of the proposed project is to:

- Reduce vulnerability of the Glendale Boulevard-Hyperion Avenue viaduct complex in major earthquake events
- Resolve design deficiencies of the Glendale Boulevard-Hyperion Avenue viaduct complex
- Improve traffic circulation to improve the operational efficiency of the viaduct complex
Need
The Glendale-Hyperion Viaduct Complex has a sufficiency rating of 72, which classifies it as “functionally obsolete” under the FHWA ranking criteria. With the exception of the Waverly Drive Bridge, each of the bridge structures of the complex requires seismic retrofitting to meet current design standards of the City of Los Angeles and State of California. In addition to the need to seismically upgrade the complex, existing geometric configurations of the several complex structures do not meet current design standards for operational safety. The current viaduct complex presents a risk to public safety due to design-related deficiencies and unacceptable vulnerability to damage under recently revised maximum credible earthquake (MCE) design criteria.

This Programmatic 4(f) Determination is part of a complete Initial Study/Environmental Assessment for the Glendale Hyperion Bridge structures. Additional details regarding the Purpose and Need for the bridge improvements are in Chapter 1, Purpose and Need of that document.

4.0 Description of Section 4(f) Property

The Glendale Boulevard – Hyperion Avenue Viaduct Complex (Viaduct Complex) is located between Atwater Village in the Northeast Los Angeles Community Planning Area and the Hollywood Community Planning Area of the City of Los Angeles. Please see Figure 3-1, Vicinity Map. The Viaduct Complex, completed in 1929, spans the Los Angeles River, Interstate 5 (I-5), and Riverside Drive.

The Viaduct Complex is generally aligned along a southwest-northeast axis and is bounded by Ettrick Street on the south and and Glenhurst Avenue on the north, respectively. A portion of the Hyperion Avenue Viaduct (531069) spans I-5 and is under the jurisdiction of the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans). Of the six structures comprising the Viaduct Complex, this is the only component that is part of the State Highway System. The five other structures are under the City’s jurisdiction.

---

3 Glendale Boulevard-Hyperion Avenue Complex of Bridges Improvement Project Initial Study-Environmental Assessment (IS-EA), 2012.
Figure 3-1 Vicinity Map

The six structures that comprise the Viaduct Complex have been determined, in their entirety, to be eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). The City of Los Angeles Bureau of Engineering (LABOE) designed and constructed the Viaduct Complex between 1927 and 1929. The Viaduct Complex is noted for its innovative design techniques and as a bold engineering achievement. It is also noteworthy for its aesthetic quality and use of neo-classical forms.

The Viaduct Complex is eligible for inclusion in the NRHP under Criteria A and C. It is significant as one of the twelve historic bridges over the Los Angeles River and provided an
efficient solution to a serious traffic problem. It is also significant as an example of neoclassical
design and as a work of the LABOE, now seen as the most historically significant municipal
bridge design department in California and a master designer.

Descriptions of the Viaduct Complex’s six structures, including Bridge Identification Numbers,
are included below.

**Waverly Drive Bridge over Hyperion Avenue (Bridge Number 53C-1179)** – The 65-feet-
long earth-filled reinforced concrete arch structure is two lanes wide, with a flush roadway and
pedestrian walkways on both sides of the bridge. Enclosing the bridge are railings which have
solid concrete finish with inset panels that covered the original balusters. Cast bronze lanterns
with glass globes are set at each corner of the bridge.

**Hyperion Avenue over Riverside Drive (Bridge Number 53C-1882)** – The portion of the
Glendale-Hyperion Viaduct Complex that carries Hyperion Avenue over Riverside Drive is also
a reinforced concrete arch bridge. It includes three arch spans with a total length of 429 feet.
The Hyperion Avenue structure accommodates four traffic lanes and is 63 feet wide Support for
the structure is provided by two reinforced concrete abutments and two reinforced concrete
piers. The main span is an open spandrel arch measuring 135 feet. Two additional filled
spandrel arches, each measuring 118 feet, make up the length of the bridge. Pedestrian
walkways flank both sides of the roadway along Riverside Drive. The structure has solid
reinforced concrete railings with decorative inset panels and a smooth concrete finish, which
cover the original baluster railing. Two reinforced concrete octagonal-shaped pylons, capped
with tile copings, are located at the east end of the main span.

**Hyperion Avenue over Interstate 5 (Bridge Number 53-1069)** – The segment of the Viaduct
Complex that carries Hyperion Avenue over I-5 (Golden State Freeway) is a single span,
reinforced concrete, open spandrel arch that is 135 feet long. It carries four lanes of traffic and is
71 feet wide with cantilevered walkways flanking the roadway. Like the other portions of the
Glendale-Hyperion Viaduct Complex, the original balustrades have been covered by a smooth
solid reinforced concrete finish with inset panels. Octagonal shaped pylons with tile copings
along the tops are located at each end of the span. Decorative bronze-cast lanterns and glass
globes, like those on the other spans, are set on the railings.

**Hyperion Avenue over the Los Angeles River (Bridge Number 53C-1881)** – Composed of
nine spans with a total length of 518 feet, the Hyperion Avenue Bridge over the Los Angeles
River is composed of reinforced concrete filled spandrel arches. The bridge carries four lanes of
traffic and is 68 feet wide. It is supported by three reinforced concrete abutments and seven
reinforced concrete piers, each crowned with octagonal pylons. The main span of the bridge is
68 feet wide and each of the eight additional arch spans is 48 feet wide. Cantilevered walkways
flank the roadway. Solid reinforced concrete railings having decorative inset panels and a
smooth concrete finish are present. These railings are identical to those found on other portions
of the Viaduct Complex along Hyperion Avenue. This bridge is flanked by the structures that
carry northbound and southbound Glendale Boulevard over the Los Angeles River.

**Southbound Glendale Boulevard Bridge over the Los Angeles River (Bridge Number 53C-
1883)** – The southbound Glendale Boulevard Bridge over the Los Angeles River segment of the
Glendale-Hyperion Viaduct Complex consists of six reinforced concrete arch spans with a total
length of 316 feet. Each is a filled spandrel arch measuring 48 feet long. Reinforced concrete
abutments and piers support the bridge. The bridge supports two traffic lanes within a total
width of 38 feet and is flanked by flush walkways that are situated next to solid reinforced concrete railings with inset panels and a smooth concrete finish. Concrete pylons are located at the terminus of the bridge and are hexagonal, each topped with tile coping. Decorative lanterns with glass globes are set on the railings.

Northbound Glendale Boulevard Bridge over the Los Angeles River (Bridge Number 53C-1884) – The northbound Glendale Boulevard Bridge over the Los Angeles River segment of the Viaduct Complex is identical to the southbound structure just discussed, except that it sits adjacent to the flow control walls, or river training walls, situated in the river on the south side of the Viaduct Complex.

5.0 Impacts on Section 4(f) Property

Under 36 CFR 800.5(a)(2)(i), an adverse effect is defined as “Physical destruction of or damage to all or part of the property” [emphasis added], which under this alternative is demolition. The elements of the Viaduct Complex that would be affected include many of the character defining features essential to establishing a portion of the bridge’s design as Neo-Classical and thus, essential to the Viaduct Complex’s eligibility for listing in the NRHP. By affecting these original components, the proposed project would potentially alter the bridge’s historic integrity, specifically by changing the design, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association.

Both the Southbound Glendale Boulevard Bridge over the Los Angeles River (53C1883) and the Northbound Glendale Boulevard Bridge over the Los Angeles River (53C1884) would be partially demolished and rebuilt as wider structures as part of this project. These two structures are contributing components of the Glendale-Hyperion Viaduct Complex. The project would remove portions of these structures that are character-defining features of the Viaduct Complex, including the arches and pylons.

No-Build Alternative
Use of Section 4(f) property would not be required under this alternative. Since the status quo would be maintained, no potential adverse impacts would result.

Proposed Action

Construction associated with implementing the bridge improvements and seismic reinforcement would result in construction noise, dust, and traffic lane restrictions. These temporary effects would not diminish the historic integrity of the bridge, as all of its character-defining features would be retained and would not be adversely affected by these types of project impacts. Modifications such as restriping/installation of a pedestrian crosswalk; curb removal, sidewalk work and installation of concrete center barrier and concrete sidewalk barrier on the Hyperion Avenue bridges; replication of original balustrades, reuse and/or replication of existing street lighting, and the seismic retrofit measures will not cause a substantial adverse change to the historical resource. These elements of the project will not materially alter in an adverse manner the historical resource’s physical characteristics that convey its historical significance and justify its inclusion in the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR).

Both the Glendale Boulevard bridges (53C1883 & 53C1884), which are contributing components of the Glendale-Hyperion Viaduct Complex, would be widened. This would involve removing the decorative facade of the arches, which are character-defining features, and replicating them in the widened structure. The decorative pylons, also character-defining, would be repositioned on the widened structure to match the original appearance.
**Air Quality**

The proposed project would not increase traffic throughput or increase the capacity of the viaduct complex (see Section 2.10 Air Quality of Initial Study/Environmental Assessment), no increases in criteria pollutants would result that could cause adverse impacts to air quality.
Furthermore, operation of the proposed project would not result in an incremental increase of greenhouse gases relative to the No-Build Alternative. The reconfiguration of the northbound I-5 off-ramp to Glendale Boulevard would also result in a reduction in total vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and a corresponding reduction in related vehicle emissions, including greenhouse gases. The new signalized intersection at the reconfigured northbound I-5 off-ramp would operate at a free flowing level, and no CO or particulate matter hotspots are expected to occur from project operation. Similarly, this new intersection is not expected to result in PM$_{10}$ or PM$_{2.5}$ hotspots.

**Accessibility**

Roadway construction along Riverside Drive, Glendale Boulevard, and Hyperion Avenue would require the temporary closure of one or more travel lanes; however, at least one lane in each direction would always be maintained, as would access to adjacent properties and land uses along Glendale Boulevard and Riverside Drive. Pedestrian access across the Glendale Boulevard Bridges over the Los Angeles River during construction would be prohibited, but access to nearby structures would not be prohibited. Because access to local streets would be maintained during construction, residential and commercial land uses would not be adversely affected.

Substantial improvements would be made to the currently inadequate pedestrian facilities on Hyperion Avenue and Glendale Boulevard. The widening of Glendale Boulevard bridges would provide room for widened sidewalks and curb lane plus the addition of a curbside shoulder. The sidewalk upgrades would not only facilitate mobility for pedestrians but improve safety by placement of a concrete vehicular barrier. These changes would have an overall positive effect.

**Noise**

Noise impacts from construction of the proposed project are a function of the noise generated by construction equipment, the location and sensitivity of nearby receptors, and the timing and duration of noise-generating activities. During the Glendale Boulevard Bridge widening, the loudest construction noise levels are expected to result from demolition of the sides (rails) of the bridge structures and construction of the substructure and superstructure improvements. Construction of the proposed project would be conducted over an approximately 30-month period and the noise levels generated would depend upon construction activities in different construction phases (see Section 2.11 Noise of the Initial Study/Environmental Assessment). These construction phases are expected to represent the worst-case phase from a noise standpoint because they involve the highest number of pieces of construction equipment and equipment having the greatest noise-generating characteristics.

**Vegetation**

The bridge widening would require tapering of the new bridge width to the current roadway width along northbound Glendale Boulevard (just north of the bridge), which would require the use of a narrow sliver of the landscaped median known to the local community as a “Red Car River Park” green space. The majority of this landscaped median would remain unaffected during construction. Any disruption to the existing planting irrigation system would be properly restored and any vegetation removed would be replanted.

**Visual**

The existing covered railing system would be removed and replaced with railings that replicate the original balustrade design. This is seen as an improvement over the existing railing system, which is currently damaged and in a state of disrepair. The installation of replica balustrades, the most important project element that helps preserve the Viaduct Complex’s historic character, would return a key feature of the property’s classically-inspired design.
The replacement of the existing center divider with a concrete median barrier as well as crash-resistant protective barriers would partially conceal the restored railing, but the effect would be an improvement in the overall visual character of the viaduct complex because portions of the new balustrades would be visible from Hyperion Avenue, and fully visible from external viewpoints.

Widening of the Glendale Boulevard bridges necessitates removal of the decorative façade of the arches of each bridge and repositioning of the pylons. Though the façade and original railing design will be replicated and the pylons will be preserved and repositioned, the widening will change the appearance of the bridges, thus causing an adverse effect.

6.0 Applicability

As documented below, the proposed project meets the applicability criteria and the required findings of the Programmatic Section 4(f) Evaluation and Approval for FHWA Projects that Necessitate the Use of Historic Bridges (1983). The applicability criteria and required findings are presented in the text below.

1. The bridge is to be replaced or rehabilitated with Federal funds
2. The project will require the use of a historic bridge structure which is on or is eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places
3. The bridge is not a National Historic Landmark
4. The FHWA Division Administrator determines that the facts of the project match those set forth in the sections of this document labeled Alternatives, Findings and Mitigation
5. A Memorandum of Agreement between the SHPO and Caltrans that addresses minimization measures was executed on October 30, 2012.

The bridge is to be replaced or rehabilitated with Federal funds.

The geometric configuration issues or deficiencies have qualified the Viaduct Complex for inclusion on the EBL for funding under the federal HBP. The HBP is intended to ensure that the Nation’s highway bridges are safe for vehicular use. The program is administered by the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) under delegated authority from the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA). Bridges are determined eligible for funding based upon inspections and evaluations by Caltrans and a scoring system developed by FHWA. The current funding amount scheduled to complete the bridge improvement is approximately $35,595,000.4

The project will require the use of a historic bridge structure which is on or is eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP).

The six structures that comprise the Viaduct Complex have been determined, in their entirety, to be eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). The Viaduct Complex was determined eligible for listing by the NRHP as part of the Caltrans Historic Bridge Inventory of 19885 under Criterion C as a significant example of innovative design techniques

5 Since updated and available online at http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/strustr/strmaint/historic.htm.
and bold engineering achievement that was used to ease the bottlenecks of a complex traffic pattern. It is also noteworthy for its aesthetic quality and use of neo-classical forms.\(^6\)

**The bridge is not a National Historic Landmark.**
The Viaduct Complex is not a National Historic Landmark listed on the U.S. Department of Interior’s database.

**The FHWA Division Administrator determines that the facts of the project match those set forth in the sections of this document labeled Alternatives, Findings and Mitigation**

FHWA’s responsibility for environmental review, consultation, and any other action required in accordance with applicable federal laws for this project is being, or has been, carried out by Caltrans under its assumption of responsibility pursuant to 23 U.S.C. 327(a)(2)(A). Hence, Caltrans, as the agency assuming responsibility for environmental review, consultation and coordination of this project, has reviewed and determined the facts of the project match those set forth in the sections of this document labeled Avoidance Alternatives and Other Findings, and Measures to Minimize Harm. The proposed action will impair the southbound and northbound Glendale Boulevard bridges over the Los Angeles River (53C1883 & 53C1884) by rehabilitation and demolition. The proposed action would have an adverse effect under Section 106, as concurred by SHPO. (See Cultural Resources Section 2.6.3.2 Permanent Impacts)

**Agreement among the FHWA, the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO), and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) has been reached through procedures pursuant to Section 106 of the NHPA.**

Caltrans has consulted with SHPO about the project in accordance with the Programmatic Agreement among the Federal Highway Administration, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, State Historic Preservation Officer, and the California Department of Transportation regarding compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. On May 5, 2009\(^7\), the SHPO concurred that the Glendale Boulevard-Hyperion Avenue Viaduct Complex Improvement Project would result in an adverse effect on the Complex. A Memorandum of Agreement between Caltrans, as assigned by the FHWA, and the SHPO that addresses minimization measures was executed on October 30, 2012 (see Appendix H).

**7.0 Avoidance Alternatives and Other Findings**
The following alternatives would avoid use of the historic bridge structures:

1. Do nothing.
2. Build a new structure at a different location without affecting the historic integrity of the old bridge, as determined by procedures implementing the NHPA.
3. Rehabilitate the historic bridge without affecting the historic integrity of the structure, as determined by procedures implementing the NHPA.

The facts and circumstances below support the findings required for the programmatic evaluation:

1. **Do Nothing** – The No-Build Alternative has been considered and evaluated, but would not meet the project purpose and need. No improvements to the viaduct complex would

---

\(^6\) JRP Historical Consulting. Caltrans Inventory of Concrete Arch Bridges, Bridge Inspection Report, 2004.

be undertaken, including seismic retrofit/rehabilitation. The existing viaduct complex would remain seismically deficient and remain vulnerable to earthquake-induced forces, deformations, and possible failures. In the event of an earthquake, the existing structures would continue to pose a level of hazard to the public using the viaduct that is greater than would be the case for a structure rehabilitated to current seismic performance standards. The Do Nothing Alternative would not meet the project purpose and need, as discussed in Section 1.2.

2. **Build on New Location Without Using the Old Bridge** - Investigations have been conducted to construct a bridge on a new location or parallel to the old bridge (allowing for a one-way couplet), but eliminated for one or more of the following reason:

Build Alternative 5 was identified to provide a replacement bridge for the existing Viaduct Complex, on either side of the Complex. The existing 4(f) resource would remain in place and retain its historic fabric, but would not be seismically improved. Moreover, Build Alternative 5 would not cure the design or seismic defects of the existing complex.

Glendale Boulevard and Hyperion Avenue are highways within an extensive transportation network of a highly urbanized area. The viaduct complex, at its existing location, is the only feasible and prudent site, since it is provides an important linkage between the established communities of Atwater Village and Silver Lake. This alternative reconfiguration of the entire street system at both ends of the viaduct complex, and cause extraordinary disruption to established traffic patterns. This alternative would also require extensive right-of-way acquisition from an established community, and result in displacement of a significant number of families and businesses.

3. **Rehabilitate the historic bridge without affecting the historic integrity of the structure, as determined by procedures implementing the NHPA**

Studies have been conducted of rehabilitation measures. The Build Alternative 1-Seismic Retrofit Only would sufficiently strengthen the existing viaduct complex to meet current seismic performance standards without altering the current geometric configuration. Aside from seismic improvement described in Section 1.3.1.5 of the Initial Study/Environmental Assessment, no other improvements would be provided and it would not meet the project goal of removing the viaduct complex from the EBL under the HBP. But, for one or more of the following reasons, this alternative is not feasible and prudent. It fails to meet the project’s purpose and need objectives.

With the exception of the Waverly Drive Bridge, each of the bridge structures of the complex requires seismic retrofitting to meet current design standards of the City of Los Angeles and State of California. The existing geometric configurations of several of the Complex’s structures also do not meet current design standards for operational safety.

The following design-related deficiencies are common to all structures and would remain unaddressed under this alternative:

- Inadequate curb-to-curb width to meet major highway design standards.
- Inadequate vertical clearance beneath the Hyperion Bridge (53C-1881 along northbound and southbound Interstate 5.
• Absence of shoulders.
• Deteriorated railings.
• Inadequate pedestrian facilities along Hyperion Avenue and Glendale Boulevard.
• Non-standard sight distance at terminus of I-5 Northbound Off-Ramp
• Non-standard sight distance at entrance to I-5 Southbound On-Ramp

8.0 Measures to Minimize Harm

Measures to minimize harm to the Section 4(f) property are discussed in Chapter 2 of the IS/EA. Listed below is a brief summary of the mitigation and least harm measures to minimize impact on 4(f) historical resources.

H-1: Recordation to Historic American Engineering Record (HAER) Specifications: Prior to the start of any work that could adversely affect characteristics that qualify the Glendale-Hyperion Viaduct Complex as a historic property, contact the National Park Service Pacific West Region Office (NPS), to determine if additional recordation is required for the historic property beyond that provided in “Historic American Engineering Record, Glendale-Hyperion Viaduct, HAER No. CA-272,” 2000-2001. NPS should respond to the additional recordation request within 30 days. If additional documentation is required, it should be completed and accepted by the NPS before the viaduct is altered. Prepare draft and final reports.

H-2: Historic American Buildings Survey (HABS)/HAER Dissemination: Upon completion of the documentation prescribed in Mitigation Measure H-1, documentation meeting current archival quality standards established by the NPS’ Heritage Documentation Program to Caltrans District 7 and the Caltrans Transportation History Library in Sacramento shall be provided. Archive quality documentation shall also be provided to NPS, if NPS requests it. Copies of the documentation shall be offered to, at a minimum, the Los Angeles Public Library, Los Angeles Conservancy, Los Angeles City Historical Society, Historical Society of Southern California, and the California Office of Historic Preservation.

H-3: Online Publication: Work with the Los Angeles Public Library to place the historical information from the HAER report, prescribed in Mitigation Measure H-1, on City of Los Angeles website with a link to a public library website, such as the Los Angeles Public Library website, available to the public for a minimum period of three years. The information link shall also be made available to the Caltrans Transportation Library and History Center at Caltrans Headquarters in Sacramento for inclusion on their website.

H-4: Video Documentary: Produce a documentary (motion picture or video) that addresses the history of the Los Angeles River monument bridges, and their importance and use within the broader contextual history of the City of Los Angeles. The motion picture or video shall be of broadcast quality, between 30- and 90-minute duration, and shall be made available to local broadcast stations, public access channels in the local cable systems, and requesting schools/libraries; one copy shall be submitted to the Caltrans Transportation Library and History Center at Caltrans Headquarters in Sacramento.
H-5: **Traveling Exhibits:** Produce and publish a booklet on the Historic Los Angeles River Bridges that addresses the history of the monumental concrete bridges of Los Angeles and this bridge’s place in that history. The booklet shall be similar in general format to the “Historic Highway Bridges of California” published by the California Department of Transportation (1991) and shall include high-quality, black and white images of the Los Angeles River Bridges, historic photographs or drawings, as appropriate, and text describing each of the bridges’ location, year built, builder, bridge type, significant character-defining features and its historic significance. Ensure that an electronic version of the booklet is posted on a City website and produce paper copies for distribution to local libraries, institutions and historical societies. One copy shall be submitted to the Caltrans Transportation Library and History Center in Sacramento. Ensure that the camera-ready master booklet is maintained and produce additional copies if there is demand.

H-6: **Replication of Design Elements:** Ensure that a Caltrans Professionally Qualified Staff Principal Architectural Historian reviews the 65% and 95% design plans and specifications for the Glendale-Hyperion Viaduct Complex for conformance with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties (SOI Standards), and that SHPO is afforded the opportunity to review the same design plans and specifications. Failure of the SHPO to respond within thirty (30) calendar days after receipt of the plans shall not preclude Caltrans from proceeding with the undertaking. Should the SHPO or the Council object within thirty (30) calendar days to any plans and specifications submitted for review, then Caltrans shall consult with the objecting party, for a period not to exceed ten (10) calendar days, to resolve the objection. If the objection cannot be resolved within this time period, the FHWA shall request the Council review the Finding in accordance with 36 CFR 800.5(c)(3).

9.0 **Coordination**

Caltrans submitted the Finding of Effect for this project to SHPO, who concurred with the finding of adverse effect in May 2009. Attached is the letter from the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) concurring the Glendale Boulevard-Hyperion Avenue Viaduct Complex Improvement Project would have an adverse effect on the Glendale-Hyperion Viaduct Complex. Another letter shows the City of Los Angeles’ concurrence on the use evaluation of the historic bridge structures and proposed measures to minimize harm. The City of Los Angeles has jurisdiction and ownership of five bridges and the final bridge segment (53-1069) is under the ownership of Caltrans.

The Memorandum of Agreement between Caltrans and the SHPO was executed on October 30, 2012. A copy is attached.

10.0 **Concluding Statement**

Given the above considerations, there is no feasible and prudent alternative to the use of land from the Viaduct Complex. The proposed action includes all possible planning to minimize harm to the Viaduct Complex resulting from such use.
11.0 Letters and Other Correspondence
4(f) Concurrence Letter from City
February 9, 2012

Mr. Carlos Montez, Branch Chief
Division of Environmental Planning
District 7, California Department of Transportation
100 South Main Street
Los Angeles, California 90012

Dear Mr. Montez,

Programmatic 4(f) Evaluation for Glendale Boulevard-Hyperion Avenue Complex of Bridges Improvement Project – City concurrence on use evaluation and proposed measures to minimize harm

The City of Los Angeles is the project proponent for the Glendale Boulevard-Hyperion Avenue Complex of Bridges Improvement Project and also has jurisdiction and ownership of bridges identified in the Caltrans Bridge Inventory as numbers 53C-1179, 53C-1881, 53C-1882, 53C-1883, and 53C-1884. (The final bridge segment included in the complex, 53-1069, is under the ownership of Caltrans.) The complex of bridges is eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places.

The project is subject to Section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act, which requires the property owner and the agency with jurisdiction over the resource to concur that there are no feasible and prudent alternatives to the use of the historic bridge structures to be rehabilitated with federal funds and that the project includes all possible planning to minimize harm resulting from such use. The Bureau of Engineering, as the City of Los Angeles entity with jurisdiction over bridges in the public right of way, hereby concurs.

Questions regarding this concurrence may be referred to Mr. Wenn Chyn, Project Manager, at (213) 485-1455.

Sincerely,

James Treadaway
Program Manager
Bridge Improvement Program
SHPO Section 106 Concurrence Letter
May 5, 2009

Gregory P. King, Chief
Cultural and Community Studies Office
Division of Environmental Analysis, MS 27
PO Box 942874
Sacramento, CA 94274-0001

Re: Finding of Adverse Effect for the Glendale Avenue-Hyperion Boulevard Viaduct Complex Improvement Project, Los Angeles, CA

Dear Mr. King:

Thank you for consulting with me about the subject undertaking in accordance with the Programmatic Agreement Among the Federal Highway Administration, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, the California State Historic Preservation Officer, and the California Department of Transportation Regarding Compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, as it Pertains to the Administration of the Federal-Aid Highway Program in California (PA).

The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) is requesting my concurrence, pursuant to Stipulation X.C.1. of the PA, that the above undertaking would have an adverse effect on the Glendale Hyperion Viaduct Complex, a property determined eligible for the National Register of Historic Places in 1987 and again in 2004 as part of the Caltrans Historic Bridge Inventory. Based on my review of the submitted documentation, I concur.

I look forward to working with Caltrans to develop a Memorandum of Agreement for this undertaking.

Thank you for considering historic properties during project planning. If you have any questions, please contact Natalie Lindquist of my staff at (916) 654-0631 or email at nlindquist@parks.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

Milford Wayne Donaldson, FAIA
State Historic Preservation Officer
Memorandum of Agreement
MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT
BETWEEN THE CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
AND THE CALIFORNIA STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICER
REGARDING THE
GLENDALE BOULEVARD – HYPERION AVENUE VIADUCT
COMPLEX IMPROVEMENT PROJECT
CITY OF LOS ANGELES, LOS ANGELES COUNTY, CALIFORNIA

WHEREAS, the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) has assigned and the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) has assumed FHWA responsibility for environmental review, consultation, and coordination pursuant to 23 USC 327, which became effective on October 1, 2012 and applies to this undertaking; and

WHEREAS, Caltrans has determined that the Glendale Boulevard – Hyperion Avenue Viaduct Complex Improvement Project, City of Los Angeles, Los Angeles County, California (Undertaking), will have an adverse effect on the Glendale-Hyperion Viaduct Complex, which is comprised of six structures - Bridges 53 1069, 53C1179, 53C1881, 53C1882, 53C1883, 53C1884, a property determined to be eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places (National Register); and

WHEREAS, Caltrans has consulted with the California State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) pursuant to Stipulations X.C., and X.I of the January 2004 Programmatic Agreement among the Federal Highway Administration, The Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, The California State Historic Preservation Officer, and the California Department of Transportation Regarding Compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, as it Pertains to the Administration of the Federal-Aid Highway Program in California (PA), and where the PA so directs, in accordance with 36 CFR Part 800, the regulations implementing Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (16 USC Section 470f), as amended (NHPA), regarding the Undertaking’s effects on the historic property and has notified the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (Council) of the adverse effect finding pursuant to 36 CFR§800.6(a)(1), and the Council declined to participate per their July 13, 2009 letter; and

WHEREAS, Caltrans has thoroughly considered alternatives to the Undertaking, has determined that the statutory and regulatory constraints on the design of the Undertaking preclude the possibility of avoiding adverse effects to the Glendale-Hyperion Viaduct Complex during the Undertaking’s implementation, and has further determined that it will resolve adverse effects of the Undertaking on the subject historic property through execution and implementation of this Memorandum of Agreement (MOA); and

WHEREAS, Caltrans District 7 (District 7) and the City of Los Angeles (City) have participated in the consultation process and have been invited to concur in this MOA;

NOW, THEREFORE, Caltrans and the SHPO agree that, upon Caltrans’ decision to proceed
with the Undertaking, Caltrans shall ensure that the Undertaking is implemented in accordance with the following stipulations in order to take into account the effect of the Undertaking on the historic property, and further agrees that these stipulations shall govern the Undertaking and all of its parts until this MOA expires or is terminated.

STIPULATIONS

I. AREA OF POTENTIAL EFFECTS

A. The Undertaking’s area of potential effects (APE) is included as Attachment A to this MOA. The APE includes the public right-of-way that encompasses the boundaries of the viaduct complex with the widened Glendale Boulevard bridges over the Los Angeles River, encompassing the geographic area within which the undertaking may directly or indirectly cause alterations in the character or use of the historic property. Attachment A set forth hereunder may be amended through consultation among the MOA parties without amending the MOA.

II. TREATMENT OF HISTORIC PROPERTIES

A. Prior to the start of any work that could adversely affect characteristics that qualify the Glendale-Hyperion Viaduct Complex (Bridges 53 1069, 53C1179, 53C1881, 53C1882, 53C1883, 53C1884) as a historic property, the City shall contact the National Park Service Pacific West Region Office (NPS), to determine if additional recordation is required for the historic property beyond that provided in “Historic American Engineering Record, Glendale-Hyperion Viaduct, HAER No. CA-272,” 2000-2001. The City shall provide NPS 30 days to respond to their additional recordation determination request. If additional documentation is required, Caltrans shall ensure that the additional documentation is completed and accepted by NPS before the Viaduct is altered. The City shall prepare draft and final reports to be reviewed by Caltrans and NPS.

B. Upon completion of the documentation prescribed in subsection A, the City shall provide the documentation meeting current archival quality standards established by the NPS’ Heritage Documentation Program to District 7 and the Caltrans Transportation History Library in Sacramento. The City shall also provide the archive quality documentation to NPS, if NPS requests it. Copies of the documentation shall be offered by the City to, at a minimum, the Los Angeles Public Library, Los Angeles Conservancy, Los Angeles City Historical Society, Historical Society of Southern California, and the California Office of Historic Preservation.

C. The City shall work with the Los Angeles Public Library to place the historical information from the HAER report, prescribed in subsection A, on a City website with a link to a public library website, such as the Los Angeles Public Library website, available to the public for a minimum period of three years. The information link shall also be made available to the Caltrans Transportation Library and History Center at Caltrans.
Headquarters in Sacramento for inclusion on their website.

D. The City shall produce a documentary (motion picture or video) that addresses the history of the Los Angeles River monument bridges, and their importance and use within the broader contextual history of the City of Los Angeles. The motion picture or video shall be of broadcast quality, between 30- and 90-minute duration, and shall be made available to local broadcast stations, public access channels in the local cable systems, and requesting schools/libraries; one copy shall be submitted to the Caltrans Transportation Library and History Center at Caltrans Headquarters in Sacramento.

E. The City shall produce and publish a booklet on the Historic Los Angeles River Bridges that addresses the history of the monumental concrete bridges of Los Angeles and this bridge’s place in that history. The booklet shall be similar in general format to the “Historic Highway Bridges of California” published by the California Department of Transportation (1991) and shall include high-quality, black and white images of the Los Angeles River Bridges, historic photographs or drawings, as appropriate, and text describing each of the bridges’ location, year built, builder, bridge type, significant character-defining features and its historic significance. City shall ensure that an electronic version of the booklet is posted on a City website and produce paper copies for distribution to local libraries, institutions and historical societies. One copy shall be submitted to the Caltrans Transportation Library and History Center in Sacramento. Caltrans shall ensure that the City maintains the camera-ready master booklet and produce additional copies if there is demand.

F. The City shall submit the 35%, 65% and 95% design plans and specifications for the Glendale-Hyperion Viaduct Complex to District 7 and request review by a Caltrans Professionally Qualified Staff Principal Architectural Historian for conformance with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties (SOI Standards). Caltrans shall be afforded 30 days to complete its review. The SHPO shall be afforded the opportunity to review the same design plans and specifications. Failure of the SHPO to respond within thirty (30) calendar days after receipt of the plans shall not preclude Caltrans from implementing the plans. Should the SHPO or the Council object within thirty (30) calendar days to any plans and specifications submitted for review, then Caltrans shall consult with the objected party, for a period not to exceed ten (10) calendar days, to resolve the objection. If the objection cannot be resolved within this time period, Caltrans shall request the Council review the Finding in accordance with 36 CFR 800.5(c)(3).

G. The City shall prepare a construction monitoring plan and conduct periodic monitoring of construction activities to ensure the project is conducted in a manner that meets the SOI Standards. The City shall provide District 7 a draft construction monitoring plan. District 7 shall have thirty (30) calendar days after receipt of the document to review and comment. The City will address the comments and prepare a final construction monitoring plan. The plan shall include description of the project, description of the
historic property’s character-defining features, discussion of the monitoring’s purpose, and construction activities to be monitored, as well as methods, schedule, and procedures for monitoring and reporting. Caltrans shall ensure that the construction monitoring plan is implemented. Monitoring reports shall include photographs indicating that the activities are in compliance with the SOI Standards. The monitor shall meet the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualifications Standards for Architectural Historian or Historic Architect pursuant to CFR 36 CFR Part 61, Appendix A (PQS Standards).

III. ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

A. Definitions. The definitions provided at 36 CFR §800.16 are applicable throughout this MOA.

B. Professional Qualifications and Standards. Caltrans shall ensure that only individuals meeting the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualifications Standards (48 FR 44738-39) in the appropriate field of study carry out or review appropriateness and quality of the actions and product required by Stipulation II. A in this MOA.

C. Discoveries and Unanticipated Effects. If Caltrans determines during implementation of the terms of this MOA or after construction of the Undertaking has commenced, that the Undertaking will affect a previously unidentified property that may be eligible for listing in the National Register, or affect a known historic property in an unanticipated manner, Caltrans will address the discovery or unanticipated effect in accordance with 36 CFR Part 800.13(b)(3). Caltrans at its discretion may hereunder assume any discovered property to be eligible for inclusion in the National Register in accordance with 36 CFR 800.13 (c).

D. Resolving Objections

1. Should any party to this MOA object at any time in writing to the manner in which the terms of this MOA are implemented, to any action carried out or proposed with respect to implementation of the MOA, or to any document prepared in accordance with and subject to the terms of the MOA, Caltrans shall immediately notify the other parties of the objection, request their comments on the objection within 15 days following receipt of Caltrans’ notification, and proceed to consult with the objecting party for no more than 30 days to resolve the objection. Caltrans will honor the request of any other parties to participate in the consultation and will take any comments provided by those parties into account.

2. If the objection is resolved during the 30 day consultation period, Caltrans may proceed with the disputed action in accordance with the terms of such resolution.

3. If at the end of the 30 day consultation period, Caltrans determines that the objection
cannot be resolved through such consultation, then Caltrans shall forward all
documentation relevant to the objection to the Council, including Caltrans’ proposed
response to the objection, with the expectation that the Council will, within 30 days
after receipt of such documentation:

a. Advise Caltrans that the Council concurs in Caltrans’ proposed response to the
objection, whereupon Caltrans will respond to the objection accordingly. The
objection shall thereby be resolved; or

b. Provide Caltrans with recommendations, which Caltrans will take into account in
reaching a final decision regarding its response to the objection. The objection
shall thereby be resolved; or

c. Notify Caltrans that the objection will be referred for comment pursuant to 36
CFR Part 800.7(c) and proceed to refer the objection and comment. Caltrans shall
take the resulting comments into account in accordance with 36 CFR 800.7(c)(4)
and Section 110(1) of the NHPA. The objection shall thereby be resolved.

4. Should the Council not exercise one of the above options within 30 days after receipt
of all pertinent documentation, Caltrans may implement their proposed response. The
objection shall thereby be resolved.

5. Caltrans shall take into account any of the Council’s recommendations or comments
provided in accordance with this stipulation with reference only to the subject of the
objection. Caltrans’ responsibility to carry out all other actions under this MOA that
are not the subject of the objection shall remain unchanged.

6. At any time during implementation of the measures stipulated in this MOA, should a
member of the public raise an objection in writing pertaining to such implementation
to any signatory party to this MOA, that signatory party shall immediately notify the
other signatory party in writing of the objection. Either signatory party may choose to
comment in writing on the objection to the other signatory party. Caltrans shall
establish a reasonable time frame for this comment period. Caltrans shall consider the
objection, and in reaching its decision, Caltrans will take all comments from the other
signatory party into account. Within 15 days following closure of the comment
period, Caltrans will render a decision regarding the objection and respond to the
objecting party. Caltrans will promptly notify the other signatory party of its decision
in writing, including a copy of the response to the objecting party. Caltrans’ decision
regarding resolution of the objection will be final. Following issuance of its final
decision, Caltrans may authorize the action subject to dispute hereunder to proceed in
accordance with the terms of that decision.

7. Caltrans shall provide all parties to this MOA, and the Council, if the Council has
commented, and any parties that have objected pursuant to Section D.6 of the
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stipulation, with a copy of its final written decision regarding any objection addressed pursuant to this stipulation.

8. Caltrans may authorize any action subject to objection under this stipulation to proceed after the objection has been resolved in accordance with the terms of this stipulation.

E. Amendments

Any signatory party to this MOA may propose that this MOA be amended, whereupon all signatory parties shall consult to consider such amendment. The amendment will be effective on the date a copy signed by all of the original signatories is filed with the Council. If the signatories cannot agree to appropriate terms to amend the MOA, any signatory may terminate the agreement in accordance with Stipulation III. F, below.

F. Termination

1. If this MOA is not amended as provided for in section E of this stipulation, or if either signatory party proposes termination of this MOA for other reasons, the signatory party proposing termination shall, in writing, notify the other MOA parties, explain the reasons for proposing termination, and consult with the other parties for at least 30 days to seek alternatives to termination. Such consultation shall not be required if Caltrans proposes termination because the Undertaking no longer meets the definition set forth in 36 CFR Part 800.16(y).

2. Should such consultation result in an agreement on an alternative to termination, the signatory parties shall proceed in accordance with the terms of that agreement.

3. Should such consultation fail, the signatory party proposing termination may terminate this MOA by promptly notifying the other parties in writing. Termination hereunder shall render this MOA without further force or effect.

4. If this MOA is terminated hereunder, and if Caltrans determines that the Undertaking will nonetheless proceed, then Caltrans shall comply with the requirements of 36 CFR Part 800.3-800.6.

G. Duration of the MOA

1. Unless terminated pursuant to section F of this stipulation, or unless it is superseded by an amended MOA, this MOA will be in effect following execution by the signatory parties until Caltrans, in consultation with the other signatory party, determines that all of its stipulations have been satisfactorily fulfilled.

2. The terms of this MOA shall be satisfactorily fulfilled within ten (10) years
following the date of execution by the signatory parties. If Caltrans determines that this requirement cannot be met, the MOA parties will consult to reconsider its terms. Reconsideration may include continuation of the MOA as originally executed, amendment of the MOA or termination. In the event of termination, Caltrans will comply with section F.4 of this stipulation, if it determines that the Undertaking will proceed notwithstanding termination of this MOA.

3. If the Undertaking has not been implemented within five (5) years following execution of this MOA, this MOA shall automatically terminate and have no further force or effect. In such event, Caltrans shall notify the other signatory parties in writing and, if it chooses to continue with the Undertaking, shall reinstate review of the Undertaking in accordance with 36 CFR Part 800.

H. Progress Reports. The City will prepare semi-annual progress reports regarding the stipulation measures, to be circulated among the signatories.

I. Effective Date

This MOA will take effect on the date that it has been executed by Caltrans and the SHPO.

EXECUTION of this MOA by Caltrans and the SHPO, its filing with the Council in accordance with 36 CFR§800.6(b)(l)(iv), and subsequent implementation of its terms, shall evidence, pursuant to 36 CFR§800.6(c), that Caltrans has afforded the Council an opportunity to comment on the Undertaking and its effects on historic properties, and that Caltrans has taken into account the effects of the Undertaking on historic properties.
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Appendix B2 Resources Evaluated Relative to the Requirements of Section 4(f)

This section of the document discusses the parks, recreational facilities, and trails found within or adjacent to the Glendale Boulevard-Hyperion Avenue Complex of Bridges Improvement Project (“proposed project”) area that do not trigger Section 4(f) protection either because: 1) they are not publicly owned, 2) they are not open to the public, 3) they are not eligible historic properties, 4) the project does not permanently use the property and does not hinder the preservation of the property, or 5) the proximity impacts do not result in constructive use.

Each potential 4(f) resource has been independently evaluated below and the location of each potential resource evaluated has been included on Figure 1, Resources Evaluated Relative to Section 4(f).

1.0 LA River Bike Path

The Los Angeles River Bike Path is located along the top of the right bank of the Los Angeles River within the City of Los Angeles right-of-way, and is classified as a Class I bicycle path in the 2010 Bicycle Plan, a component of the Transportation Element of the City’s General Plan. The bike path is an integral part of the local transportation system, and is utilized for both commuter and recreational purposes.

As discussed in the environmental document, the proposed project would require the temporary rerouting of the Los Angeles River Bike Path, which would occur prior to construction so that bike path use can be maintained. A bicycle pedestrian ramp linking the bike path with NB Glendale Boulevard would also be constructed, utilizing the current location of the I-5 NB off-ramp terminus, as part of this project. The project would not permanently incorporate land from the bike path, and would result only in a temporary occupancy of the bike path.

The proposed project would result in a temporary occupancy of the bike path, and meets all the conditions set forth in 23 CFR 771.135(p)(7):

a. The occupancy of the bike path during construction would be temporary, and would not exceed the construction period. There would be short-term partial closure of the bike path during off-peak hours during construction. However, the bike path would remain accessible to users. Following construction, the bike path would remain under the City of Los Angeles’s right-of-way, and no change in land ownership would occur as a result of the proposed project.

b. The scope of the work would be minor, and does not involve construction of the bike path. The proposed project would widen the Glendale Boulevard bridges, extending the deck by eight feet, and pier supports upstream and downstream. Construction would be
contained within the Glendale Boulevard Bridge, and would result in temporary narrowing (partial closure) of the bike path. The new bicycle ramp, which links NB Glendale Boulevard to the bike path, would be conducted early in the project construction phase, and can be utilized as an alternative route.

c. There would be no permanent adverse physical impacts to the bike path as a result of the temporary detour during construction and bike path linkage improvements. The commuter and recreational purposes of the bike path would be unaffected, as the proposed project would maintain its alignment and continuity.

d. Following the completion of the seismic improvements, the bike path would be fully restored to the existing condition, and the continuity of the bike path would be restored to pre-construction conditions.

e. The documented agreement from the City of Los Angeles Department of Transportation (LADOT), who has jurisdiction over the bike path, is included as Attachment 1. This agreement specifies that the LADOT concurs the proposed project meets the temporary occupancy conditions set forth in 23 CFR 774.13(d), as described above.

As demonstrated, the temporary occupancy of the Los Angeles River Bike Path meets all the conditions set forth is 23 CFR 771.135(p)(7), and does not constitute the use of a Section 4(f) resource. Therefore, the provisions of Section 4(f) are not triggered.

2.0 Griffith Park

Griffith Park is an official park and recreational facility operated by the Los Angeles Department of Parks and Recreation, and is located approximately 0.15 mile from the project site. It encompasses 4,210 acres, and is situated just west of the Golden State Freeway (I-5), roughly between Los Feliz Boulevard on the south and the Ventura Freeway (SR 134) on the north. Griffith Park provides recreational opportunities and activities throughout the park.

Griffith Park is a 4(f) resource. Please see section 2.1.5, Parks and Recreational Facilities, of the Environmental Document for additional details. The proposed project does not impact Griffith Park. Approximately 30.91 acres of the park are located within a 0.5-mile radius of the proposed project site. No access points within the 30.91 acres lie within a 0.5-mile radius.

| Accessibility | The proposed project does not affect or impact accessibility to Griffith Park. |
| Visual | The visual integrity of Griffith Park would remain. The visual character and view to the surrounding land uses within the project area will be preserved. |
| Noise | The proposed project will not result in noise impacts to Griffith Park. |
| Vegetation | The proposed project will not disturb vegetation within Griffith Park. |
Wildlife  The proposed project will not disturb existing wildlife or wildlife habitat within Griffith Park.

Air Quality  The proposed project will not result in air quality impacts to Griffith Park.

Water Quality  The proposed project will not disturb or impact water quality within Griffith Park.

The proposed project will not “use” Griffith Park, as defined by 23 CFR 771.135(p). The proposed project will not cause a constructive use of Griffith Park because the proximity impacts will not substantially impair the protected activities, features, or attributes of the park. The proposed project also would have no impact on the accessibility, visual quality, noise, vegetation, wildlife, air quality and water quality to either the Park in its entirety or the portion of the Park that lies within 0.5 mile of the project area.

3.0 Equestrian Trail (along the Los Angeles River)

The equestrian trail, located within the City of Los Angeles right-of-way, is located along the top of the left (north) bank of the Los Angeles River, and ends at the Glendale Boulevard Bridges. It is identified in the Citywide Major Equestrian and Hiking Trails Plan. The segment of the equestrian trail within the project area is undeveloped. As specified in the Northeast Los Angeles Community Plan, the equestrian trail is proposed for future completion and connection to trails to serve recreational needs and improve accessibility to other open space resources.

Accessibility  The equestrian trail at this segment has not been implemented, and ends at the Glendale Boulevard Bridges. The proposed project does not affect or impact accessibility to the equestrian trail.

Visual  The visual integrity of the equestrian trail would remain and be unaffected by the proposed project. Therefore, the visual character and view to the surrounding land uses within the project area will be preserved.

Noise  The proposed project will have no noise impacts to the equestrian trail.

Vegetation  The proposed project will not disturb vegetation along the equestrian trail.

Wildlife  The proposed project will not disturb and existing wildlife or wildlife habitat along the equestrian trail.

Air Quality  There will be no air quality impacts to the equestrian trail.

Water Quality  The proposed project will not disturb or impact water quality along the equestrian trail.

The proposed project will not “use” the equestrian trail, as defined by 23 CFR 771.135(p). The proposed project will not cause a constructive use of the equestrian trail because the proximity impacts will not substantially impair the protected activities, features, or attributes of the trail. The proposed project also would have no impact on the accessibility, visual quality, noise, vegetation, wildlife, air quality and water quality to the equestrian trail. Further, the proposed
project would not change the alignment or impair the continuity of the existing or proposed future development of the equestrian trail.

4.0 Sunnynook River Park
Located west of Glendale Boulevard and Los Angeles River, east of I-5, upstream of the project site, is a 3.4-acre parcel for the proposed “Sunnynook River Park.” It is not a state or local-designated park, and would be constructed entirely within the Caltrans right-of-way. It is a priority project of the Los Angeles River Revitalization Master Plan, and is scheduled for construction in 2012.

Caltrans has granted permission to use this right-of-way to the City of Los Angeles Department of Parks and Recreation through an Agreement for Maintenance of Landscape Area Within State Right-of-Way. The agreement has been included as Attachment 2, Agreement for Maintenance of Landscape Area within State Highway Right of Way. Use of the site is granted through Permit No. 708-NLF-1868 between the City of Los Angeles and Caltrans.

In situations where land which is owned by a State DOT or other applicant and designated for future transportation purposes (including highway rights-of-way) is temporarily occupied or being used for either authorized or unauthorized recreational purposes such as for a playground or a trail (bike, snowmobile, hiking, etc.) on property purchased as right-of-way, Section 4(f) does not apply. ¹ Therefore, the provisions of Section 4(f) are not triggered.

5.0 Red Car River Park
Red Car River Park is a triangular-shaped, landscaped median separating the northbound lanes from the two-directional frontage road within the Glendale Boulevard right-of-way. A community group, the “Friends of Atwater Village,” has unofficially designated this median “Red Car River Park.” It is not a state or local designated park or recreation area, and is maintained, as are all other landscaped medians in street rights-of-way, by the City’s Bureau of Street Services.

In situations where land which is owned by a State DOT or other applicant and designated for future transportation purposes (including highway rights-of-way) is temporarily occupied or being used for either authorized or unauthorized recreational purposes such as for a playground or a trail (bike, snowmobile, hiking, etc.) on property purchased as right-of-way, Section 4(f) does not apply. ² Therefore, the provisions of Section 4(f) are not triggered.

² Ibid.
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RESOURCES EVALUATED RELATIVE TO THE REQUIREMENTS OF SECTION 4(f)
July 2, 2012

Tim Fremaux
City of Los Angeles
Department of Transportation
100 S. Main St., 10th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Re: Glendale Boulevard – Hyperion Avenue Complex of Bridges Improvement Project,
Los Angeles, CA, Request for Concurrence on Temporary Occupancy of the Los Angeles River Bike Path

Dear Mr. Fremaux:

The City of Los Angeles (City), in cooperation with the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), proposes to improve the Glendale Boulevard-Hyperion Avenue Viaduct Complex and a portion of the I-5 northbound off-ramp to northbound (NB) Glendale Boulevard in the City of Los Angeles, California. The proposed project includes seismically strengthening the existing viaduct complex, widening the Glendale Boulevard bridges, improving pedestrian and bicycle facilities, replacing railings with replica balustrades, and realigning the I-5 NB off-ramp to NB Glendale Boulevard. As a mitigation measure, the project will also install an alternate pedestrian crossing over the Los Angeles River across the existing Red Car piers.

The Los Angeles River Bike Path is located along the top of the right bank of the Los Angeles River within the City of Los Angeles right-of-way, and is classified as a Class I bicycle path in the 2010 Bicycle Plan, a component of the Transportation Element of the City’s General Plan. The bike path is an integral part of the local transportation system, and is utilized for both commuter and recreational purposes.

Section 4(f) of the US Department of Transportation Act directs that the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) not approve of any project that would require the use of any publicly owned land from a public park, recreation area or wildlife and waterfowl refuge of federal, state, or local significance unless there is no feasible and prudent alternatives to such use (49 USC Section 303 and 23 CFR Part 774). In addition, a temporary occupancy of land does not constitute a use within the meaning of Section 4(f) when the following conditions set forth in 23 C.F.R. 771.135(p)(7) are satisfied:

1. Duration (of the occupancy) must be temporary, i.e., less than the time needed for construction of the project, and there should be no change in ownership of the land;
2. Scope of the work must be minor, i.e., both the nature and the magnitude of the changes to the 4(f) resource are minimal;

3. There are no anticipated permanent adverse physical impacts, nor will there be interference with the activities or purpose of the resource, on either a temporary or permanent basis;

4. The land being used must be fully restored, i.e., the resource must be returned to a condition which is at least as good as that which existed prior to the project; and

5. There must be documented agreement of the appropriate Federal, State, or local officials having jurisdiction over the resource regarding the above conditions.

Two alternatives are being considered for the project: the No Build Alternative, and the Proposed Project.

No Build Alternative

Under the No Build Alternative, the proposed project would not be constructed; therefore, no use of the Los Angeles River Bike Path would occur. The No Build Alternative would not adversely affect the activities, features, and attributes that qualify the Los Angeles River Bike Path for protection under Section 4(f).

Proposed Project

The proposed project includes seismically strengthening the existing viaduct complex, widening the Glendale Blvd bridges, improving pedestrian and bicycle facilities, replacing railings with replica balustrades, and realigning the I-5 NB off-ramp to NB Glendale Boulevard. As a mitigation measure, the project will also install an alternate pedestrian crossing over the Los Angeles River across the existing Red Car piers. Construction of the proposed project is anticipated to last approximately 30 months. The proposed project would require the temporary rerouting of the Los Angeles River Bike Path, which would occur prior to construction so that bike path use can be maintained. A bicycle pedestrian ramp linking the bike path with NB Glendale Boulevard would also be constructed, utilizing the current location of the I-5 NB off-ramp terminus, as part of this project. The project would not permanently incorporate land from the bike path, and would result only in a temporary occupancy of the bike path.

The occupancy of the bike path during construction would be temporary, and would not exceed the construction period. There would be short-term partial closure of the bike path during off-peak hours during construction. However, the bike path would remain accessible to users. Following construction, the bike path would remain under the City of Los Angeles right-of-way, and no change in land ownership would occur as a result of the proposed project.

The scope of the work would be minor, and does not involve construction of the bike path. The proposed project would widen the Glendale Boulevard bridges, extending the deck by eight feet, and pier supports upstream and downstream. Construction would be contained within the Glendale Boulevard Bridge, and would result in temporary narrowing (partial closure) of the bike path. The new bicycle ramp, which links NB Glendale Boulevard to the bike path, would be built early in the project construction phase, and can be utilized as an alternative route.

There would be no permanent adverse physical impacts to the bike path as a result of the temporary detour during construction and bike path linkage improvements. The commuter and recreational purposes of the bike path would be unaffected, as the proposed project would maintain its alignment and continuity.
Following the completion of the seismic improvements, the bike path would be fully restored to its existing condition, and the continuity of the bike path would be restored to pre-construction conditions.

**Temporary Use Determination**

Based upon environmental analyses conducted, and for the reasons described above, it has been determined that project impacts on the Los Angeles River Bike Path would be on a temporary use basis, where the temporary occupancy of land is so minimal that it does not constitute a use within the meaning of Section 4(f), as specified in 23 C.F.R. 771.135(p)(7).

The City Bureau of Engineering and Caltrans would like to request the concurrence of the City Department of Transportation, as the official with 4(f) jurisdiction over the Los Angeles River Bike Path, regarding the conditions discussed above. The proposed project would result in a temporary occupancy on the Los Angeles River Bike Path.

*Please sign below to document your concurrence with this finding. If you have any questions regarding this project or the Los Angeles River Bike Path as a Section 4(f) resource, please feel free to contact me.*

Sincerely,

Linda Moore
Environmental Manager,
Bridge Improvement Program
Environmental Management Group
Bureau of Engineering, Department of Public Works
(213) 485-5751

[Signature]

Mr. Tim Fremaux, P.E.
Transportation-Engineering Associate III
City of Los Angeles
Department of Transportation
AGREEMENT FOR MAINTENANCE OF LANDSCAPE AREA WITHIN STATE HIGHWAY RIGHT OF WAY

Permit No. 708-NLF-1868

Location: 07-LA-5-23.8

Project: Sunnynook River Park

This Agreement is made and entered into this 8th day of December 2009 by and between the State of California, acting by and through the Department of Transportation, District 7, located at 100 South Main Street, Los Angeles, California 90012, hereinafter referred to as “STATE”, and City of Los Angeles, a municipal corporation, acting by and through its Board of Recreation and Parks Commissioners located at 221 North Figueroa Street, Suite 1510 Los Angeles, California 90012, hereinafter referred to as “PERMITTEE”.

A. RECITALS:

The parties desire to provide that PERMITTEE may have the use of the real property within the STATE’S right of way along the northbound 5 freeway just north of Glendale Boulevard in City of Los Angeles (hereafter “PREMISES”) as shown on the attached Exhibit A so that PERMITTEE may: 1) use a section of the PREMISES for a portion of the term of this agreement as a laydown area in connection with a City construction project; and 2) develop a new riverside park for recreational purposes by installing and maintaining improvements, which shall include landscaping (planting and irrigation), site furniture (picnic tables, benches, signage), fencing, and decomposed granite pathways, referred to herein as “PROJECT.” PERMITTEE is willing to fund one hundred (100%) of all design, capital outlay, maintenance, and staffing costs.

B. AGREEMENT:

In consideration of the mutual covenants and promises herein contained, PERMITTEE agrees as follows:

1. PERMITTEE will submit plans, prepared and signed by a licensed Landscape Architect to the Office of Permits for review and approval and will obtain all necessary encroachment permits prior to the installation of the PROJECT within the PREMISES,

2. After installation of PROJECT and to the satisfaction of STATE, PERMITTEE shall apply for an annual maintenance permit (NLM) in accordance with
STATE'S standard permit procedures. PERMITTEE shall obtain aforesaid encroachment permit through the Caltrans, District 7, Office of Permits at (213) 897-3631.

3. PERMITTEE may contract with others to install, and thereafter to maintain the PROJECT per Section 6. A separate encroachment permit is required for any sponsored third party which shall be issued at no cost. In addition, a letter is required from PERMITTEE stating that authorization has been granted to a third party to perform such maintenance work. It is understood that terms and conditions of this agreement, or any interest herein, or any portion hereof, with exception to Section 7 shall not be assigned or delegated to third parties.

4. Damage to PROJECT resulting from accident, storm, neglect or other causes beyond the control of the STATE are the responsibility of the PERMITTEE.

5. STATE will maintain all highway signs, paved drainage structures, and other non-landscape highway appurtenance with exception to those items listed in Section “A”, Recitals and as shown on the attached Exhibit.

6. Except as to the “Laydown Area” section of the PREMISES during that period of time when the space is needed for the construction project, in addition to designing and installing these permitted landscape items, PERMITTEE agrees to:

   a) Provide and maintain all water and irrigation systems including utility costs for PROJECT. Irrigation system will be maintained and operated to avoid slope damage, excessive water flooding, or spraying onto the pavement.

   b) Replace unhealthy or dead plantings as they are observed.

   c) Be responsible for the removal of litter and debris.

   d) Be responsible for rodent and pest control activities.

   e) Control weed growth before weeds exceed 6 inches in length. Any weed control performed by chemical weed sprays (pesticides) shall comply with all laws, rules, and regulations established by the California Department of Food and Agriculture.

   f) Maintain the landscaping, paving or other unplanted areas along the roadside within the limits of the PROJECT, exclusive of paved drainage facilities, so as not to obstruct the flow of water.
g) All plantings shall be maintained in such condition that they do not interfere with the free flow of traffic, includes the maintenance of adequate sight distances and visibility of signs, signals, and pedestrians.

h) Adequately water and fertilize all plantings to maintain a healthy growth. Plants shall be fertilized 3 times a year.

7. It is understood that for any reason PERMITTEE decides not to renew its maintenance permit required herein, or if the planting is not maintained to the minimum standards specified herein, STATE shall provide PERMITTEE with a written notice. In such event, PERMITTEE shall respond within thirty (30) days of receipt of said notice. Said response shall describe the action to be taken by PERMITTEE to bring the affected areas back into compliance. In the event PERMITTEE does not provide such response and take any action, this AGREEMENT will be terminated. In such event, PERMITTEE will reimburse STATE, on presentation of a bill, for all costs incurred by STATE forces or a STATE contractor to maintain or remove the PROJECT and to pave over or otherwise restore the area to a condition satisfactory with STATE; provided, PERMITTEE shall not be responsible for costs of restoration to a condition better than the PROJECT area was in prior to installation of the PROJECT.

8. All work performed for or by PERMITTEE within the PROJECT will be done at no cost to the STATE.

9. Various future STATE projects may be implemented which will require removal and/or modification to all or a portion of PROJECT. Any replacement landscaping including irrigation facilities may be STATE'S responsibility. Upon completion of work, which affects the limits of maintenance, a revised Exhibit will be prepared and delivered to PERMITTEE for review. The revised exhibit will supersede the original limits shown on the original exhibit/permit plans.

10. Changes to PROJECT affecting public safety or public convenience, all design and specification changes and all major changes including removal, severe pruning (topping), or addition of either planting or irrigation shall be approved by STATE in advance of performing work. Unless otherwise directed by STATE'S representative, changes authorized will require an encroachment permit. Failure to notify STATE of such changes shall result in the immediate removal of PROJECT or portions of PROJECT at PERMITTEE'S expense.
C. LEGAL RELATIONS AND RESPONSIBILITIES:

1. Nothing in this provision of this AGREEMENT is intended to create duties or obligations to or rights in third parties not parties to this agreement, or affects the legal liability of either party by imposing any standard of care respecting the design, construction, and maintenance of STATE highway right of way different from the standard of care imposed by law.

2. It is understood and agreed that, except as to acts or circumstances caused in whole or in part by the acts or omissions of the STATE, neither STATE, nor any officer or employee thereof is responsible for any damage or liability occurring by reason of anything done or omitted to be done by PERMITTEE under or in connection with any work performed by PERMITTEE under this agreement. It is further understood and agreed that, pursuant to Government Code Section 895.4, PERMITTEE shall defend, indemnify and hold harmless the STATE, and all of its officers and employees from all claims, suits, or actions of every name, kind and description brought for or on account of injuries to or death of any person or damage to property resulting from anything done or omitted to be done by PERMITTEE under or in connection with any work performed by PERMITTEE under this agreement.

3. Except as to acts or circumstances caused in whole or in part by the acts or omissions of the STATE, PERMITTEE waives any and all rights to any type of express, implied and comparative indemnity against STATE, its officers and employees arising from any work performed by PERMITTEE under this agreement.

4. Upon termination of this agreement, ownership and title to all materials, equipment and appurtenances installed inside STATE’S right of way will automatically be vested in STATE. Those materials and equipment installed outside of the STATE’S right of way will automatically and immediately be vested in PERMITTEE, and no further agreement will be necessary to transfer ownership.

D. NOTICES:

1. All notices and demands which may or are to be required or permitted to be given by either party to the other hereunder shall be in writing. All notices and demands shall be personally delivered (including by means of professional messenger service), sent by United States mail, postage prepaid, return receipt requested, or transmitted by telex (e.g., Fax) or electronic mail (upon mutual agreement of participating parties), in which case the receiving party shall immediately confirm receipt of such telexed or electronic mail notice. All notices are effective upon
receipt. Either party may from time to time designate another person or place in a notice.

2. All notices given under this Agreement which are mailed or telexcopied shall be addressed to the respective parties as follows (except where redesignated as provided above):

To PERMITTEE:

Department of Recreation and Parks
Planning and Construction Division/Real Estate
221 North Figueroa Street, Suite 100
Los Angeles, California 90012
Telecopier: (213) 202-2611

with a copy of any notice to:

Office of the City Attorney
Real Property/Environment Division
200 North Main Street, Room #701
Los Angeles, California 90012
Telecopier: (213) 978-8090

To STATE:

Caltrans
Office of Permits - MS-9
100 South Main Street, Suite 100
Los Angeles, CA 90012
Telecopier: (213) 897-0420

E. TERM OF AGREEMENT

1. The term of this agreement is 30 years.

2. PERMITTEE may terminate this Agreement upon three (3) months prior written notice to the STATE.

3. Failure to comply with provisions set forth in Section B, Article 7 would be grounds for Notice of Termination by STATE.
IN WITNESS WHEREOF, parties hereto have caused this AGREEMENT to be executed by their duly authorized representatives:

Executed this __________ day of __________, 2009

THE CITY OF LOS ANGELES, a municipal corporation, acting by and through its Board of Recreation and Park Commissioners:

By

PRESIDENT

By

ANTONY A. WILSON
SECRETARY

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

By

JEFFREY A. YUEN
LANDSCAPE ASSOCIATE
(213) 897-6381

Approved as to Form:

Date: __________

CARMEN A. TRUTANICH,
City Attorney

By

KEVIN T. RYAN
DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY
SUNNYNOOK RIVER PARK
EXHIBIT A
APPENDIX C: Title VI Policy Statement
March 2013

NON-DISCRIMINATION POLICY STATEMENT

The California Department of Transportation, under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and related statutes, ensures that no person in the State of California shall, on the grounds of race, color, national origin, sex, disability, religion, sexual orientation, or age, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be otherwise subjected to discrimination under any program or activity it administers.

For information or guidance on how to file a complaint based on the grounds of race, color, national origin, sex, disability, religion, sexual orientation, or age, please visit the following web page: http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/bep/title_vi/t6_violated.htm.

Additionally, if you need this information in an alternate format, such as in Braille or in a language other than English, please contact the California Department of Transportation, Office of Business and Economic Opportunity, 1823 14th Street, MS-79, Sacramento, CA 95811. Telephone: (916) 324-0449, TTY: 711, or via Fax: (916) 324-1949.

MALCOLM DOUGHERTY
Director

"Caltrans improves mobility across California"
APPENDIX D: List of Technical Studies
List of Technical Studies

Initial Site Assessment, 2004 and supplement 2012.
APPENDIX E: Notice of Preparation
January 8, 2007

NOTICE OF PREPARATION

To: Responsible Agencies, Trustee Agencies, Stakeholders and Interested Persons

From: City of Los Angeles
Department of Public Works, Bureau of Engineering
Environmental Management Group
1149 S. Broadway, Suite 700
Los Angeles, CA 90015-2213

Subject: Notice of Preparation of a Draft Environmental Impact Report

The City of Los Angeles (City), Bureau of Engineering (BOE), is the Lead Agency and will prepare an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the project identified below. The City is proposing to seismically strengthen and improve the Glendale–Hyperion Viaduct complex in the Atwater area of the City (see Figure 1, Project Vicinity). The City is requesting input from responsible agencies, trustees, and other interested parties on the scope and content of the proposed Project relevant to the statutory responsibilities of responsible and trustee agencies’ and the concerns of interested organizations and persons. Using the information obtained through this public process, the City will prepare an EIR to analyze the environmental impacts of the proposed Project and alternatives. The contents of this NOP have been prepared in accordance with Section 15082 of the California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines.

The Glendale-Hyperion Viaduct complex (shown in Figure 2, Project Location) consists of the following structures:

- Hyperion Avenue Bridge over the Los Angeles River (53C-1881)
- Hyperion Avenue Bridge over Riverside Drive (53C-1882)
- Hyperion Avenue Bridge over I-5 (53-1069)
- Southbound Glendale Boulevard Bridge over the Los Angeles River (53C-1883)
- Northbound Glendale Boulevard Bridge over the Los Angeles River (53C-1884)
- Waverly Drive Bridge (Bridge Number 53C-1179)

The maximum credible earthquake event for the project area is a magnitude 7.5 event. The existing viaduct was not designed to withstand such an earthquake and is therefore seismically deficient. In addition, existing geometric configurations of the several complex
components, do not meet current design standards for operational safety. As part of the Highway Bridge Program, the City evaluated the condition of the Viaduct complex. The Sufficiency Rating of the existing complex was determined to be 72, which classifies the complex as “functionally obsolete” under the FHWA ranking criteria. To address these issues, the proposed Project would be comprised of the following improvements:

- Seismically strengthen the Viaduct complex structures.
- Improve Hyperion Avenue by adding a center median to physically separate northbound and southbound traffic, consolidate the two sidewalks along Hyperion Avenue into a single sidewalk along the west side of the complex, add a pedestrian crosswalk across southbound Glendale Boulevard at the northern end of the bridge, and restripe the travel lanes to provide new lane widths (12-foot wide inner lanes and 14-foot wide curb lanes).
- Widen the northbound and southbound Glendale Boulevard bridges over the Los Angeles River by approximately 8 feet.
- Replace the railings along both Glendale Boulevard viaducts, along Hyperion Avenue, and along the Waverly Bridge with replicas that more closely resemble the original railing systems.
- Realign the existing I-5 northbound off-ramp to Glendale Boulevard to connect with northbound Glendale Boulevard south of the current exit.
- Add a connector from northbound Glendale Boulevard to the bike path along the Los Angeles River.
- Construct an observation overlook to the east of the Viaduct complex that extends from the bike path.

Potential impacts associated with the proposed Project include:

- Air Quality
- Biological Resources
- Cultural Resources

An analysis of potential environmental effects is provided in an Initial Study Checklist, which can be viewed or obtained at the following locations:

1. Bureau of Engineering, Bridge Program, 221 N. Figueroa Street, Suite 350, Los Angeles CA, 90012, Contact: Wallace E. Stokes at (213) 202-5580, fax: (213) 202-5518
2. Atwater Village Public Library, 3379 Glendale Boulevard, Los Angeles, CA 90039
3. Los Feliz Public Library, 1874 Hillhurst Avenue, Los Angeles, CA 90027
5. District Office, Councilmember Tom LaBonge,, CD4, 10116 Riverside Dr., Ste 200, Toluca Lake, CA 91602
In addition, two scoping meetings will be held to obtain input on the scope and contents of the EIR, at the times and locations shown below:

Thursday, February 8, 2007  
7-9 pm  
Glenfeliz Blvd Elementary School  
3955 Glenfeliz Blvd.  
Los Angeles, CA 90039

Thursday, February 15, 2007  
7-9 pm  
Silverlake Community Church  
2930 Hyperion Avenue (near Rowena)  
Los Angeles, CA 90027

Due to the time limits mandated by state law, your response must be sent at the earliest possible date, but not later than 30 days after receipt of this notice.

Please send your response to:

Wallace E. Stokes  
City of Los Angeles  
Public Works, Bureau of Engineering  
Bridge Program  
221 N. Figueroa Street, Suite 350  
Los Angeles, CA 90012

If you have any questions, please contact Mr. Wallace Stokes (213) 202-5580. We would appreciate the name, telephone number, and e-mail address for the person to contact if we have any questions regarding your comment.

Prepared By:  
Wallace E. Stokes  
Date:  January 8, 2007

Approved By: Gary Moore, P.E.  
City Engineer  
By:  
Ara Kasparian, Ph.D., Manager  
Environmental Management Group  
Date:  1/18/07
Figure 1
Project Vicinity Map
Glendale-Hyperion
Structures (53C-1881, 53C-1883, and 53C-1884)
Rehabilitation and Seismic Retrofit Design

Figure 2
Project Location Map
Glendale - Hyperion Structures (53C-1881, 53C-1883, and 53C-1884)
Rehabilitation and Seismic Retrofit Design
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APPENDIX F-1: September 25, 2013 Community Meeting Comment Cards
1) Reduce vehicle speed on Hyperion Avenue
2) Provide bike lanes on Hyperion Avenue (perhaps protected by barrier)
3) Add full-width crosswalk at Atwater Side of Glendale and Hyperion
4) Eliminate median and railing barriers, and/or banked turns
5) Non-specific approval
6) Non-specific disapproval
7) This is not a pedestrian-friendly design
8) Do not increase or improve access to cyclists on Hyperion
9) Propose a multi-modal design/be consistent with Bike Plan & Caltrans Safety Policy
10) Enhance safety for everyone
11) There should be narrower car/traffic lanes and reduce traffic lanes
12) There should be well-marked crosswalks and wayfinding signs
13) Preserve the historic bridge design
14) There should be wider sidewalks
15) Address traffic congestion
16) Consider proposed alternative designs
17) Provide accessibility to LA River
18) Provide a public hearing
19) Review related projects, specifically the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers document, Los Angeles River Ecosystem Restoration Integrated Feasibility Study that could potentially impact the detention/infiltration basin in Sunnynook River Park
20) Emergency vehicles possibly will not be able to get through due to crash barrier
21) We would like to participate in advisory board
22) Security Measures for Pedestrian Bridge
23) On demand traffic light at I-5 exit
24) What are the number of lanes on pedestrian bridge/access?
25) Will there be a link between pedestrian paths on both sides of the bridge?
26) Keep the median barriers in the plan.
27) Reduce the bridge to one lane in each direction.
28) Provide benches on the sidewalks on the bridge.
29) Design the center of the bridge for pedestrians and bikes.
30) Create a public space on the bridge for pedestrians.
31) Provide noise mitigation during construction.
32) Will project provide proper bike/pedestrian detours, signage, and safe alternative routing if existing bike facility is impacted by construction?
33) Must maintain Metro facilities and services during project
34) Will bus shelters, benches and other amenities be installed?
35) Be consistent with Caltrans Complete Streets Policy (DD-64-R1) and FHWA Routine Accommodations Policy (23 C.F.R. § 652.5)-elderly and handicapped
36) Provide a signalized crosswalk with refuge areas at both sides of street at east end of bridge complex
37) Caltrans and the City of Los Angeles Cannot Certify the IS/EA if a Fair Argument Can Be Made That the Project Will Create Significant Impacts for Bicyclists
38) A wide shoulder/shoulder is not a bike lane
39) Review flood maps
Date: 9/25/13

Please submit any comments on the proposed project tonight by placing this card in the comment box or send it by October 11, 2013 via email to Tami.Podesta@dot.ca.gov, or by mail to:

Tami Podesta, Branch Chief
Division of Environmental Planning
California Department of Transportation District 7
100 South Main St., Los Angeles, CA 90012

Name: Matthew Torbenson  
Address: 1411 CALUMET AVE

Email: mathewtorbenson@gmail.com  
City/Zip: LOS ANGELES 90026

Organization represented, if any: ECHO PARK BURGER CLUB

Comment: Just stopping by to help advocate for the inclusion of bicycle lanes on the renovated Hyperion bridge. Cyclists from Echo Park/Silver Lake are continually impeded to deterred from traveling to Atwater Village due to unsafe means of getting there. Bicycle lanes (included in the original proposal) will help further connect neighborhoods within the city & foster safer travel for cyclists. Thanks!
Please submit any comments on the proposed project tonight by placing this card in the comment box or send it by October 11, 2013 via email to Tami.Podesta@dot.ca.gov, or by mail to:

Tami Podesta, Branch Chief
Division of Environmental Planning
California Department of Transportation District 7
100 South Main St., Los Angeles, CA 90012

Date: 9/25/13

Name: Ceny Lai
Address: 2300 EDGEWATER TER.
Email: GandLai@yahoo.com
City/Zip: Los Angeles, CA 90039

Comment: Pedestrian bridge's design should be more aligned with the historic bridge's aesthetics. Would like to see more bike safety features for the bridge as well as automobile traffic calming features. Slower traffic across the bridge!
Glendale-Hyperion Complex of Bridges Improvement Project

COMMENT CARD

Date: 9/25/13

Please submit any comments on the proposed project tonight by placing this card in the comment box or send it by October 11, 2013 via email to Tami.Podesta@dot.ca.gov, or by mail to:

Tami Podesta, Branch Chief  
Division of Environmental Planning  
California Department of Transportation District 7  
100 South Main St., Los Angeles, CA 90012

Name: CHEN, DANNIS  
Address: 2235 N. HOMMERT BLVD

Email: CHEN, DANNIS@LAHYPERION.COM  
City/Zip: 90027

Organization represented, if any: HOSTEL IMPROVEMENT ASSN, HOSTEL HYPERION CA

Comment: Width of the lanes adds to the roadway project of the bridge. A 10 ft lane/11 ft would cause the speed to reduce to 40 mph vs 50 mph (4'). If this is done one has another lane width for bike lanes. The lanes, whether in the center or on the curb, edge would allow bikes to cross from Atwater to Franklin Hills.
Glendale-Hyperion Complex of Bridges Improvement Project

COMMENT CARD

Date: 9/25/13

Please submit any comments on the proposed project tonight by placing this card in the comment box or send it by October 11, 2013 via email to Tami.Podesta@dot.ca.gov, or by mail to:

Tami Podesta, Branch Chief
Division of Environmental Planning
California Department of Transportation District 7
100 South Main St., Los Angeles, CA 90012

Name: NINA SOENKIN
Address: 2354 Kemilworth

Email: nina.soenerkia@gmail.com
City/Zip: LOS ANGELES 90039

Organization represented, if any: Resident

Comment:
What will be security measures for the pedestrian bridge?
1. Lighting - at either end as well as on bridge
2. Call box
3. Patrol

I like design 2
Date: 9/25/13

Please submit any comments on the proposed project tonight by placing this card in the comment box or send it by October 11, 2013 via email to Tami.Podesta@dot.ca.gov, or by mail to:

Tami Podesta, Branch Chief
Division of Environmental Planning
California Department of Transportation District 7
100 South Main St., Los Angeles, CA 90012

Name: Nina Sorkin  Address: 2354 Kenilworth
Email: nina.sorkin@gmail.com  City/Zip: Los Angeles 90039

Organization represented, if any: Resident

Comment: With the new state law requiring motor vehicles to stay 3 feet from bicycles or slow down until you can move around to pass, will there be a dedicated bike lane in both directions
Date: 9/25/2013

Please submit any comments on the proposed project tonight by placing this card in the comment box or send it by October 11, 2013 via email to Tami.Podesta@dot.ca.gov, or by mail to:

Tami Podesta, Branch Chief
Division of Environmental Planning
California Department of Transportation District 7
100 South Main St., Los Angeles, CA 90012

Name: RONALD VAN AMMERI
Address: 2300 MORENO DR

Email: RONALDVANAMMERS2@GMAIL.COM
City/Zip: 90039

Organization represented, if any: 

Comment: IN JULY AND AUGUST THE BRIDGE IS NOT CROSSABLE BY PEDESTRIANS BECAUSE THERE IS NO SHADE AND TEMPERATURES MAY BE IN 90° OR EVEN 100°F. COULD A ROOF BE PROVIDED FOR PEDESTRIANS? A ROOF WOULD ALSO BE GOOD WHEN IT RAINS
Date: 9-25-13

Please submit any comments on the proposed project tonight by placing this card in the comment box or send it by October 11, 2013 via email to Tami.Podesta@dot.ca.gov, or by mail to:

Tami Podesta, Branch Chief
Division of Environmental Planning
California Department of Transportation District 7
100 South Main St., Los Angeles, CA 90012

Name: Douglas Kerr  Address: ________________________________
Email: dougkerr@pacbell.net  City/Zip: ________________________________
Organization represented, if any: ________________________________

Comment: Hoping the new I-5 exit will have on demand traffic lights so traffic doesn’t unnecessarily back up either on the exit ramp or on Northbeard St. Glendale Blvd.

bike/pedestrian bridge will have 4 lanes I hope.
Please submit any comments on the proposed project tonight by placing this card in the comment box or send it by October 11, 2013 via email to Tami.Podesta@dot.ca.gov, or by mail to:

Tami Podesta, Branch Chief
Division of Environmental Planning
California Department of Transportation District 7
100 South Main St., Los Angeles CA 90012

Name: Davis EDWARDSON
Email: 2642 CORBA DR
Address: LA 90039
City/Zip: 

Organization represented, if any: 

Comment:

NO ROAD

DEE

UNTIL BIKE ARE THE PRIMARY
WAS TRANS FORMATION WE ABANDON
MORE CAR LANES
Glendale-Hyperion Complex of Bridges Improvement Project

COMMENT CARD

Date: 9/25/13

Please submit any comments on the proposed project tonight by placing this card in the comment box or send it by October 11, 2013 via email to Tami.Podesta@dot.ca.gov, or by mail to:

Tami Podesta, Branch Chief
Division of Environmental Planning
California Department of Transportation District 7
100 South Main St., Los Angeles, CA 90012

Name: Glenn Wolf
Address: 2812 Waverly Dr #4

Email: gkwolf53@gmail.com
City/Zip: LA 90039

Organization represented, if any: local for 16 years, landscape architect

Comment:

Thank you for the left & left turn off the 5 off Glendale, I

The restoration looks great for an old icon.

Native plants please (or mostly native) keep the Crepe Myrtles

I’ve never felt comfortable walking down Glendale from Waverly, now I’ll have 2 options to get to Altadena.

Thrilled with the drainage basin to get rain to LA River

Please widen the pedestrian/bike bridge as much as possible. It gets nasty walking and having a bike race past. separate them if possible.
Glendale-Hyperion Complex of Bridges Improvement Project

COMMENT CARD

Date: 9/25/2012

Please submit any comments on the proposed project tonight by placing this card in the comment box or send it by October 11, 2013 via email to Tami.Podesta@dot.ca.gov, or by mail to:

Tami Podesta, Branch Chief
Division of Environmental Planning
California Department of Transportation District 7
100 South Main St., Los Angeles, CA 90012

Name: Acme Tongue
Address: _________________________________

Email: wsf0610@gmail.com
City/Zip: 90039

Organization represented, if any: 

Comment: How do you handle the heavy traffic flow into Rowena and Hyperion intersection? The traffic has gotten heavier and making a west turn onto Rowena going SWbound is an increasing problem and hazard for drivers and pedestrians.
Please submit any comments on the proposed project tonight by placing this card in the comment box or send it by October 11, 2013 via email to Tami.Podesta@dot.ca.gov, or by mail to:

Tami Podesta, Branch Chief
Division of Environmental Planning
California Department of Transportation District 7
100 South Main St., Los Angeles, CA 90012

Name: Tony Taylor
Email: Turtle.Toothless@big.com
Address: 6787 Cleary St, 43 KSD
City/Zip: 720 40 A 3/003

Organization represented, if any: Save The Los Angeles River

Comment: This is yet another huge financial boondoggle painted on the people who don't want it.
This is another waste of money!!
Glendale-Hyperion Complex of Bridges Improvement Project

COMMENT CARD

Date: 9/25/13

Please submit any comments on the proposed project tonight by placing this card in the comment box or send it by October 11, 2013 via email to Tami.Podesta@dot.ca.gov, or by mail to:

Tami Podesta, Branch Chief
Division of Environmental Planning
California Department of Transportation District 7
100 South Main St., Los Angeles, CA 90012

Name: Pat Smith
Address: 4206 Hollyhock Dr.
Email: psmith@perbell.net
City/Zip: LA 90027

Organization represented, if any:

1. **BIKES**
   - Instead of installing a center-barring, slow down vehicular traffic, and use center lane width for bike lanes, and part of the lane down to 10" (11" next to curb). So this will help slow vehicular traffic.

2. **TRAFFIC**
   - 11' 11' 4' 11' 11'
   - 12 5 11 11 11 5 3

3. Why did the City of LA not consider bike lanes in this critical gap in the bike network?
Glendale-Hyperion Complex of Bridges Improvement Project

COMMENT CARD

Date: 9/25/13

Please submit any comments on the proposed project tonight by placing this card in the comment box or send it by October 11, 2013 via email to Tami.Podesta@dot.ca.gov, or by mail to:

Tami Podesta, Branch Chief
Division of Environmental Planning
California Department of Transportation District 7
100 South Main St., Los Angeles, CA 90012

Name: Pat Smith
Address: 4206 Holly Knoll Dr.
Email: pat.smith@pacbell.net
City/Zip: 90027

Organization represented, if any:

Comment:

1. Traffic i new NB offramp with left turn to Glendale Blvd will shift traffic from Hyperion northbound to Rosemead Ave. parallel local street. Hyperion has 2 lanes each way. Rosemead has only one and is a local serving street.

2. How will emergency vehicles navigate with the road in the center? They need to be able to cross over to the other side.
Date: 24 SEPT 2013

Please submit any comments on the proposed project tonight by placing this card in the comment box or send it by October 11, 2013 via email to Tami.Podesta@dot.ca.gov, or by mail to:

Tami Podesta, Branch Chief
Division of Environmental Planning
California Department of Transportation District 7
100 South Main St., Los Angeles, CA 90012

Name: DEBORAH MURPHY Address: 2351 SILVER RIDGE AVE
Email: losangeleswalks@gmail.com City/Zip: LOS ANGELES, CA 90039
Organization represented, if any: LOS ANGELES WALKS

Comment: WE DO NOT NEED THE CONCRETE CENTERED BARRIER ON HYPERION AS IT ENCOURAGES DRIVERS TO SPEED. WE CAN USE THAT ROOMY WIDTH TO PROVIDE ON STREET BIKE LINES NEXT TO THE Curb. ALL VEHICLE LINES SHOULD BE THE MINIMUM WIDTH POSSIBLE. 11 FEET WIDE NEXT TO THE Curb AND 10 FEET WIDE AT ALL OTHER LOCATIONS. WIDE VEHICLE LINES ENCOURAGE SPEEDING AND CAUSE CRASHES & DANGERS TO PEDESTRIANS & CYCLISTS.

SEE MARKED UP STREET SECTION WITH OUR PROPOSAL OF THE VIAJACO.

Organization represented, if any: LOS ANGELES WALKS

Comment: OUR STREETS MUST BE "CO," NOT SPEEDWAYS FOR DRIVERS.
Date: ____________________

Please submit any comments on the proposed project tonight by placing this card in the comment box or send it by October 11, 2013 via email to Tami.Podesta@dot.ca.gov, or by mail to:

Tami Podesta, Branch Chief  
Division of Environmental Planning  
California Department of Transportation District 7  
100 South Main St., Los Angeles, CA 90012

Name: Margaret Arnold  Address: ________________________________

Email: Arndypost@yahoo.com  City/Zip: ____________________________

Organization represented, if any: ____________________________

Comment: ___________________________________________________

As a pedestrian, I am concerned about access into/out of the pedestrian bridge. If I'm going from Atwater & Silverlake, it leaves me away from the boulevards & leaves me to figure out how to get back.

My other concern is for the historic nature of the bridge. I'm glad you are putting the rails back, but remained concerned for this beautiful architectural landmark.
Date: 9/25/13

Please submit any comments on the proposed project tonight by placing this card in the comment box or send it by October 11, 2013 via email to Tami.Podesta@dot.ca.gov, or by mail to:

Tami Podesta, Branch Chief
Division of Environmental Planning
California Department of Transportation District 7
100 South Main St., Los Angeles, CA 90012

Name: Don Ward
Email: CALHALL@EDC
Address: 90027
City/Zip: 90027

Organization represented, if any: 

Comment: THERE IS NO CONSIDERATION FOR BIKES. YOU ARE DESIGNING A BIG, BIG, A FREEWAY INTO OUR NEIGHBORHOOD.

12 AND 14 FOOT LANES ARE FREEWAY WIDTH.

NEW ENGINEER STATED THAT BRIDGE CONFIGURATION IS DESIGNED FOR 55 MPH TRAFFIC SPEEDS. THIS IS UNACCEPTABLE.
Glendale-Hyperion Complex of Bridges Improvement Project

COMMENT CARD

Date: 25 Sep 2013

Please submit any comments on the proposed project tonight by placing this card in the comment box or send it by October 11, 2013 via email to Tami.Podesta@dot.ca.gov, or by mail to:

Tami Podesta, Branch Chief
Division of Environmental Planning
California Department of Transportation District 7
100 South Main St., Los Angeles, CA 90012

Name: Sergio Landarri
Address:

Email: sergio@atwatervillage.org
City/Zip: 90049

Organization represented, if any: Atwater Village NC

Comment: Pedestrian Control Light

Why does the crosswalk not extend completely across Glendale Blvd at the base of Hyperion bridge? Pedestrians will not walk two blocks to a traffic light, the walk two blocks back to a point they were directly across - if it remains as designed it will become an accident waiting to happen. A pedestrian crosswalk is to be installed for a reason, but why only for two lanes? Crossing the entire roadway is the only logical design.
Glendale-Hyperion Complex of Bridges Improvement Project

COMMENT CARD

Date: 25 Sep 2013

Please submit any comments on the proposed project tonight by placing this card in the comment box or send it by October 11, 2013 via email to Tami.Podesta@dot.ca.gov, or by mail to:

Tami Podesta, Branch Chief
Division of Environmental Planning
California Department of Transportation District 7
100 South Main St., Los Angeles, CA 90012

Name: Sergio Cumburri Address: 8622 North Harkness
Email: sergio@atwatervillage.org City/Zip: 90068
Organization represented, if any: Atwater Village Neighborhood Council

Comment: The proposed pedestrian bridge over the river - will it be wide enough to accommodate bicyclists and pedestrians (shoulder to shoulder) in both directions (will it be four lanes wide)?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
Date: 9-26-2013

Please submit any comments on the proposed project tonight by placing this card in the comment box or send it by October 11, 2013 via email to Tami.Podesta@dot.ca.gov, or by mail to:

Tami Podesta, Branch Chief
Division of Environmental Planning
California Department of Transportation District 7
100 South Main-St., Los Angeles, CA 90012

Name: Therese Dietlein
Address: 4057 Benny's St.
Email: dietlein@shoeglobal.net
City/Zip: LA 91739

Comment:

[Handwritten comment]

I like the bridge just as it is. I would prefer to leave it as it is with wider sidewalks. Bike paths are questionable unless they can be easily accommodated without interfering with cars. Right now the problem for me is that the sidewalks are too narrow. They can't accommodate both pedestrians and bikers. Also, the lack of pedestrian crossings to access either the bridge. I have never seen anyone go 55-60 mph on the bridge. If they do, they need to be ticketed.

The pedestrian bridge to the south is ludicrous
Date: 9/25/13

Please submit any comments on the proposed project tonight by placing this card in the comment box or send it by October 11, 2013 via email to Tami.Podesta@dot.ca.gov, or by mail to:

Tami Podesta, Branch Chief
Division of Environmental Planning
California Department of Transportation District 7
100 South Main St., Los Angeles, CA 90012

Name: KAREN KNAPP  Address: 2202 Ingledale Terrace
Email: KNAPPTIME@ATT.NET  City/Zip: LA 90039

Organizations represented, if any: MEMBER OF ATWATER NEIGHBOR COUNCIL, BUT COMMENTING AS PRIVATE CITIZEN

Comment:

1. I KNOW THERE IS A BIG PUSH TO GET A BIKE LANE ACROSS THE BRIDGE, BUT I'D LIKE TO SAW THAT BIKE LANES THAT ARE SHARED WITH CARS SEEM TOO DANGEROUS. IF THE BIKE LANE WERE SEPARATED BY A PARTITION IT WOULD MAKE MORE SENSE. HOWEVER, I'M NOT SURE THE BRIDGE WILL ACCOMMODATE BOTH A BIKE LANE AND A PEDESTRIAN PATH. HOW ABOUT THE BIKERS SHARE THE PEDESTRIAN PATH BY WALKING THEIR BIKES THE SHORT DISTANCE OVER THE BRIDGE.

2. ALSO: I KNOW THE NEW GLENDALE OFF-RAMP WILL ALLOW A LEFT TURN TO SILVERLAKE, BUT WILL THERE BE ANY SOLUTION TO THE GLENDALE'S LEFT TURN? WHERE CARS JAM UP TO MAKE A U-TURN TO GET TO THE ENTRANCE TO THE 5 NORTH?

3. ALSO, COULD THERE BE A REAL LINK BETWEEN THE PEDESTRIAN PATHS ON BOTH SIDES OF THE BRIDGE AS THE BIKE PATHS CIRCLE ON THE OTHER SIDE.
Date: 9/25/13

Please submit any comments on the proposed project tonight by placing this card in the comment box or send it by October 11, 2013 via email to Tami.Podesta@dot.ca.gov, or by mail to:

Tami Podesta, Branch Chief  
Division of Environmental Planning  
California Department of Transportation District 7  
100 South Main St., Los Angeles, CA 90012

Name: Joan Stevenson  
Address: 2314 Silver Ridge W, LA

Email:  
City/Zip: Los Angeles, CA 90039

Organization represented, if any:  

Comment: Really like the plan!
Glendale-Hyperion Complex of Bridges Improvement Project

COMMENT CARD

Date: 9/25/13

Please submit any comments on the proposed project tonight by placing this card in the comment box or send it by October 11, 2013 via email to Tami.Podesta@dot.ca.gov, or by mail to:

Tami Podesta, Branch Chief
Division of Environmental Planning
California Department of Transportation District 7
100 South Main St., Los Angeles, CA 90012

Name: Matthew Moody
Address: 1416 Lucile Ave
Email: Matthew.Moody53@ymail.com
City/Zip: LA, CA 90022

Organization represented, if any:

Comment:

Please include bike lanes on the bridge. I would suggest that the pedestrian sidewalk is not multi-purposed with bikes. Bikes are traveling at too high a speed to mix with pedestrians. Also please consider a ROAD Diet.
Glendale-Hyperion Complex of Bridges Improvement Project

COMMENT CARD

Date: 9/25/13

Please submit any comments on the proposed project tonight by placing this card in the comment box or send it by October 11, 2013 via email to Tami.Podesta@dot.ca.gov, or by mail to:

Tami Podesta, Branch Chief
Division of Environmental Planning
California Department of Transportation District 7
100 South Main St., Los Angeles, CA 90012

Name: DAVE DUCE
Email: DAVE_DUCE@hotmail.com
Organization represented, if any:

Comment:

THANK YOU CALTRANS AND CITY OF L.A. STAFF FOR PUSHING THIS PROJECT FORWARD. THANKS FOR THE PED LANES AND RED ROOF TROLLEY BRIDGE.

PEOPLE MOVE LIKE ANTS, LIKE CYCLISTS, THEY TAKE THE SHORTEST/QUICKEST ROUTE. THE CYCLISTS WILL CONTINUE TO USE THE ROAD, AND MIXING CARS GOING 60+ MPH ON A SEMI-GLOOMY CORNER, SOMEONE IS GOING TO DIE, THERE ARE MANY HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS THAT USE THE GLENDALE BRIDGE!

I LOVE THE BRIDGE, IT IS OUR BRIDGE.

PEOPLE = PEDESTRIANS, CYCLISTS, DRIVERS, STROLLERS ETC.
Date: 9/25/2013

Please submit any comments on the proposed project tonight by placing this card in the comment box or send it by October 11, 2013 via email to Tami.Podesta@dot.ca.gov, or by mail to:
  
  Tami Podesta, Branch Chief
  Division of Environmental Planning
  California Department of Transportation District 7
  100 South Main St., Los Angeles, CA 90012

Name: DENNIS P. KEENE
Address: 3291 LARGA AVE
Email: DON'T HAVE
City/Zip: LA 90039-2246

Organization represented, if any: 

Comment: LA RESIDENT SINCE 1935

Thank you for choosing Wednesday and not FRIDAY.

However BOO!! for choosing 6:00PM as a start time. Traffic in this area is bad all the time!! but it is better after 7:00 PM.
APPENDIX F-2: October 28, 2013 Public Hearing Comment Cards
1) Reduce vehicle speed on Hyperion Avenue
2) Provide bike lanes on Hyperion Avenue (perhaps protected by barrier)
3) Add full-width crosswalk on Atwater Side of Glendale and Hyperion
4) Eliminate median and railing barriers, and/or banked turns
5) Non-specific approval
6) Non-specific disapproval
7) This is not a pedestrian-friendly design
8) Do not increase or improve access to cyclists on Hyperion
9) Propose a multi-modal design/be consistent with Bike Plan & Caltrans Safety Policy
10) Enhance safety for everyone
11) There should be narrower car/traffic lanes and reduce traffic lanes
12) There should be well-marked crosswalks and wayfinding signs
13) Preserve the historic bridge design
14) There should be wider sidewalks
15) Address traffic congestion
16) Consider proposed alternative designs
17) Provide accessibility to LA River
18) Provide a public hearing
19) Review related projects, specifically the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers document, Los Angeles River Ecosystem Restoration Integrated Feasibility Study that could potentially impact the detention/infiltration basin in Sunnynook River Park
20) Emergency vehicles possibly will not be able to get through due to crash barrier
21) We would like to participate in advisory board
22) Security Measures for Pedestrian Bridge
23) On demand traffic light at I-5 exit
24) What are the number of lanes on pedestrian bridge/access?
25) Will there be a link between pedestrian paths on both sides of the bridge?
26) Keep the median barriers in the plan.
27) Reduce the bridge to one lane in each direction.
28) Provide benches on the sidewalks on the bridge.
29) Design the center of the bridge for pedestrians and bikes.
30) Create a public space on the bridge for pedestrians.
31) Provide noise mitigation during construction.
32) Will project provide proper bike/pedestrian detours, signage, and safe alternative routing if existing bike facility is impacted by construction?
33) Must maintain Metro facilities and services during project
34) Will bus shelters, benches and other amenities be installed?
35) Be consistent with Caltrans Complete Streets Policy (DD-64-R1) and FHWA Routine Accommodations Policy (23 C.F.R. § 652.5)-elderly and handicapped
36) Provide a signalized crosswalk with refuge areas at both sides of street at east end of bridge complex
37) Caltrans and the City of Los Angeles Cannot Certify the IS/EA if a Fair Argument Can Be Made That the Project Will Create Significant Impacts for Bicyclists
38) A wide shoulder/shoulder is not a bike lane
39) Review flood maps
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Available</th>
<th>Replied</th>
<th>Mailing Address</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Smith Pat</td>
<td><a href="mailto:patlsmith@pacbell.net">patlsmith@pacbell.net</a></td>
<td>9/25/13</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Murphy Deborah</td>
<td><a href="mailto:losangeleswalks@gmail.com">losangeleswalks@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>9/25/13</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Arnold Margaret</td>
<td><a href="mailto:arroyosj@yahoo.com">arroyosj@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Ward Don</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>9/25/13</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Lombarri Sergio</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sergio@atwatervillage.org">sergio@atwatervillage.org</a></td>
<td>9/25/13</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Dietlin Terese</td>
<td><a href="mailto:tdietlin@sbcglobal.net">tdietlin@sbcglobal.net</a></td>
<td>9/25/13</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Knapp Karen</td>
<td><a href="mailto:knapptime@att.net">knapptime@att.net</a></td>
<td>9/25/13</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Stevenson Jason</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>9/25/13</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Mooney Matthew</td>
<td><a href="mailto:matthew.mooney.53@my.csun.edu">matthew.mooney.53@my.csun.edu</a></td>
<td>9/25/13</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Duce Dave</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dave_duce@hotmail.com">dave_duce@hotmail.com</a></td>
<td>9/25/13</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Keene Dennis</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>9/25/13</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Wildman Bob</td>
<td><a href="mailto:yewrox1@aol.com">yewrox1@aol.com</a></td>
<td>10/28/13</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Byers Christina</td>
<td><a href="mailto:byerskj@mattel.com">byerskj@mattel.com</a></td>
<td>10/28/13</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Hagen Erik</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mail@erikhagen.com">mail@erikhagen.com</a></td>
<td>10/28/13</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Safonov Alexander</td>
<td><a href="mailto:skramble73@yahoo.com">skramble73@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>10/28/13</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Klipp Luke</td>
<td><a href="mailto:lukeklipp@gmail.com">lukeklipp@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>10/28/13</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Forth Sarah</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sforth@igc.com">sforth@igc.com</a></td>
<td>10/28/13</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Estrada Diane</td>
<td><a href="mailto:d.sofly@gmail.com">d.sofly@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>10/28/13</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Herrera Troy</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>10/28/13</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Garza Angelica</td>
<td><a href="mailto:garzapi@yahoo.com">garzapi@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>10/28/13</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Jojola Eric</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jojola@gmail.com">jojola@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>10/28/13</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Savage Kathryn</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>10/28/13</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Salazar Kevin</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kevin_salazar28@yahoo.com">kevin_salazar28@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>10/28/13</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Edewards Jonathan</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>10/28/13</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>Winneteaux <a href="mailto:winneteaux@gmail.com">winneteaux@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>10/28/13</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Pascal Marino</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mpascal@gmail.com">mpascal@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>10/28/13</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Miller Blair</td>
<td><a href="mailto:blairmiller1@yahoo.com">blairmiller1@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>10/28/13</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Murphy Deborah</td>
<td><a href="mailto:losangeleswalks@gmail.com">losangeleswalks@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>10/28/13</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Glendale-Hyperion Complex of Bridges Improvement Project

COMMENT CARD

Date: 10-29-13

Please submit any comments on the proposed project tonight by placing this card in the comment box or send it via email by November 7, 2013 to Tami.Podesta@dot.ca.gov, or by mail to:

Tami Podesta, Branch Chief
Division of Environmental Planning
California Department of Transportation District 7
100 South Main St., Los Angeles, CA 90012

Name: Bob Johnson
Address: 3338 Belita

Email: VELODX1@AOL.COM
City/Zip: LA 90039

Organization represented, if any: F A V

Comment: A BIKE LANE WOULD NOT BE A GOOD MIX FOR THE VERY BUSY PORTION OF GLENDALE BLVD. THERE ARE ALREADY PROVISIONS FOR BIKES AS PART OF THE PEDESTRIAN WALKWAY. THE BIKES SHOULD BE WALKED OVER THIS SECTION OF BRIDGE.
Date: 10-26-13

Please submit any comments on the proposed project tonight by placing this card in the comment box or send it via email by November 7, 2013 to Tami.Podesta@dot.ca.gov, or by mail to:

Tami Podesta, Branch Chief
Division of Environmental Planning
California Department of Transportation District 7
100 South Main St., Los Angeles, CA 90012

Name: AHRUSING BYERS  Address: 2144 CADB SHARE AVE

Email: BRYERSKY@Mattel.com  City/Zip: LA 90039

Organization represented, if any: ________________________________

Comment: I want a bike lane, pedestrian friendly bridge, 35 mile per hour limit, the design is UGLY, it should be more old school.
Glendale-Hyperion Complex of Bridges Improvement Project

COMMENT CARD

Date: 10/24/2013

Please submit any comments on the proposed project tonight by placing this card in the comment box or send it via email by November 7, 2013 to Tami.Podesta@dot.ca.gov, or by mail to:

Tami Podesta, Branch Chief
Division of Environmental Planning
California Department of Transportation District 7
100 South Main St., Los Angeles, CA 90012

Name: ERIK HAGEN Address: 3375 DESCHAMPS #2

Email: MA@ERIKHAGEN.COM City/Zip: LA, CA 90026

Organization represented, if any: AIA / UCLA

Comment: IN A CITY THAT IS ALREADY UNSAFE FOR BICYCLES W/ INCOMPLETE BIKE LANES, TERRIBLE POT- HOLE DUTCH GUTTERS & RAMPANT SPEEDING, I FEEL THAT OPENING UP THE HYPERION BRIDGE TO ENCINITAS FASTER CORS WITH PRETTY MUCH NO SAFE CONSIDERATION BICYCLES IS JUST THE WRONG DIRECTION TO GO. THERE ARE NOT MANY OPTIONS TO GET FROM SILVERLAKE TO ATUATER, THIS IS THE BIGGER ONE MAKE IT WORK FOR ALL.
Date: 10-29-13

Please submit any comments on the proposed project tonight by placing this card in the comment box or send it via email by November 7, 2013 to Tami.Podesta@dot.ca.gov, or by mail to:

Tami Podesta, Branch Chief
Division of Environmental Planning
California Department of Transportation District 7
100 South Main St., Los Angeles, CA 90012

Name: ALEXANDER SAFONOV Address: 854 SANBORN AVENUE

Email: SKRAMBLE73@YAHOO.COM City/Zip: L.A. 90029

Organization represented, if any: BICYCLE KITCHEN

Comment: I LIVE NEAR THE INTERSECTION OF SANTA MONICA BLVD. AND HOOVER. CURRENTLY THERE IS NOT A SAFE AND DIRECT WAY FOR ME TO TRAVEL BY BICYCLE FROM SILVERLAKE TO ATWATER. I HOPE THAT FUTURE PLANS FOR THE HYPERION VIADUCT WILL BE ACCOMODATING TO CYCLISTS AND PEDESTRIANS ALIKE. THE INCLUSION OF BICYCLE LANES IN THE PLANNING OF THE NEW VIADUCT WILL BE A GREAT IMPROVEMENT TO THE NEIGHBORHOOD.
Glendale-Hyperion Complex of Bridges Improvement Project

COMMENT CARD

Date: 10/28/13

Please submit any comments on the proposed project tonight by placing this card in the comment box or send it via email by November 7, 2013 to Tami.Podesta@dot.ca.gov, or by mail to:

Tami Podesta, Branch Chief
Division of Environmental Planning
California Department of Transportation District 7
100 South Main St., Los Angeles, CA 90012

Name: Luke Klipp
Address: 1320 N. Hoover St.

Email: Lukebkipp@gmail.com
City/Zip: Los Angeles, CA 90027

Organization represented, if any:

Comment: We're building a connection between two communities that for the next couple generations of Angelenos will represent our values and shape our lifestyles. If you build a bridge that discourages anything beside driving, all people will do is drive across the bridge. I recognize that funding for the project is contingent on provision of bike lanes, but glorified gutters are not bike lanes. I also recognize that all of this public comment is coming late(r) in the planning process, but what you're hearing is the hopes and desires of many people for a more walkable/bikeable connection between our communities. I support the alternate proposal put forth by the LA County Bike Coalition.
Date: 28 Oct 2013

Please submit any comments on the proposed project tonight by placing this card in the comment box or send it via email by November 7, 2013 to Tami.Podesta@dot.ca.gov, or by mail to:

Tami Podesta, Branch Chief
Division of Environmental Planning
California Department of Transportation District 7
100 South Main St., Los Angeles, CA 90012

Name: SARAH FORTH Address: 2436 ARMSTRONG 90039-3201
Email: SFORTH@ige.org City/Zip: LA

Organization represented, if any: member of LACBC

Comment: I live in Silverlake and walk rather than use a car whenever I can. It's 1.5 miles from my house to Atwater Village; I've walked that distance many times. What I can't do, however, is walk Hyperion between Atwater Village and the shopping district along Hyperion marking the border between Silverlake and Los Feliz. Why?

1. To cross Glendale to access Hyperion risks life and limb since drivers use the traffic light at Glenoaks as a starting line for a race up the bridge and there is no crosswalk or light. 2. The "sidewalks" are impossibly narrow and under wary, nonexistent. If I have my shopping cart with me, I simply don't fit. 3. There's no separation between speeding traffic and what meagre sidewalk there is. It's too scary to walk there.

One more thing: I almost always walk on the south side of Glendale to get to Atwater Village because crossing the 5N on-ramp is suicidal. I want a bridge I can walk on safely!
Date: 10/29/2013

Please submit any comments on the proposed project tonight by placing this card in the comment box or send it via email by November 7, 2013 to Tami.Podesta@dot.ca.gov, or by mail to:

Tami Podesta, Branch Chief
Division of Environmental Planning
California Department of Transportation District 7
100 South Main St., Los Angeles, CA 90012

Name: Diana Estrada
Address: 4210 Los Feliz #3

Email: d.estrada@gmail.com
City/Zip: 90027

Organization represented, if any:

Comment:

I have lived in Los Feliz for five years. I love it here, but I still do shopping/rec activities in Glendale/Atwater. A quick way is to take the Hyperion Bridge.

It's really difficult to cross from the bridge from Rowena. There is not a Safe sidewalk to cross. Going down the bridge is difficult because I have to cross streets w/ cars going at high way speeds. This area needs to Slow Down! Not Safe for children or Elderly. Please make this Safe for motorists/cyclists/walkers. Please reconsider your current plan. Thank you.
Glendale-Hyperion Complex of Bridges Improvement Project

COMMENT CARD

Date: __________________

Please submit any comments on the proposed project tonight by placing this card in the comment box or send it via email by November 7, 2013 to Tami.Podesta@dot.ca.gov, or by mail to:

Tami Podesta, Branch Chief
Division of Environmental Planning
California Department of Transportation District 7
100 South Main St., Los Angeles, CA 90012

Name: Troy Herrera          Address: 4109 melrose ave

Email: ___________________     City/Zip: Los Angeles 90029

Organization represented, if any: ____________________________

Comment: The paramount to such a project is to protect all commuters of Los Angeles. Reducing car speed and protecting the non car commuters (i.e. bikes and pedestrians) let me be very clear... A bike lane needs to be blocked from cars and pedestrians. If not then it must be a sharrow in a full LANE.

__________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________
Date: 10/28/13

Please submit any comments on the proposed project tonight by placing this card in the comment box or send it via email by November 7, 2013 to Tami.Podesta@dot.ca.gov, or by mail to:

Tami Podesta, Branch Chief
Division of Environmental Planning
California Department of Transportation District 7
100 South Main St., Los Angeles, CA 90012

Name: ANGELICA GARZA Address: 4045 GLENALBYN DR

Email: GARZA.PC74180.COM City/Zip: LA CA 90065

Organization represented, if any:

Comment: As a driver who has driven over the bridge in the Southern direction, I have noticed that the speeds most cars reach are unsafe currently.

The currently proposed plan for the seismic changes will increase speeds and make the bridge more unsafe and a liability for the city. Cars are simply going from one community to another. It makes no sense to increase speeds for the span of the bridge.

As a driver who has seen cyclists traverse the bridge, I fear for their lives. With the growing number of cyclists, the city is exposing itself to more liability by making the bridge less safe for them with the proposed plan.

I oppose the current plan. There are alternatives being proposed which are far better designed or that contain elements that would decrease the
Glendale-Hyperion Complex of Bridges Improvement Project

COMMENT CARD

Date: 10-28-13

Please submit any comments on the proposed project tonight by placing this card in the comment box or send it via email by November 7, 2013 to Tami.Podesta@dot.ca.gov, or by mail to:

Tami Podesta, Branch Chief
Division of Environmental Planning
California Department of Transportation District 7
100 South Main St., Los Angeles, CA 90012

Name: Eric Sugiwa

Email: e.sugiwa@gmail.com

Address: 1923 W. 84th Pl.

City/Zip: Los Angeles, CA 90047

Organization represented, if any:

Comment: I'm a road cyclist and who commutes by bike. I frequently transit from Silver Lake to Atwater using the Glendale-Hyperion Bridge. I urge a design that includes designated bicycle lanes on both sides of the bridge and includes a central traffic meridian to prevent cars from colliding into each other. I support any structural changes to slow traffic and protect and encourage pedestrian and cyclist use of the bridge, in accordance with the 2010 Los Angeles City Bicycle Master Plan.
Glendale-Hyperion Complex of Bridges Improvement Project

COMMENT CARD

Date: 10/28/13

Please submit any comments on the proposed project tonight by placing this card in the comment box or send it via email by November 7, 2013 to Tami.Podesta@dot.ca.gov, or by mail to:

Tami Podesta, Branch Chief
Division of Environmental Planning
California Department of Transportation District 7
100 South Main St., Los Angeles, CA 90012

Name: Peter G SAFONOV  Address: 329 S Rock Dr

Email: PSAFONOV@gmail.com  City/Zip: BEVERLY HILLS CA 90212

Organization represented, if any: ________________________

Comment: As a cyclist and motorist in Los Angeles, I feel failed by the proposed design for the Hyperion Bridge. As a cyclist, the ramps are obvious. Hyperion is already a scary ride as is. The idea that it would be proposed to make it even worse is appalling. As a motorist I also feel failed, because it is another reminder that motorists are taught that they are entitled to the road, and that more vulnerable road users are not a consideration. I am reminded of this when I see the DMV does not mention cyclists in driver tests, I was reminded of this when I saw a cyclist harassed by a motorist as he made a legal left turn on the way to this very meeting. I am reminded every time a cyclist I know is hit by a motorist, even more so when it is a hit-and-run, which happens all too often. And this bridge is another reminder of a toxic culture that teaches selfishness to those in power and that vulnerable road users need to get out of the way.
Glendale-Hyperion Complex of Bridges Improvement Project

COMMENT CARD

Date: 10/28/13

Please submit any comments on the proposed project tonight by placing this card in the comment box or send it via email by November 7, 2013 to Tami.Podesta@dot.ca.gov, or by mail to:

Tami Podesta, Branch Chief
Division of Environmental Planning
California Department of Transportation District 7
100 South Main St., Los Angeles, CA 90012

Name: Kathryn Savage
Address: ________________________________

Email: _________________________________ City/Zip: ________________________________

Organization represented, if any: ________________________________

Comment: I strongly oppose the current proposal of the Glendale Blvd. - Hyperion Ave. Complex of Bridge Improvement Project b/c it does not include safe pedestrian access to pedestrian, bicyclists and drivers. I strongly oppose the inclusion of (crash barriers), a median barrier, banked curves, a design speed of 55 mph & the exclusion of bicycle lanes (sidewalks on both sides of the bridge) direct pedestrian access all the way across the Complex (a signalized crosswalk all the way across the width of the Complex).

If a median barrier is included it will pose an obstacle for emergency vehicles. If there is a column & cars block it up徒步 emergency cars won’t be able to get through & up the other side & across the median barrier.
I strongly oppose current proposal for a few reasons. One reason is that it does not provide safe, equal access to pedestrians, bicyclists, and drivers. It also includes a median barrier. If there is an accident on the bridge, cyclists block now. A ride on emergency vehicle can only get to you at the side. I want to be able to ride my bike across the bridge. I ride across the bridge, and vehicles speed up, making it dangerous for me. I often have to swerve to avoid cars speeding up, and I do not feel safe. Traffic is often heavy, and I do not feel safe taking right turns or passing other cars. I want to feel safe when I ride my bike across the bridge. I demand that the proposal include bike lanes. The City has the responsibility to make it safe for me to ride my bike across this bridge. That means slowing down the traffic, adding bike lanes, and ensuring safety for all.
Date: 10-28-13

Please submit any comments on the proposed project tonight by placing this card in the comment box or send it via email by November 7, 2013 to Tami.Podesta@dot.ca.gov, or by mail to:

Tami Podesta, Branch Chief
Division of Environmental Planning
California Department of Transportation District 7
100 South Main St., Los Angeles, CA 90012

Name: Kevin Salazar
Address: 3130 hollydale drive
Email: Kevin_Salazar.28@yahoo.com
City/Zip: Los Angeles CA 90039

Organization represented, if any: 

Comment: The Hyperion-Glendale Bridge Community Crossing alternate Concept plan is the best way to go because I grew up in Atwater all my life and now dorm at Cal State Northridge but before going to college, I went to John Marshall high on the other side of the bridge and I went to school by bike all four years and those four years were the scariest because cars go extremely fast and the Northeast police do not enforce the speed limit on the bridge. All four years and years before I have not yet seen one police car pull over a speeder. Don't turn the bridge into a freeway.
Date: ____________________

Please submit any comments on the proposed project tonight by placing this card in the comment box or send it via email by November 7, 2013 to Tami.Podesta@dot.ca.gov, or by mail to:

Tami Podesta, Branch Chief
Division of Environmental Planning
California Department of Transportation District 7
100 South Main St., Los Angeles, CA 90012

Name: Jonathan Edwards
Address: 507 S Madison Ave #5

Email: ____________________________ City/Zip: Pasadena, CA 91101

Organization represented, if any: Pasadena Complete Streets Coalition

Comment:

Please reduce the # of auto lanes
reduce the planned speed of autos
remove the "crash barriers"
Add wide sidewalks on both sides
Add protected bike lanes on both sides
Date: 10/27/13

Please submit any comments on the proposed project tonight by placing this card in the comment box or send it via email by November 7, 2013 to Tami.Podesta@dot.ca.gov, or by mail to:

Tami Podesta, Branch Chief
Division of Environmental Planning
California Department of Transportation District 7
100 South Main St., Los Angeles, CA 90012

Name: Winneteaux Address: 4109 Melrose Ave

Email: Winneteaux@gmail.com City/Zip: LA 90029

Organization represented, if any: Church of E.U.N.

Comment: I personally ride the Hyperion Bridge everyday to and from work on my bicycle. There is absolutely no reason it needs to be a freeway. Its absurd, either side of the bridge is regular street with regular speed limits and lanes It would only make the bridge more dangerous for cyclists.
Date: **10-28-13**

Please submit any comments on the proposed project tonight by placing this card in the comment box or send it via email by November 7, 2013 to Tami.Podesta@dot.ca.gov, or by mail to:

Tami Podesta, Branch Chief  
Division of Environmental Planning  
California Department of Transportation District 7  
100 South Main St., Los Angeles, CA 90012

Name: **MARINO PASCAL**  
Address: **2325 CRESTMOORE PL**

Email: **mpascal@gmail.com**  
City/Zip: **LOS ANGELES 90065**

Organization represented, if any: 

Comment: I support 6 ft wide bike lanes in both directions. No crash barriers
Gassell Park
- Fletcher
- Hyperion

My step daughter would ride

the proposed side bridge impractical

taking the side up the street

Bike lanes to nowhere

Thank for listening

A lot of great speakers

Ground zero bik comm
Glendale-Hyperion Complex of Bridges Improvement Project
COMMENT CARD

Date: 10/28/13

Please submit any comments on the proposed project tonight by placing this card in the comment box or send it via email by November 7, 2013 to TamLPodesta@dot.ca.gov, or by mail to:
Tami Podesta, Branch Chief
Division of Environmental Planning
California Department of Transportation District 7
100 South Main St., Los Angeles, CA 90012

Name: Blair Miller
Address: 1795 Asbury Drive

Email: blairmiller1@yahoo.com
City/Zip: Pasadena CA 91104

Organization represented, if any:

Comment: I live in Pasadena and work in E. Hollywood. I bike several times per month between the two locations. I would bike through Atwater except that I do not feel safe riding over the bridge.

Also, I am a member of the Transportation Commission for Pasadena and Pasadena’s Complete Streets Coalition. Based on that experience, I know that creating safe, attractive infrastructure that encourages walking and cycling is critical to getting people out of their cars, with all of the attendant environmental and health and economic benefits.

Glendale-Hyperion has the potential to be a tremendous connection between neighborhoods. Please make sure this potential is realized. And please keep the vision of the L.A. River in mind in your planning.
Please submit any comments on the proposed project tonight by placing this card in the comment box or send it via email by November 7, 2013 to Tami.Podesta@dot.ca.gov, or by mail to:

Tami Podesta, Branch Chief  
Division of Environmental Planning  
California Department of Transportation District 7  
100 South Main St., Los Angeles, CA 90012

Name: DON WARD  
Address: ROADBLOCK @ MIDNIGHTRIDAZZ.COM 90027

Email:  
City/Zip:  

Organization represented, if any:  

Comment:  

I DON'T FEEL SAFE WITH THE DESIGN SPEED OF THIS PROJECT WHICH IS STATED TO BE > 30 MPH.  

I DON'T FEEL SAFE WITH THE CRASH BARRIERS BECAUSE OF EMERGENCY VEHICLE ACCESS.  

I DON'T FEEL SAFE WITH CRASH BARRIERS BECAUSE OF FEELING TRAPPED WITH 55 MPH TRAFFIC.  

THERE IS NO NORTH SOUTH PEDESTRIAN ACCESS IN THE PROPOSED PLAN.  

SHOULDER ALWAYS HAVE GLASS AND DEBRIS.  

LADOT ENGINEERS ARE NOT INFORMED ENOUGH TO KNOW DESIGN SPEEDS.  

THE CUTTERS AND ROAD EDGES ARE NEVER CLEANED.  

THE PROBLEM IS SPEEDING.
Date: **Oct. 28, 2013**

Please submit any comments on the proposed project tonight by placing this card in the comment box or send it via email by November 7, 2013 to Tami.Podesta@dot.ca.gov, or by mail to:

Tami Podesta, Branch Chief  
Division of Environmental Planning  
California Department of Transportation District 7  
100 South Main St., Los Angeles, CA 90012

Name: **Cody Sisco**  
Address: **3215 Berkeley Ave**

Email: **@cody@gmail.com**  
City/Zip: **Los Angeles, CA 90026**

Organization represented, if any:

Comment: **The measure of success for any urban development or improvement program is not whether the letter or spirit of planning law has been met; rather it is whether it contributes to the needs of the community. The design of the bridge over the LA River at Hyperion & Glendale fails to improve mobility for pedestrians & cyclists and fails to contribute to the Bicycle Master Plan for Los Angeles.**

To meet the Plan's intent, we should create bidirectional, grade-separated lanes for bicycle traffic in addition to sidewalks for pedestrians.

And no more pledges of allegiance at public meetings!
Date: 10/28/13

Please submit any comments on the proposed project tonight by placing this card in the comment box or send it via email by November 7, 2013 to Tami.Podesta@dot.ca.gov, or by mail to:

Tami Podesta, Branch Chief
Division of Environmental Planning
California Department of Transportation District 7
100 South Main St., Los Angeles, CA 90012

Name: REUBEN OLIVAS Address: 3511 ATWATER AVE #3
Email: OLIVAS99@HOTMAIL.COM City/Zip: L.A. CA 90039

Organization represented, if any: _________________________________

Comment: Problem: Bridge is used as At Rear for Frex
My son & I walk bridge at different hours & cars speed
by at high rate. This is not a Freeway. Speed
needs to be controlled & LOWERED. Many
kids walk to Marshall H.S. including my
teen & I Fear it daily.
I lived in Atwater since 1988 - Traffic
is worse. But RAISING the SPEED WILL
NOT HELP. ONLY RAISE TRAFFIC
Glendale-Hyperion Complex of Bridges Improvement Project

COMMENT CARD

Date: 10-28-2013

Please submit any comments on the proposed project tonight by placing this card in the comment box or send it via email by November 7, 2013 to Tami.Podesta@dot.ca.gov, or by mail to:

Tami Podesta, Branch Chief
Division of Environmental Planning
California Department of Transportation District 7
100 South Main St., Los Angeles, CA 90012

Name: Jessica Ruvacabas
Address: 5481 San Vicente Blvd #9

Email: ruvacabasjc@yahoo.com City/Zip: Los Angeles 90019

Organization represented, if any:

Comment: As a non-car owner for the last 10 years I feel that my life is healthier. People feel that you must drive a car. Median barriers bar people from accidents. Less cars and slower speeds will encourage people to be safer. We want traffic to reduce & people to be safer.
Date: 10/28/13

Please submit any comments on the proposed project tonight by placing this card in the comment box or send it via email by November 7, 2013 to Tami.Podesta@dot.ca.gov, or by mail to:

Tami Podesta, Branch Chief  
Division of Environmental Planning  
California Department of Transportation District 7  
100 South Main St., Los Angeles, CA 90012

Name: STEVE ISAACS  
Address: 1518 N. MANSFIELD AVE 90025

Email: steveisaccs@me.com  
City/Zip: HOLLYWOOD CA 90028

Organizations represented, if any:

Comment: I choose to be a bicycle commuter in this city. The cost, pollution, congestion and inconvenience has forced this decision. The danger involved in bicycling in this city is the only negative.

This bridge needs proper, safe bike lanes, not small spaces with no insulation from speeding cars.

Frankly, I am much more afraid of being run over by a speeding car on this bridge than of an earthquake.
Date: 10/28/13

Please submit any comments on the proposed project tonight by placing this card in the comment box or send it via email by November 7, 2013 to Tami.Podesta@dot.ca.gov, or by mail to:

Tami Podesta, Branch Chief
Division of Environmental Planning
California Department of Transportation District 7
100 South Main St., Los Angeles, CA 90012

Name: Pat Smith
Address: 4206 Holly Knoll Dr.
Email: PatLSmith@paqtel.net
City/Zip: LA 90027

Organization represented, if any:

Comment:

Bike lanes (which by definition must be at least 5' wide) are required to comply with the 2010 Bike Plan and federal Complete Streets standards/policies. At a minimum, narrow the lanes to 10.5' over the main bridge to allow for 5' bike lanes. If it is possible to design a barrier that does not require 4' (2' median + 1' on each side), do so to free up space for wider sidewalk.

At Waverly, consider when the roadway is narrowing, consider 10' lane widths to allow for wider striped shoulders (cur concrete) & similarly evaluate opportunities for a narrower barrier to achieve bike lanes.

Seismic repairs are essential, as is historic restoration. These improvements are not mutually exclusive of complete street design.
We have 10' lanes and even 9.5' lanes on many streets in the City of Los Angeles, particularly on streets the same local neighborhoods, where speeding should be discouraged.

Understanding that "maintaining vehicular capacity" is required to maintain funding, once the project has been completed, convert the roadway to one lane each way with protected buffered bike lanes. If bike lanes are not included, funding will be jeopardized because the project environmental document is flawed (it does not address non-compliance with 2010 Bike Plan & Complete Streets Policy) and, sue therefore, subject to litigation.
Date: 10/28/15

Please submit any comments on the proposed project tonight by placing this card in the comment box or send it via email by November 7, 2013 to Tami.Podesta@dot.ca.gov, or by mail to:

Tami Podesta, Branch Chief
Division of Environmental Planning
California Department of Transportation District 7
100 South Main St., Los Angeles, CA 90012

Name: Alexis Lante
Address: \_

Email: alexislante@gmail.com
City/Zip: \_

Please ensure this project includes better pedestrian access, connection to the river, and bike lanes or a bike path.

Beyond just providing for all users on the bridge's creating a bridge that is safe for all users is the impact to the communities on both sides of the river. If you design the bridge for 35 it's not just an issue on the bridge it's an issue off the bridge - people speeding on the bridge speed off the bridge is create unsafe streets where we shop, drive, enjoy time with our families & friends.

The speed limit on both sides of the bridge is 35 & the bridge should be designed for 35 mile house speeds. It should be designed in a way that connects our communities for all users - especially our youngest & oldest community members.

A bridge without bike lanes or a path, sidewalks on both sides and safe speeds is a blight on our community & misses a tremendous opportunity to enhance our communities & the LA river.
Glendale-Hyperion Complex of Bridges Improvement Project

COMMENT CARD

Date: 10/27/13

Please submit any comments on the proposed project tonight by placing this card in the comment box or send it via email by November 7, 2013 to Tami.Podesta@dot.ca.gov, or by mail to:

Tami Podesta, Branch Chief
Division of Environmental Planning
California Department of Transportation District 7
100 South Main St., Los Angeles, CA 90012

Name: MARC CASWEEL Address: 2974 Bellevue Ave
Email: MARC A caswell @ gmail.com City/Zip: 90026

Organization represented, if any:

Comment: With 16.4% of households in Los Angeles being car-free -- and millions more with only one car, how can we build a project that fails to provide the safe transport of so many?

To build a project that is solely designed for cars is inequitable and immoral. Should this project move forward w/o a bike lane and an individual is killed, the potential liability to LADOT would be huge.

Further-- once this area’s posted speed is raised 55 MPH, the LADOT will be forced to review and increase the surrounding streets (Hyperion/Glendale) to meet the 65 percentile causing unsafe conditions in the neighborhood and near schools. The ripple effect is unacceptable...

Safety first-- always. Please,
Glendale-Hyperion Complex of Bridges Improvement Project

COMMENT CARD

Date: 10/28/13

Please submit any comments on the proposed project tonight by placing this card in the comment box or send it via email by November 7, 2013 to Tami.Podesta@dot.ca.gov, or by mail to:

Tami Podesta, Branch Chief
Division of Environmental Planning
California Department of Transportation District 7
100 South Main St., Los Angeles, CA 90012

Name: Leslie Jean Koch Ochs          Address: 1651 Lucile Ave.

Email: lesliekoch56@gmail.com          City/Zip: L.A. CA. 90026

Organization represented, if any:

Comment: This project concerns me because every time I ride my bike over Hyperion Bridge I put my life on the line! For many years I have lamented the poor planning of this bridge. But this “plan” is crazy. I live in Silver Lake (17 yrs) and work in Atwater and would love to bike to work, the only reason I hesitate is the dangerousness of riding on, and oft crossing terrifying lanes of motorists. Cutting pedestrian and bike access to the Bridge is horrible.
Date: 10/28/13

Please submit any comments on the proposed project tonight by placing this card in the comment box or send it via email by November 7, 2013 to Tami.Podesta@dot.ca.gov, or by mail to:

Tami Podesta, Branch Chief
Division of Environmental Planning
California Department of Transportation District 7
100 South Main St., Los Angeles, CA 90012

Name: Everton Buehning  Address: 1715 Lemoyne St

Email: everon.bing@hotmail.com  City/Zip: 90026

Organization represented, if any:

Comment: This seemed a bit like a bike riders complaint session.

As someone who drives and am not interested in being on a bike, I would like them as far away from the cars as possible. Since most of them don't obey the traffic laws, I don't really want less road, but if they are separate, it would be a whole lot better.
Glendale-Hyperion Complex of Bridges Improvement Project

COMMENT CARD

Date: OCT. 28, 2013

Please submit any comments on the proposed project tonight by placing this card in the comment box or send it via email by November 7, 2013 to Tami.Podesta@dot.ca.gov, or by mail to:

Tami Podesta, Branch Chief
Division of Environmental Planning
California Department of Transportation District 7
100 South Main St., Los Angeles, CA 90012

Name: DEMOCRAT MURPHY Address: 2351 SILVER PIPER AVE
Email: losangeleswalksegmail.com City/Zip: LOS ANGELES, CA 90039

Organization represented, if any: LOS ANGELES WALKS

The city will not destroy silver lake and atwater by building a freeway between our communities. We are already divided by a freeway.

The city will not destroy visions for a more walkable and bikeable silver lake, Atwater and northeast Los Angeles.

The city will not violate its own 2010 bike plan by not providing a bike lane on the hyperion bridge.

The city will not sacrifice the life of any pedestrian by not providing a safe pedestrian crossing at the junction of hyperion ave and Glendale blvd.

The city will not jeopardize the federal funding for this project that requires a bike linkage on the bridge since cyclists can ride on the streets leading to the bridge.

The city will not destroy the lives of children and seniors who rely on walking as their main mode of transportation.

The city will not violate the state mandated complete streets act by building a bridge only for the movement of cars.

The city will build a bridge that links our communities and strengthens our active transportation networks.

The city will live up to its commitments to improve the mobility of Los Angeles. From the mobility element goals:

1. Develop a revised Mobility Element which will identify goals, objectives, policies, and programs that reflect the communities’ future mobility ideas and suggested strategies.

2. Identify a layered network of arterial streets that assist all types of mobility (especially trucks, cars, bicycles, and pedestrians) to get around.

3. Update our City’s Street Standards to reflect all transportation modes (trucks, cars, scooters, bicycles, and pedestrians).

The city will build a project that adds to the safety of all users not to the apparent safety of only car drivers.

The city will listen to the residents, business and property owners, cyclists, walkers, kids, dog owners, students, computers who want a safe and sane community, not a roadway.
Our city was built for the care and culture of people, not for the movement of cars.
We are all pedestrians. Every driver, every cyclist, every transit rider, every kid, every senior, every every body.

**THE CITY WILL BUILD A SIDEWALK ON BOTH SIDES OF EACH BRIDGE AS PEDESTRIANS WALK ON BOTH SIDES NOW DESPITE THE FACT THAT THE EASTSIDE SIDEWALK IS ONLY ABOUT 1 1/2 FEET WIDE, THERE IS NO PROHIBITION FOR PEDESTRIANS TO WALK THERE.**

**ALSO SEE ATTACHED LETTER**
Ms. Tami Podesta, Branch Chief  
Division of Environmental Planning  
California Department of Transportation District 7  
100 South Main Street  
Los Angeles, California 90012  

Los Angeles Walks Comments on Glendale Boulevard-Hyperion Avenue Complex of Bridges Improvement Project  

Dear Ms. Podesta,  

Los Angeles Walks is concerned that the proposed design for the Hyperion Ave viaduct will not be safe and inviting for pedestrians and cyclists. We suggest improvements to the design to create a bridge that is safe for all users. Los Angeles Walks is a pedestrian advocacy organization dedicated to promoting walking and pedestrian infrastructure in Los Angeles, educating Angelenos and local policymakers concerning the rights and needs of pedestrians of all abilities, and fostering the development of safe and vibrant environments for all pedestrians. We view the viaduct as an important link between two walkable Los Angeles communities – Los Feliz/Silver Lake and Atwater where linkages are very limited due to the Los Angeles River and Interstate 5. It is therefore extremely problematic that the proposed project is designed to freeway standards at 55 miles per hour, with a crash barrier and wide vehicle lanes that tend to encourage fast driving. These design standards are not appropriate in urban settings and would disadvantage pedestrians and cyclists and be a safety hazard for all users. Fortunately, modifications to the distribution and width of facilities on the right of way can significantly improve the viaduct as a complete street and provide a vital community connection.  

A More Walkable Viaduct Design  

There are a number of factors that have been shown to make streets safe and inviting places to walk. On roads with busy vehicle traffic, pedestrians need separate facilities, direct routes, safe places to cross the street and surroundings that feel safe. As required by law the viaduct project calls for a sidewalk on one side of the Hyperion Viaduct. If, however, the roadway is designed with wide lanes and a crash barrier so as to allow and encourage fast driving, many residents will not feel comfortable walking on the sidewalk. Perceived safety and comfort are very important to pedestrians and the rush of cars moving at near

---

everyone walks in L.A.
freeway speeds next to sidewalks will discourage walking. Calming the traffic on the viaduct through design changes is essential to making it a good pedestrian environment.

Removing the median crash barrier, not super-elevating turns, and using lane widths appropriate for an urban setting rather than for a rural highway lane will provide a calmer and more pedestrian-friendly traffic environment. This allows for wider sidewalks and for bike lanes on both sides of the bridge. The cross section should be as follows (design by Los Angeles County Bike Coalition - LACBC):

69' Hyperion Viaduct Cross-Section

[Diagram of 69' Hyperion Viaduct Cross-Section]

58' Hyperion Avenue Cross-Section (under Waverly)

[Diagram of 58' Hyperion Avenue Cross-Section (under Waverly)]
Additional Crossings and Safety Measures
We appreciate the addition of a new pedestrian walkway across the former red car trolley piers and encourage its construction as it provides important connections to the Los Angeles River Ped-Bike Path. The addition of this walkway does not reduce the need to make the Hyperion viaduct, the most direct route across the river and the freeway, into a safe and welcoming route for pedestrians and cyclists. Walking is the lowest speed form of mobility and there is research showing that walkers are not likely to use bypasses and indirect routes (they will hopefully use the pedestrian walkway to access the river.)

Enhanced pedestrian crossings are needed to allow pedestrians to safely cross the often high-speed traffic between Hyperion Avenue and Glendale Blvd. The proposed project does not provide access to the single-side Hyperion Avenue sidewalk from the south side of Glendale Boulevard. A signalized crosswalk with refuge areas across both streets at the east end of the bridge complex would allow pedestrians to cross safely and would also assist cyclists.

A Complete Street
Los Angeles Walks encourages Caltrans and LADOT to listen to community voices calling for a safe viaduct rather than a freeway-style design. We look forward to working with you to create a rehabilitated bridge that promotes safe transportation for all.

Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions or concerns. My contact information is listed above.

All the best,

Deborah Murphy, Executive Director

Cc:
Honorable Eric Garcetti
Honorable Tom LaBonge
Honorable Mitch O'Farrell
Eric Bruins, LACBC
Margot Ocanas, LADOT Pedestrian Coordinator
Michelle Mowery, LADOT Bike Coordinator
APPENDIX F-3: October 28, 2013 Public Hearing Transcript
1) Reduce vehicle speed on Hyperion Avenue
2) Provide bike lanes on Hyperion Avenue (perhaps protected by barrier)
3) Add full-width crosswalk on Atwater Side of Glendale and Hyperion
4) Eliminate median and razing barriers, and/or banked turns
5) Non-specific approval
6) Non-specific disapproval
7) This is not a pedestrian-friendly design
8) Do not increase or improve access to cyclists on Hyperion
9) Propose a multi-modal design/be consistent with Bike Plan & Caltrans Safety Policy
10) Enhance safety for everyone
11) There should be narrower car/traffic lanes and reduce traffic lanes
12) There should be well-marked crosswalks and wayfinding signs
13) Preserve the historic bridge design
14) There should be wider sidewalks
15) Address traffic congestion
16) Consider proposed alternative designs
17) Provide accessibility to LA River
18) Provide a public hearing
19) Review related projects, specifically the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers document, Los Angeles River Ecosystem Restoration Integrated Feasibility Study that could potentially impact the detention/infiltration basin in Sunnynook River Park
20) Emergency vehicles possibly will not be able to get through due to crash barrier
21) We would like to participate in advisory board
22) Security Measures for Pedestrian Bridge
23) On-demand traffic light at I-5 exit
24) What are the number of lanes on pedestrian bridge/access?
25) Will there be a link between pedestrian paths on both sides of the bridge?
26) Keep the median barriers in the plan.
27) Reduce the bridge to one lane in each direction.
28) Provide benches on the sidewalks on the bridge.
29) Design the center of the bridge for pedestrians and bikes.
30) Create a public space on the bridge for pedestrians.
31) Provide noise mitigation during construction.
32) Will project provide proper bike/pedestrian detours, signage, and safe alternative routing if existing bike facility is impacted by construction?
33) Must maintain Metro facilities and services during project
34) Will bus shelters, benches and other amenities be installed?
35) Be consistent with Caltrans Complete Streets Policy (DD-64-R1) and FHWA Routine Accommodations Policy (23 C.F.R. § 652.5) elderly and handicapped
36) Provide a signalized crosswalk with refuge areas at both sides of street at east end of bridge complex
37) Caltrans and the City of Los Angeles Cannot Certify the IS/EA if a Fair Argument Can Be Made That the Project Will Create Significant Impacts for Bicyclists
38) A wide shoulder/shoulder is not a bike lane
39) Review flood maps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Surname</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Email Address</th>
<th>ZIP Code</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Dhanda</td>
<td>Nishith</td>
<td><a href="mailto:nishiths@gmail.com">nishiths@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>90068</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Waldner</td>
<td>Mark</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mark90039@gmail.com">mark90039@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Waldner</td>
<td>Lisa</td>
<td><a href="mailto:normandy17612@msn.com">normandy17612@msn.com</a></td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Kerr</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>90026</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Keene</td>
<td>Dennis</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>90039</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Huffman</td>
<td>Niall</td>
<td><a href="mailto:nhuffman28@gmail.com">nhuffman28@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>90036</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Nern</td>
<td>Ben</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>90029</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Murphy</td>
<td>Deborah</td>
<td><a href="mailto:losangeleswalks@gmail.com">losangeleswalks@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>90039</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Knutzen</td>
<td>Erik</td>
<td><a href="mailto:thoughstyle@sbcglobal.net">thoughstyle@sbcglobal.net</a></td>
<td>90026</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Ward</td>
<td>Don</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>O'Grady</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td><a href="mailto:tomasogrady@enrichla.org">tomasogrady@enrichla.org</a></td>
<td>90027</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Berolzheimer</td>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>51250</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Safonov</td>
<td>Alex</td>
<td>90210</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Lopez</td>
<td>Luis</td>
<td>90209</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Roullier</td>
<td>Steven</td>
<td>90266</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Carson</td>
<td>Andy</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Geometric</td>
<td>Directory</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Michaelson</td>
<td>Andy</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>Joe</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>Joe</td>
<td>90039</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>Joe</td>
<td>90039</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>Joe</td>
<td>90039</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>Joe</td>
<td>90039</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>Joe</td>
<td>90039</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>Joe</td>
<td>90039</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>Joe</td>
<td>90039</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>Joe</td>
<td>90039</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>Joe</td>
<td>90039</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>Joe</td>
<td>90039</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>Joe</td>
<td>90039</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>Joe</td>
<td>90039</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>Joe</td>
<td>90039</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>Joe</td>
<td>90039</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>Joe</td>
<td>90039</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>Joe</td>
<td>90039</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>Joe</td>
<td>90039</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>Joe</td>
<td>90039</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>Joe</td>
<td>90039</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>Joe</td>
<td>90039</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>Joe</td>
<td>90039</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>Joe</td>
<td>90039</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>Joe</td>
<td>90039</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>Joe</td>
<td>90039</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>Joe</td>
<td>90039</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>Joe</td>
<td>90039</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>Joe</td>
<td>90039</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>Joe</td>
<td>90039</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>Joe</td>
<td>90039</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>Joe</td>
<td>90039</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>Joe</td>
<td>90039</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>Joe</td>
<td>90039</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>Joe</td>
<td>90039</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>Joe</td>
<td>90039</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>Joe</td>
<td>90039</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>Joe</td>
<td>90039</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>Joe</td>
<td>90039</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>Joe</td>
<td>90039</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>Joe</td>
<td>90039</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>Joe</td>
<td>90039</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>Joe</td>
<td>90039</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>Joe</td>
<td>90039</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>Joe</td>
<td>90039</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>Joe</td>
<td>90039</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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Los Angeles, California, Monday, October 28, 2012

6:00 p.m.

MR. BRADY: Hello everybody and welcome to the public hearing. We want to start out as we always do with the Pledge of Allegiance. Please stand.

(Pledge of Allegiance was recited)

MR. BRADY: Hi, everybody. I'm John Brady from the Bureau of Engineering. I'm going to be your host and MC for tonight's public hearing.

This is our agenda: We'll do a welcome and introduction. We'll then have a presentation by the Bureau staff. We'll have some question and answers that the idea there is for clarification questions about the presentation that you'll see.

And then we'll open up the official public hearing, and that's for your comments that you want to go into the record of the -- during this environmental process. So like I said, this is a public hearing. And do we have -- I want to give the representatives from the elected officials' offices.

Are there any here that want to introduce themselves? Well, when they roll in we'll let them introduce themselves. Now, tonight is an opportunity for
you to provide the comments -- official comments for the
official record on the environmental document.

And you can either present verbal comments or also
written comments. And, of course, if you don't provide
verbal comments tonight, you can do written comments up
until November 7th. That's the close of the official
comment period.

There are comment cards in the room, and some of
the staff have it if you didn't get one. If you have a
comment card or a speaker card -- excuse me -- if everyone
can fill out a speaker card if you have it. If you haven't,
can you please pass those in?

Where's Katherine? Katherine over there in the
teal dress is collecting the comment cards. Let's see.

Other things. Okay. And then let's see. So the ground
rules. Fairly basic.

Please show respect at all times. All opinions are
welcome. This is the public comment period or hearing. If
you want to speak, you have to fill out a speaker card, so
please do that. One person at a time. And we'll call you
up here and speak from the podium.

And the time, everyone will have two minutes. The
time to speak is nontransferable. And we also have a court
reporter here who is taking everything down, so please --
please speak clearly.
And with that, my initial portion is done, and I would like to introduce Jim Treadway from the Bureau of Engineering. He's the program manager for our bridge improvement program, and he will be presenting the project, a short presentation and -- for you. And we'll go from there.

Jim?

MR. TREADWAY: Thanks, John. Every project has a purpose and need, and this is defined upon the screen. It's a seismic upgrade, correct, known safety issues whether they're seismic or geometric.

It's a historic preservation. This is historic monument #164 in the City of Los Angeles and to improve the mobility of cars, pedestrians, and bikes. On funding, it's a $50 million job if you skip to the bottom line. It's made up and called together from a variety of sources.

HBP stands for Highway Bridge Program. The majority of the funding comes from the FHWA, and that's administered by CalTrans, Measure R, Prop G is seismic funds, Prop C and Metro grant for $4 million.

Some of the timing issues and the federal end of it, 23CFR630 and title 23. There's a thing called a ten-year rule. With every federal funds, they want you to spend the money and get a project out on the street.

Noting the highlight, we've been at this for ten years. We've had a three-year extension and our funding
deadline, our milestone to get into the next phase, which is the right away phase, is March 2014.

Some history on this project for those of you who have been around and been part of the community for some time. You'll notice the initial proposal was to widen Hyperion by 44 feet and Glendale by 24 feet.

A revised proposal to widen Hyperion by 24 feet and Glendale by 16 feet. And the currently approved proposal is to widen Hyperion by 8 feet -- I'm sorry -- 8 feet on both Glendale. You see Hyperion is sandwiched in between Glendale.

Graphically, this is some of the highlights we thought it was necessary for to you know about. There was an initial proposal in 2002/2003. That was the first widening. 2004/2005 that got skinnied up. 2006/2007 that got skinnied up to where Hyperion was not widened in 8-foot widening on Glendale.

2008/2009 there was a request made to add a left turn lane off I-5 north which is incorporated in the current layout. Those of you who have driven that know the sight distance is quite short and it's a tough turn.

In 2008/2009 an infiltration basin was added to the project. And in 2011/2012 a ped bridge was added to the project. We've got graphics showing that further on in the presentation. There's your I-5 northbound off ramp and your
new bike lane that's proposed in the current project.

This is your infiltration basin next to the park on
the west side upstream. This is the ped bridge we talked
about. It uses some of the old, some of the new. The new
ped bridge, the old footings.

This is the rebuilt balustrades. These replicate
what was originally built in the original bridge and should
restore the historic look to the bridge.

Summing it all up, there's eight points. Seismic
widening, historic, I-5 northbound, ramp, signalized
crosswalks, pedestrian bridge over LA River, and water
quality in the infiltration basin.

Last September at the end of September, we had some
comments. This is our attempt to summarize those comments,
and this is what we heard:

Reduce the vehicular speed on Hyperion; extend the
crosswalk along all eight lanes on the Atwater Village side
of the bridge; lack of designated bike lanes along Hyperion,
and concerns over the median crash barrier.

So these are design options and considerations
remembering we're only in 35 percent design. You have got
to do a certain amount of design in order to get a project
and in order to talk about it in reality. That's about
where we are.

So we're talking about reducing the speeds to
address that concern, talked about some radar feedback signs. To be clear, the existing speed on Hyperion is 35 miles an hour. To be clear, the speed limit after the seismic improvement is planned will remain at 35 miles an hour.

Another thing to reduce the speed is to strike the shoulders and skinny those down and reduce the width. We took a look at that. We propose -- the project proposes to reduce the width to 10 and 1/2 feet and 11 feet with 3- and 4-foot shoulders respectively.

Talking about the crosswalk, a signalized crosswalk across Glendale and Hyperion is one thing we can consider and a design option that we can look at. The bike lane, there's a certain amount of real estate on this bridge. We proposed a 4-foot shoulder along the bridge and 3-foot under Waverly.

One of the things we heard is we don't want that asphalt concrete berm, so we're widening the shoulder so there's no berm for bicyclists. This is a potential design solution. There's 58 feet between the retaining wall and the retaining wall under Waverly.

Cut it any way you want, there's only 58 feet. The proposal on the table is 4.25 for pedestrians, 3 feet for a striped shoulder, 11-foot lane, 10 1/2 foot lane, 1 foot buffer, 2 foot barrier, 1 foot buffer, and 10 1/2, 3/4
there. All in all 58 feet.

You'll notice a great difference here. This is the 69-foot portion. 11 for travel lanes, same barrier, wider sidewalk, replica railing, replica railing, and striped shoulders. That's what's on the table now.

We're trying to trace out the bike routes in blue, and that's what we've got to get it all in one slide. These are the pedestrian routes in yellow. We've been talking to the LA County Bicycle Coalition, and this is their proposal under Waverly:

5-foot sidewalk, 5-foot bike lane, 11-foot lane, 10 1/2-foot lane, no median, 10 1/2-foot lane, 11-foot and 5-foot. On the 69 section, 1 1/2 light pole, 7-foot sidewalk, bike lane 5, railing there, 11, 11, 1-foot barrier between opposing traffic and the same on the other side. So that's a proposal from the LA County Bicycle Coalition.

The meeting guidelines. Don't need to remind you of that. What happens next? Always a good question. All comments, both oral or written, will be reviewed and written responses will be prepared. This is part of our environmental process.

These will be posted on the City and the project websites. The environmental document along with comments and responses attached will be forwarded to the Board of Public Works for a recommendation.
The City Council will then consider the comments and responses and the Board's recommendation before deciding on whether or not to approve the project and what conditions of the approval should be.

The dates on that project will be heard and posted on the websites. CalTrans will also consider the same information in coming to a decision on the funding of the project. The deadline to submit comments is November 7th, 2013.

Information on where to find the environmental document and where to submit is in the hearing notice and on the project website. It's also available in the back of the room. Thank you. You can always go to this website, too, for the latest.

MR. BRADY: Thank you, Jim. Let's go back to our agenda. Do we have any representatives from the elected officials offices? Do they want to come up and introduce themselves?

MR. PEREZ: Hello everyone. My name is Marcel Perez. I'm an associate director for transportation for Mayor Garcetti.

MS. RAMSEY: Hi. My name is Marie Ramsey. I'm here on behalf of Council Member O'Farrell, and this is my daughter, Janet.

MR. HAGER: Justin Hager on behalf of assembly member
Mike Gatto. I also live right across the street. I'll be in the back if you have questions.

MR. HALDEN: I'm Dan Halden. I'm a field deputy for council member Tom LaBonge.

MR. BRADY: Thank you very much. Remember, if you want to speak, please fill out a speaker card. If you don't want to speak but you still want to give comments, there are comment cards here that you can fill out.

There are two ways to do that. And of course if you don't do that tonight, you can always provide written comments up until November 7th. I've got quarter after. We wanted to give ten minutes for clarification questions about anything that you saw here.

If you have questions that are more of where you want them to actually go into the record, then I would -- for -- our recommendation is to do that during your speaking portion.

But if you have clarification questions or questions of fact, this is the time to do it. Now it's a quarter after. We can until 25 after. Does anybody have questions like that? Yeah.

MS. REHAT: Yeah. Barbara Rehat. My question has to do with pedestrian safety. I had the opportunity to see approximately 15 students, I guess, from Marshall High School walking across the bridge.
Virtually all of them were on the east side of the bridge. Puzzling. And virtually all of them crossed to the west side of the bridge and then crossed Glendale Boulevard north of where the freeway entrance is.

And in other words, they crossed many, many lanes of traffic and they were clearly --

MR. BRADY: Is there a question in there? I need to do this --

MS. REHAT: My question is: How is this being addressed? How is pedestrian safety being addressed with this plan?

MR. BRADY: Okay. That's a quick -- can we do a quick question on pedestrian --

MR. TREADWAY: Unfortunately, this isn't a brand new project. We're saddled with existing infrastructure that we have to do the best we can with what we've got. That's what we're trying to do with this project. We've heard a need for a crosswalk at Atwater.

We're addressing that and seeing if it could be with the grades and a full stop and sight distances. There's a lot of geometry that goes into seeing if that could be done. That's what we're trying to do.

As far as people running across lanes, it's just like anywhere else. It's difficult to prevent. Safety's --

MR. BRADY: There's a question -- all right. We'll do
one, two, three, four. So these next four. Go ahead.

MR. DHANDHA: In the cross section that you showed, that grade separation right around the crash barrier, is that -- why is there a grade separation right there?

MR. BRADY: Can you actually stand up so people can hear?

MR. DHANDHA: Nishith Dhanda; N-i-s-h-i-t-h, D-h-a-n-d-h-a. I have a question just on the cross section that was shown by Jim. Why was there a grade separation at the crash barrier? What is the purpose of that?

MR. BRADY: So he has a question about why is there a grade separation at the crash barrier?

MR. TREADWAY: First of all, if you take the water all on one sheet of flow, it won't drain properly. So that's one consideration. The other thing is there's some super elevation which means it's a little bit of a bank turn. Everyone thinks it's a race park or a race track.

One of the things is you don't want the super elevation in the wrong direction where as you go around the turn, the grade falls away from you. That's what we're trying to prevent. That's the thought behind that.

MR. DHANDHA: The purpose is for safety, or is that for --

MR. BRADY: Safety. Who's number two?

MR. DASH: Alex Dash. When it comes time to do public
comments, would you mind throwing up the map slide you had there? It'll be a little easier to reference.

MR. BRADY: Sure. We can do that.

MR. DASH: That's all I have.

MR. BRADY: We can put the map slide up. Okay. That was an easy question. Well, they don't have to be easy questions; they can be hard questions.

MR. AUTHIER: Adam. I was wondering is there any consideration to make these bike route extend all the way out to Sunset because that's ultimately where people are going.

MR. BRADY: Right. So the question is: Will the bike route be extended to Sunset?

MS. MOWERY: I'm Michelle Mowery. I'm the bike coordinator with LATOD. It's actually designated in the bike plan for us to be able to do that. It's not a part of this project. We need to work with the council office to talk about overall changes in the length, but it is on the plan.

MR. BRADY: Yes, ma'am. You were four.

MS. GREENHUT: My name is Kimberly Greenhut, and I just want to confirm because I've read otherwise, I just want to confirm you said it's 35 miles per hour and there's no plan for it to ever be faster than 35 miles per hour?

MR. BRADY: That's correct. All right. Other
clarification questions? One, two, three. Number one.

MS. SMITH: Just following up on that question -- and Pat Smith is my name. My question is: I have read and understood that while the posted speed is 35, the design speed is 55, and I think that's what people are responding to.

And I think it would be helpful if you would clarify what the current design speed is and what the future design speed would be and why it needs to be higher so that people can understand.

MR. BRADY: Who should answer that? Do we have DOT here? Come up to the microphone.

MR. SARKIS: Bearj Sarkis with LADOT. We have inherited curves on this. We're not designing -- it's not a replacement project. We have the two substandard curves on the bridge, so we're inheriting those. We're not touching the alignment of the bridge.

And if we design it for anything, we'll be lucky to get 35-miles per hour on these curves.

MS. SMITH: What does that mean?

MR. SARKIS: Well, we don't design it for 55.

MR. WARD: That's not what the -- Jeff the engineer said.

MR. BRADY: So if there's another question. Yeah, number two. Remember, these are clarification questions.
If you want to make a point with the question, that really is best for the public for the actual comment because that goes into the record.

MR. WARD: My name is Don Ward, and to restate what she said, we want to know what the current design speed is. What was the bridge designed for? What speed was it designed for originally?

And we have heard from Jeff the engineer from the private consulting company that is doing this project that the future design speed is 55 miles per hour. Why is that happening and what is the current design speed of the bridge?

MR. SARKIS: I don't know what the design speed was the bridge was designed for in the thirties, but we don't design it for 55. There's no way we can design for 55 miles per hour when there are two curves.

One of them is a 300-foot radius, the other one is about 400/450 which is not even good enough for 35. We have to use curve warning sign with advisory speed about 25 and 30 miles per hour. These are not the posted speed. These are advisory speed limit.

MR. BRADY: Who has number three?

MR. LEBARRI: Sergio Lebarri. My question is about the crosswalk. Currently what -- from what I saw here, there's only one crosswalk going halfway across. One sidewalk goes
to Hyperion north to the Glendale Boulevard side.

It's not going to be extending completely across.

Is that going to be changed or is this the final design or is this the final idea for it?

MR. BRADY: They're studying that. This is an idea that we've heard from the public and it's going to be studied.

MR. LEBARRI: So across all eight lanes?

MR. BRADY: Across all eight lanes.

MR. LEBARRI: Across the base of the bridge? But it will be a signal such as this and not just a simple crosswalk? A yellow flashing light is going to come on?

MR. TREADWAY: Signalized intersection, yeah. And mid-block, yeah.

MR. LEBARRI: Thank you.

MR. BRADY: Okay. We've got about two minutes, so I'm going do one, two, three, four. So that will be the last four. Clarification questions only, please. If you don't have a clarification question about what you've seen, then please hold that for someone who does. Okay. Number one.

MS. SAVAGE: Kathryn Savage. What is the current surveyed speed on the bridge?

MR. BRADY: Current surveyed speed on the bridge. The current.

MR. SARKIS: I don't have it with me, but it shows it's for 35 miles per hour is still valid.
MS. SAVAGE: No, I'm asking --

MR. WARD: We want to know the current surveyed speed.

MS. SAVAGE: Well, my question is what's the surveyed speed?

MR. SARKIS: When was it done?

MR. WARD: No, the current surveyed speed. What is it?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: How fast are they actually going?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: 45.

MR. SARKIS: They make it 50 percentile.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: They're not going 35. That's not true.

MR. SARKIS: No, it's about 37 or 38, the 83rd percentile.

MR. WARD: Why were we told differently at the last meeting that it was 30 to 55?

MR. BRADY: Now, who's second? Number two? Who's number two? The second person? Ma'am? Can you stand up, please, and say your name?

MS. BARNETT: My name is Karen Barnett. I'm here about sound mitigation. Will we have slides about that?

MR. BRADY: We don't have any slides on sound mitigation. There weren't any in the presentation, so that would be something for the public comments. Who was three?

Who was three? Yeah.

MR. DAY-DEANO: Hi. My name Charles Day-Deano. On the
slide where the route is angled, what is the slope on that road?

MR. BRADY: Do we have the slope?

MR. TREADWAY: Yes.

MR. BRADY: No, I think he's talking about under Waverly.

MR. DAY-DEANO: Yeah, that one right there with the angle.

MR. TREADWAY: Two percent.

MR. BRADY: Two percent.

MR. DAY-DEANO: Thank you.

MR. BRADY: And -- yes.

MR. DAY-DEANO: Can you talk about the collision date that you looked at that justified the need for the median barrier? I know there was some issues with the quality of the data and have you been able to correct some of those?

MR. BRADY: DOT, do you want to say anything? Do we have any updated collision data? We're still looking at that; correct?

MS. MOWERY: Michelle Mowery. We've looked at some preliminary -- we've looked at some preliminary data. We don't have a conclusion. We have just spent a couple days playing with the data, but we are going to do some additional analysis.

MR. BRADY: Now we'd like to start off the public
hearing portion. If you have -- if you want to speak, remember you have to fill out a speaker card, please. Two minutes per speaker.

Kathryn will call up your names or call up a number of people. I'm going to turn the podium here so you can address your comments to Jim Treadway. Again, all comments are welcome. If you don't do verbal, you can do written comments tonight and of course you can do written comments until November 7th. Thank you.

MS. PADILLA: I'd like to also introduce Caroline Ramsey from council member LaBonge's office.

MS. RAMSEY: Hi. And I would introduce other members of council member LaBonge's staff. Ann Halden, Emery Johnson, Tommy Newman.

MS. PADILLA: And I see Mary Rodriguez is here as well.

MS. RODRIGUEZ: Yes, Mary Rodriguez, field deputy for council member Mitch O'Farrell. And we have Gary Benjamin from our planning committee. And Marie Ramsey was running around with her little daughter. She's in the back here. She's also planning --

MS. PADILLA: Thank you. I'm going to go ahead and start. What I'm going to do is call three names at a time and we ask you to be prepared.

Mark Waldner, Lisa Waldner, and John Kerr. By the way, there is someone from my staff who is collecting the
cards. Cindy is collecting the cards. As you can see, she's the young woman in the black pants.

MR. WALDNER: Good evening. Mike Waldner. Thank you to the City of Los Angeles Bureau of Engineering for their fine work at addressing the community's concern in modifying the original plan that was presented over 8 years ago for this project.

I strongly support the currently amended as shown tonight DOT proposal that was presented. It addresses the main concern of this project which is seismic safety. This project must move forward now.

We've been lucky that in the past years we've not had the Big One hit. We know it will and when it does, this bridge must hold. Just imagine if the Big One strikes in rush hour and the bridge fails and falls on the northbound and southbound 5 Freeway, crushing vehicles, killing and trapping potentially dozens of people.

On a positive note, many additional improvements are being included in the project particularly the northbound 5 Freeway off ramp realignment in its new signalized intersection.

This intersection will provide the several benefits. The greatest benefit is that for the first time pedestrians and cyclists from the south side of the bridge will have a safe, direct access to the Hyperion Bridge.
An added bonus is that on the off ramp realignment it's providing more open space for access to the bike path and the new permanent Red Car and pedestrian bridge. I urge your consideration that no objection raised up to this point should stand in the way of the construction. Funding moves on. No build is not an option. Thank you.

MS. WALDNER: Hello. My name is Lisa Waldner. I'm a longtime resident of Atwater Village. I was on the board of the Resident's Association. I was on the formation committee of the neighborhood counsel. I also worked in Atwater Village.

I'm speaking tonight for three reasons. One, to support this project; two, to thank the City for including median barriers in the project due to public input from our neighborhood communities; and three, to stress the importance of why these median barriers must remain in the plans for the Hyperion Bridge seismic retrofit.

I have lived in Atwater Village for twenty years at the bottom of the split level of the bridge and have seen my share of collisions due to oncoming cars from opposite lanes. The problem has plagued this bridge for a long time. Now is the opportunity to remedy it. When the original retrofit plans were presented to the communities adjacent to the bridge complex, there were no barriers. At
our insistence, a barrier modification was added to the plan, but it was rejected by the communities because the barriers were too short to stop oncoming vehicles.

Only median barriers would work, and perhaps that's why some people now opposing them call them freeway crash barriers and that they do what they need to do by providing protection from oncoming vehicles that have become out of control.

I applaud the engineers and city leaders for listening to our needs and for including this element in the plans. No future addresses the safety of all users more than median barriers, and they must remain in the plans for the benefit of pedestrians, bicyclists, motorists, and truck drivers alike.

Only a physical barrier will keep people safe, neither a curb nor a line drawn on the road to designate one lane or another will stop a car out of control from hitting or killing someone. I have been a witness to that again and again. So please keep the median barriers in the plan and please move this project forward without further delay.

We have waited years for this project to start and users of this bridge have already been at risk too long. Safety for all should be everyone's main concern. Thank you for your time.

MS. PADILLA: Three more names. Nishith Dhanda,
Dennis P. Keene, and it looks like Niall Huffman.

MR. KERR: Hello. My name is John Kerr, and I'm a resident of Silver Lake. There's a saying that there's -- sometimes the right hand doesn't know what the left hand is doing.

At a recent -- at a recent forum Mayor Garcetti talked a lot about streamlining the way our departments talk to each other, and I think this project is a very good -- it's a test case.

The bike lanes are included on the 2010 bike plan. They will make cycling across the bridge a lot safer and also have the added benefit of slowing traffic, calming traffic.

Calming traffic will eliminate a lot of the problems that you have with crash by calming traffic in addition to the crosswalk that has been talked about tonight which is a fantastic addition across all eight lanes to have the safe crosswalk for safe crossing.

But without bike lanes, this bridge is incomplete. I obviously am a strong supporter of seismic retrofit, but bike lanes can easily be added to this project, and I urge them to do so. Thank you very much.

MR. DHANDHA: Nishith Dhandha. I'm a bicycle commuter. I have been so for the last 20 years. I have used the LA River bike path. I also ride along Rowena, the new bike
lane. It takes me down to Fletcher and onto the bike path.

I go to the Atwater farmers market on Sundays.

I used the Hyperion once as a bicyclist, and the speeds on that are much higher than the 35 that has been surveyed. It's a dangerous street.

And if we're looking at safety for all, I think we have to look at the Hyperion Bridge as a major connecter between Silver Lake and Atwater and the proposed great street that's happening on Glendale Boulevard. We have to start looking at pedestrian and bicycle mobility, and that is being a major connecter.

I think if we look at safety, we have to look at the LACBC cross section, and we have to start to say well, if we can create a connection between there that includes protected bike lanes and if necessary just standard bike lanes and the most narrow section, I think we do a service to encouraging more multimode of transportation.

We do a service for safety, and we start to encourage this concept of great streets that Mayor Garcetti has brought up because if we create a juggernaut between -- I don't know if the word is juggernaut actually -- if we create a restriction in pedestrian access between Silver Lake and Atwater, we start to reduce the idea that this city is changing its paradigm for transportation. And if we are building a bridge, just like the previous bridge was 50 years
in, you know, in functioning, and it served its paradigm for transportation which is the car.

Now we're looking at the next 50 years and we're building the same kind of bridge and we're starting to lose the idea that the paradigm is shifting again. And so I feel that if we are to build a new bridge and we're going to expend close to $50 million or so, let's build one that works for everyone.

Sorry. I think I went over. Thank you so much for your time.

MS. PADILLA: Thank you. Mr. Keene is next, but I just want to call three more. Ben Nern, Deborah Murphy, Erik Knutzen.

MR. KEENE: My name is Dennis Keen. I'm a resident of Atwater Village, graduate of John Marshall High School, born in 1935. First time I used the bridge was in 1947 to ride my bicycle from the over near the City college to Glendale to buy fireworks.

I moved into Atwater Village in 1959, so I'm one of the newcomers. There are three ways to get from Los Angeles to Glendale, Pasadena, Burbank using surface streets and those are Los Feliz Boulevard, Hyperion and Glendale Boulevard, and Fletcher Drive. All three of these bridges are very, very important.

They span along the Los Angeles River. They carry
humongous amount of cars. And you are not going to slow the
people down who are going home or going to work. All you
can do is try to provide a safe passage for them and now for
bicycles and motorcycles and motor scooters.

I like the fact that they're trying to do something
about safety. However, our neighborhood council has already
said they want to okay this plan, and yet this plan is not
definite yet. It's only being proposed.

And by the way, this is a lectern; you stand on a
podium. I'm a stickler. I believe in our US Constitution,
and I also believe that the City Council doesn't listen, and
that's why they formed the neighborhood councils.

They've already made up their minds what they're going
to do, and we're stuck with it. I hope that our comments
are being heard.

MR. HUFFMAN: Good evening. I'm Niall Huffman, Los
Angeles resident. I often ride my bike across the Hyperion
Bridge to get to Glendale back and forth. Just want to
echo concerns some others have made about, you know, the
current bridge, particularly the Hyperion Bridge being
really scary to walk or ride a bike along.

You know, traffic seems to move a lot faster than,
you know, the surveyed speed of 35 or 37 that we heard
earlier and just to emphasize the need to do something to
better accommodate non-motorized users.
It just reminds everyone that we have a 2010 bike plan that was adopted by the City Council that calls for bike lines on Hyperion. We have a complete streets directive from CalTrans, from our state department of transportation that calls for the needs of all potential users to be considered.

And we have a federal safe accommodation policy for federal aid projects like this that basically call for the safe accommodation of all users on the entire corridor and for conflicts to be resolved and for all efforts to be made to ensure safety.

So I would just encourage, you know, city staff to be mindful of all those things and just emphasize that we can provide for safe passage for everyone if we, you know, chose not to design this bridge like a freeway. Thanks very much.

MR. NERN: Hi. My name is Ben Nern. I live in Silver Lake, and the bridge currently is -- the Glendale Bridge is very dangerous to ride a bike on, and I'm disappointed that it's not being addressed in what I saw currently.

And I just want to say that I support making it safer for everyone. Not just motorists, but people on bikes and pedestrians. Thank you.

MS. MURPHY: Good day. I'm Deborah Murphy. I'm the executive director for Los Angeles Walks and a resident of
Silver Lake. I'm going to speak to you about some -- my aspirations for this project. The city will not destroy Atwater and Silver Lake by building a freeway between our communities. We are already divided by a freeway.

The city will not destroy our visions for a more walkable and bikeable Silver Lake, Atwater, and northeast Los Angeles. The city will not violate its own 2010 bike plan by not providing a bike lane -- bike lanes on the Hyperion Bridge.

The city will not sacrifice the life of any pedestrian by not providing a safe crossing at the junction of the two streets. The city will not jeopardize the federal funding for the project that requires a bike lane on the bridge so cyclists can ride on the streets leading to the bridge.

The city will not destroy the lives of children and seniors who rely on walking as their main mode of transportation. The city will not violate the state-mandated Complete Streets Act by building a bridge only for the movement of cars.

The city will build a bridge that links our communities and strengthens our active transportation networks. The city will live up to its commitments to improve the mobility for Los Angeles. From the mobility of homemade goals developed -- excuse me.
That reflect the communities' future mobility needs and suggested strategies, identify a layered network of arterial streets that accommodate all users -- bike, pedestrians -- to get around.

Update our street standards to reflect the transportation modes of all users. The city will build a project that adds to the safety of all users, not to the apparent safety of only car drivers.

The city will listen to its residents, business, and property owners, cyclists, walkers, kids, dog owners, students, commuters who want a safe and sane community, not a speedway.

The city will build a sidewalk on both sides of each bridge as pedestrians walk on both sides now despite the fact that on the east side the sidewalk is only about a foot and a half. There's no prohibition against pedestrians using that even narrow sidewalk.

Our city was built for the care and culture of people, not for the movement of cars. We are all pedestrians, every driver, ever cyclist, every transit rider, every kid, every senior, every everybody. Thank you.

MS. PADILLA: Three more. Don Ward, Paul -- looks like Berolzheimer, Alex Safonov.

MR. KNUTZEN: Erik Knutzen, Silver Lake. I'll keep my comments very brief. I nominate Deborah Murphy to design
this bridge. Everything she just said and more is all that
I would say.

And the most critical component of this bridge is
we have this historic opportunity to link our two
communities and that is the primary design commitment that
we should be looking at right now.

I don't think if we lived in Florence, Italy we'd
be talking about a freeway barrier; right? We's be talking
about a nice way to eat dinner on one side and walk over to
the other and have gelato.

We'd be talking about ways for our children to be
able to walk safely to school and not end up with diabetes
later in their lives. We need a link between our two
communities that we can be proud of for 100 more years and
more. Thank you.

MR. WARD: My name is Don Ward, a Los Angeles resident.
I want to echo everything that Deborah Murphy said. That's
exactly the way that I feel. And I want to add I've been a
Los Angeles resident my whole life. I used to skate the
Atwater ramp. I'm part of this community.

This is an issue of connection between Silver Lake
and Atwater. Not only Silver Lake but the entire Los
Angeles region has only three ways to get across the river
and the bridge by street.

And this design designed for 55-mile-per-hour
speeds -- even though the engineer from the LADOT seems to forget or not know which is also a problem. Do we have people in the LADOT that actually know what they're talking about and are communicating with engineers that are working on this project? That's a problem.

They don't communicate between each other. That's a problem. They don't know the surveyed speed. That's a problem. The surveyed speed we were told at the last public meeting was 55 miles per hour average. We have it on tape. It's on the Internet.

So get together and communicate and figure out how to build this bridge correctly, and that means slower speeds so that we don't need a crash barrier. That means let's do a road dirt or do a partial road dirt.

Let's do two travel lanes in one direction and one travel lane in the other, build six-foot buffered bike lanes. There's nothing wrong with that. Keep the sidewalks. People want to walk to -- from Silver Lake to Atwater.

Why are we designing this bridge for the dinosaur fossil fuel past when the future is multimode of transportation; bicycles and walking? Thank you.

MS. PADILLA: We'd like to introduce quickly Matt Zabo, public works commissioner. Okay. We have more. Thomas O'Grady, Luis Lopez, Steven Roullier.
MR. O'GRADY: Good evening, everybody. My name is Thomas O'Grady. I'm the executive director of Enrich LA. We build edible gardens for public school. So I'm going to first start talking about the kids.

What's been happening over the last ten years in Silver Lake and Atwater is everyone's been going back to their public schools. At King Middle School did you know that we're among the top 10 improved middle schools in all of the state of California?

Last year we were an environmental studies magnet at the school. There's a bunch of kids over there right now working on a bike plan, working on how to walk to school, working on how to get out of fossil fuels.

It's kind of ridiculous that we adults are proposing to build a bridge -- by the way, which they are going pay for -- that is in contrast to what we're asking them. So it's sort of saying -- whatever that expression is. Say what I do -- whatever, you know, what I'm trying to say.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Do what I say, not what I do.

MR. O'GRADY: Do what I say. My daughters at -- every Friday night you know where they go to go out? They go to the Americana. It dives me up the wall.

You know why they go there? Because they say, "Pops, we can walk around. We can walk from store to store."
We can look at the fountain." Okay. On Grafton Street in Dublin and on the scene in Paris they walk around. They walk over a river.

We already have a river. It's the LA River. What we need to do is create a walkable bridge with bicycle lanes. Okay? And can you imagine, we'll have our own promenade starting all the way at the corner of Glendale -- at the corner of Griffith Park Boulevard in Hyperion.

We'll have dinner there. Me and the kids, we'll walk up past Trader Joe's. We'll walk over the bridge. We'll linger for a while on the bridge and look at the beautiful river that's being renovated, and we'll have dessert in Atwater Village.

We can't do that over a freeway. We need to do it over a very calm, nice, elegant bridge. So please change this design to reflect those items.

I want to finally say there are two designs that both Enrich LA has offered and another company called RAC, and I suggest you look at them. And I also believe the Bike Coalition design is wonderful. These are all great ideas.

And I urge all of you to take all of those ideas and come up with a perfect design. Your design is almost there. It's a just a few small changes. So more bike lanes, more walk lanes, and slower cars. Thank you.

MR. BEROLZHEIMER: My name is Paul Berolzheimer. I'm a
homeowner in Adams Hill which is actually Glendale, not LA, but it's right next door. And one of my favorite things -- I've been there for 21 years -- one of my favorite things about living there has always been the proximity to Atwater Village.

It's been great over the last 20 years watching Atwater develop all the great restaurants and cafes coming in, and we love to hang out here, my family and I. We walk up and down Glendale. And I also drive through and I also ride my bike through whenever I can.

So I think that definitely slowing down traffic on the bridge is crucial. I mean, several people have mentioned their concern about crashes on the bridge.

Barriers are great, but, you know, one way to prevent cars from getting out of control in the first place is to slow them down through traffic measures and those are a lot less likely to crash and the crashes will be a lot less severe when they are slower.

Nobody has talked about reducing the bridge to one lane which I think is something that at least ought to be considered as well. You know, I -- coming here this evening at the height of rush hour, 5:30 in the evening, I drove back and forth across the bridge several times.

I just wanted to sort of -- I've driven over it a million times, but I wanted to drive over it with this plan
in mind and get a sense of things. For one thing, there
wasn't really that many cars on the bridge. I don't think
reducing it to one lane would be actually a problem.

The other thing is I drove it at exactly 35 miles
per hour, and all the other cars were just whizzing by me,
going at -- probably going at least 50 to 55 miles per hour.

Another point is that I timed myself at exactly 35
miles per hour going over the bridge, and it took me about
35 to 40 seconds to get over the bridge. So allowing people
to go even twice the speed is only going to save them 20 or
30 seconds out of their day.

There's really no reason people need to go fast
over the bridge. I think it could be -- especially with the
LA River revitalization is happening -- the bridge could
actually be a destination as Thomas O'Grady has pointed out.

It could be a beautiful place to walk to, across,
to linger, to see the views over the river and of the City.
I'm very happy about the replacement of the balustrades and
the historic lighting and the realignment of the 5 ramp.

Those are things I've wished for for the entire
time I've lived in the area. But certainly I think much
better pedestrian and bike access is crucial. Thank you.

MR. SAFONOV: Hello. My name is Alex Safonov. I
just have a brief statement. I live in Silver Lake near the
intersection of Santa Monica and Hoover. Currently there's
not a really safe and direct way for me to travel from Silver Lake to Atwater via bicycle. I hope that future plans to -- for the Hyperion viaduct will be accommodating to cyclists and pedestrians alike. The inclusion of bicycle lanes in the planning of the new viaduct will be a great improvement to the neighborhood. Thanks.

MR. LOPEZ: Good evening. My name is Luis Lopez. I'm an Atwater Village resident. I'm here to express my support for the current plan which would restore and retrofit the Hyperion Bridge, a plan that has been nine years in the making.

I support the plan as it now stands because it contains key elements that a community advocated for through all those years.

It protects all the historical elements of the bridge, increases pedestrian and cyclist safety by realignment of the Interstate 5 Freeway off ramp, and the proposed pedestrian bike bridge over the Los Angeles River.

More importantly, a proposal will retrofit our historical landmark against failure in a large earthquake. The main purpose of this project is to get ready for the big earthquake. It took nine long years to develop the current plan with significant community input and due diligence by the City.
It will take, to my understanding, another 54 years
to retrofit the bridge. Enough is enough. You need to
prepare the bridge for an earthquake now and protect our
historical monuments. Thank you.

MS. PADILLA: One quick reminder. Please say your name
before you make your statement. Cody Sisco, Ann Lawson,
Kimberly Greenhut.

MR. ROULLIER: Hello. My name is Steven Roullier.
I've been a resident of Echo Park for 21 years. Previously,
I lived in Silver Lake for 16 years. I've long considered
Atwater Village to be a part of my extended neighborhood.
I visit friends in Atwater.
I shop and eat there. I frequently use the Post
Office. I travel to Atwater in both my car and my bicycle.
A few months before I was born in 1955, the last Pacific
Electric Red Car ran from downtown Los Angeles to Echo Park,
to Atwater Village and on to the north end of Glendale.

At this time our city was in the midst of a
strategy that prioritized high-speed automobile traffic over
all other forms of transportation. As a consequence, one of
the best line rail systems in the country was destroyed.

Tonight as I look at the plans to upgrade the
Hyperion bridge, I can see much that is good and sensible
about the plan, but the potential for increased speeds and
the lack of accommodations for anyone other than the users
of motor vehicles amazes me.

As it stands, this plan will even further
discourage the use of the bridge by cyclists and pedestrians
and pays little heed to the ongoing revitalization of the
river below it.

The Hyperion Bridge is a beautiful and historic
structure as well as a conduit that connects our local
communities. It should be designed to facilitate the safe
passage of all users regardless of their choice of
transportation as well as expressing a vision aligned with
the future of our city.

I strongly urge all of you here to strongly
consider the legacy that we will be leaving for future
generations. Thank you.

MR. SISCO: Hello. My name is Cody Sisco and I'm a
Silver Lake resident in a two-person, one-car, one-bicycle
household and hopefully welcoming a new bicycle to the
family soon.

So I've lived here for about a year now and up
until now haven't quite got the knack of all the different
bike lanes and bike routes around here, but one thing's
pretty sure is right now I'm cut off from Atwater, Glendale,
and all the others on that side.

And I'd really like to other see a better route for
me, for other pedestrians, other bicyclists to be put into
place. And I just wanted to point out also that the most
important factor for whether people get on their bikes and
use them and can do so safely is whether there are
infrastructure improvements made available.

So we should be talking more about grade-separated
bike lanes, wider sidewalks, separations between the
passenger, car traffic, and the bike lanes. And, you know,
the idea that we might have one lane in each direction is
fine by me. As a resident I would totally support that. So
thank you.

MS. LAWSON: Ann Lawson, board member of Friends of
Atwater Village and resident of Atwater Village for
46 years. I'm speaking on behalf of the Friends of Atwater
Village and Minnie Carr, one of our board members who could
not be here tonight. She's in Hawaii and on vacation, and
she sent me her comments.

But first of all, I -- FAV would like to thank our
Council Member Mitchell O'Farrell for sharing our vision,
conveying our safety concerns, working with the design team
to find a solution and securing funding, and Nguyen Jim,
Linda Moore, and Wall Stokes for taking that extra step to
work with our community members to try to get this project
implemented.

And Minnie Carr's comments as she e-mailed me. She
said we're addressing the demands of the bike coalition
regarding the bike lane on the Hyperion Bridge. Her comments:

"A bike lane on the Hyperion Bridge would become a suicide lane when it intersects with the Glendale Boulevard traffic. The bicycle community needs to realize that not every street can be adapted to accommodate life safely, especially not a bridge as complex as this one that's also an HCM.

The bicyclists can use the stairs as the pedestrians do and it should be noted that there is a metal wheel track to accommodate bikes already. Thank you."

MS. PADILLA: Andy G. Mendoza, looks like Alex Dash, Dave Duce.

MS. GREENHUT: My name is Kimberly Greenhut. I live in Los Feliz. I'm a motorist and a cyclist, and if you give me a safe way to go to Atwater and Glendale, I will use it. A shoulder is not good enough. We need bike lanes.

It makes motorists more aware of us and it makes us feel safer -- so much safer when I'm in a bike line. And I think a lot of people who support the current idea mentioned that it's purpose is seismic, which is of course very important, but this is an opportunity to improve our quality of life.

LA can be an isolating place. Let's find a way to bring people into the neighborhood to help us build
community, and also that gives us access to the LA River.

We're going to be revitalizing that river, spending millions of dollars to do so. The mayor was just in Washington trying to get more money.

Let's find a way to get down there. Let's not in the future be like gosh darn, I wish we had a way to get down to the river. And then also as someone who does use the LA River bike path both for recreation and as transportation to get to places I need to be, I do not have a safe way to get there.

I have to go down Los Feliz Boulevard. I have to go through that intersection at Riverside and Los Feliz. I have to cross the freeway entrance. I have to cross a freeway exit. It's dangerous. There's no reason why I should have to do that. And let's keep that in mind while we are making this plan.

And also you know the mayor mentioned on that MPR forum last week that sunshine isn't enough to attract business to our city and to attract people to our city. We need to build a better city. This is our chance to do that.

You know, we need to look to the future when we're building our city and look to what we want to live in and not just what we have. Thank you.

MR. MENDOZA: Hi. My name is Andy Mendoza. Born and raised in Silver Lake and I moved back here. And mean, I
moved back to Silver Lake. Retrofit the bridge, I agree. I want to walk my dog to get their hair cut.

Me, you know, I'm always power walking like -- you never know when that bridge will collapse. You never know earthquake, not whenever. Bike lane back there, I like the design especially where the old trolley used to pass by back in the days. That's a good design right there for the bike lane. I don't want the alternative.

Growing up I walked to (inaudible.) I walked to King. I walked to Marshall. I don't remember no bike lanes at all -- this is back in the eighties and back in the nineties -- whatsoever.

Meanwhile, I used to go on my bicycle. It was always on the sidewalk, never on the street. Hyperion Bridge there's always car crashes there. No matter what, it's always the speeding right there. No matter what you do, it's all speeding.

It's always like a racetrack; right? Especially right there. What else? That's pretty much all I want to say. Retrofit. Thank you.

MR. DASH: My name is Alex Dash, and I just wanted to let out some comments here. Thank you for you guys giving us an opportunity to say what we feel and give some input here, and I just want to say that the whole plan sounds good to me.
I'm glad you guys are going to retrofit the thing to make it safe, and I think it's great. But what other people are saying about making it accessible to bikes and pedestrians really is the thing I want to address here.

And it mainly centers around the part where you get on the bridge, the Glendale Bridge, near Valley Brick is the street I believe. To board there is really dicey, and I couldn't tell from the map -- I don't know if you guys can throw that sign up there or not really quick.

But when you want to actually get on the bridge at Valley Brick right there, that's really sketchy. And if that's where you're talking about putting in the crosswalk to get over there, you know, I'm talking about when you're going westbound on it, that would be the biggest thing.

The other really scary part about it is that it's really narrow. I don't think you can have a bike lane that's sharing the road with the cars. I mean, you can paint a line. If you can add something like maybe those little freeway bumps that wake up the truckers, that would be really helpful.

Because I've gotten buzzed too many times. I don't even ride the street there. I just ride on the sidewalk, and it's, you know, for better/for worse. But if there's someone else sharing that sidewalk, that can be really sketchy, too.
But, you know, you just have to get off and walk it.

But the really, really, really dangerous part is at the top of the bridge when you're going westbound or if you're heading eastbound and you're approaching that -- I believe it's Waverly is the street -- it gets really narrow.

It's already practically one lane each direction there anyways. And if you're pedaling a bike and you're going up that steep part of the hill, you're only going five miles an hour. So that is the scariest part. And there's nowhere to walk. The sidewalk there is just too narrow.

So if you can just somehow put that into it and consider putting an elevated bike line with the sidewalk so that you're not sharing the actual road with the car and it's not just a strip of paint, that would be huge. As far as these median barriers things, I'll let you guys figure that out.

But the -- it's mostly -- I challenge anyone designing this bridge to ride their bike from Trader Joe's to Atwater Village and back, and tell me what they think. And also while they're at it, carry their bike up the stairs.

MS. PADILLA: Bobby Gaoda, Gary Vogan, Jim Bledsoe.

MR. DUCE: Hello. My name is Dave Duce. Thank you City and everyone on both sides of the aisle for the investing time in your community regardless of which side you feel or
if there's any conflict. I'm a film and television
producer. I produce with the Main Street Foundation.

I've been a stakeholder on both sides of the river
for over 12 years. There are many good elements to this
plan, but it does not address the needs of all. The bridge
is not safe and the proposed changes do not make it safer
for everyone.

Today at 3:18 I saw a car that had to swerve around
a cyclist on that corner. And when I say that corner, you
know what I mean, going uphill. And I'm like how ironic is
that? I'm coming to a meeting this evening. I was trying
to whip out my camera.

Flanked by two progressive communities, the bridge
should also reflect the neighborhood ideals and be the gem
of the river from now and to the future. In the last minute
rush to spend the fed money, we are compromising on the
quality of our communities' needs. We agree on the seismic
upgrades and historic preservation.

There's no need to increase the speed on the bridge
of the traffic. It pulls at the -- either end. The design
of the bridge -- the designer of the bridge, Merrill Butler,
originally built the bridge with the seating areas. He was
a believer of the bridges serving the people.

After ten years we are only 35 percent done with
the design process. Things change in ten years.
Communities change. Attitudes change. Let's look forward.
Let's make the right decisions.

Suzie, stand up, please. I'm here for my kid, other people's kids who are paying for this bridge who currently are banned by their parents from riding on the bridge because we had a wipeout. So, you know, people would use this and people would say people aren't riding in that --

No one rides on that bridge with any sane sense to them. You know, it's crazy. And if that line was there, watch some of the videos on what -- video about what they've done in Amsterdam.

I know this is an extreme example, but they're talking about moving massive amounts of people through a stoplight. 20, 30 cyclists can go through a stoplight in the same time it can one or two cars.

And I know that's extreme example, but if you can lean towards that way, the bridge is to carry people.

That's it. Thank you.

MR. GAODA: Hello. My name is Bobby Gaoda, and I just rode my bike here from San Francisco, about 500 miles, and it's really fun. You guys should do it. But the scariest part was -- happened an hour ago when I was -- you guessed it -- coming down this Hyperion bridge death spiral danger hyper-nightmare zone.
So -- and it's really simple why it happens.

There's two lanes and drivers come onto it and they see oh, empty street in front of me. Finally. Because they're stuck in stop and go traffic. And they just go as fast as they can and they swerve.

And, you know, there's no cops to give them a ticket. There's no -- I think just the signs that say -- that tell you what speed you're going and flash when you go over the speed would be really helpful. So -- yes.

And I also would like to highly recommend anyone who's designed this bridge to ride a bike across it, just put on a safety vest. Like, you probably won't die. Lots of people do it every day.

And I really think that all people who design this part of our infrastructure should be required to ride a bike because a lot of people who use it are going to be riding a bike. And furthermore, all Hyperion planners should be required to ride the bikes across the country because then you really get a feel for this whole suburban, urban mess we're in.

So in conclusion, just go ride your bikes really far. Thank you.

MS. PADILLA: Adam Authier, Mark Marren, and Rick Corsini.

MR. BLEDSOE: I'm Jim Bledsoe. I live in Los Angeles.
I have a one question for you all: Where is your bicycle?

Some of you haven't ridden a bicycle in a couple of years or so, but you have a bicycle. In the back of your mind even if you were 12 years old you had a bicycle. So where is that bicycle?

In Germany -- in reference to this exact thing we're talking about here today, Waverly is the narrow spot. And Waverly is the City's -- on a chondrosternal map the city's right of way there is 100 feet wide, and we could redesign that. We could make that wider. We could spend our money there making Waverly wider.

We could also spend our money with water caching. Water is extremely important, and nobody's mentioned that this evening. Except there is a little bit of water. There's one little pond they're making. All of the bike lanes and pedestrian space need to be permeable.

All of the water that lands on the road needs to go into swails (sic), needs to go into places to store it instead of racing it to the ocean. That's not the thing to do with the water that lands on our land.

It's to serve the trees that need to be planted along the new bike path that comes along there so that we can ride our bicycles in the shade. The other things that were said here this evening about making the entirety of our new --
Our new idea about how to make Los Angeles work are very -- it's very very important that we slow the traffic down, if we quit killing people with cars. Cars are the most destructive thing on the planet.

Even when you're at there driving around, you're only going 19 miles an hour imperatively. In reality the speed that you go in your car is between six and ten miles an hour. When you figure out how much it costs you to drive -- Auto Club's number is $8,000.

How long does it take you to earn $8,000, that goes into the speed of the automobile. Speed is miles per hour. So when you drive and you get to work, you sit for two or three hours at work every day earning the money that you're going to use to drive around in.

Get rid of your car and you can take three months off. Thank you.

MR. AUTHIER: My name is Adam, and in 2007 I was nearly killed on this bridge. Everyone knows it's probably one of the most dangerous places to bike in LA County. I've had reconstructive surgery on my face. I broke my neck. I broke my jaw off my face. I broke all my ribs.

I put a hole in my lung. I broke my scapula. I nearly had my leg amputated. I got severe PTSD. I lost a lot of money. I lost a lot of time. And I'm just finding out about this, so I can't come in with all this technical
information, but I know people go way too fast on this bridge, and I can't see four lanes working.

So I heard this guy mention three lanes which I think might be something to think about. You have the emergency lane, one one, but people are going to keep trying to move from Glendale and Atwater up to Sunset, and we got to facilitate that.

And this is a great opportunity to really think about the future because I don't think the future is going to be a bunch of cars. So, you know, that's that. And seismic retrofit definitely has to be done. And I hope you make the right choices here, you know. Good luck.

MR. MARREN: Hello. My name is Mark Marren. I'm a volunteer at the Los Angeles Bicycle Kitchen. I've also been a clerk at the grocery store for 13 years at the top of that Hyperion bridge. I used to work with Adam.

We all got off at midnight one night. A bunch of us went over to a party in Silver Lake. He went home. He got home six months later after hanging out at County for six months. He was so messed up and got great attention. He made doctors -- students were looking at him, learning stuff.

At the top of that bridge, people have had their foot on the throttle. They're flooring it up that bridge. Where I work at Trader Joe's, Monon t-bones right into
Hyperion. In that intersection there's now a light, but before there was a light, there was a crosswalk.

There used to be a man named Bill Wingard. Bill Wingard was a playwright for the Lyric Theatre. He was in that crosswalk one day. This is actually 30 days before Adam was a hit-and-run, the victim of a crime by that bridge before Adam was robbed of his livelihood by that bridge.

Adam actually witnessed Bill Wingard get struck by a red sports car traveling westbound. Bill Wingard took his last breath and flew 30 feet and then died. People are going too fast up that bridge.

My ex-wife was maimed in that very same spot that Bill Wingard was slaughtered in. Her ankle was twisted 180 degrees and put back together with metal. So I personally have gone to County and seen my friends laying there because of that bridge, and I don't want to have to see that again.

Thank you.

MS. PADILLA: Mark Vallianatos, Justin Hager, Chrystina Byers.

MR. CORSINI: Good evening. I'm Rick Corsini, and I'm an architect. And I happen to live on the Silver Lake side of the river at Avenal Street near Waverly about a block from the bridge, and my office is in Atwater Village around Glendale Boulevard and San Fernando Road.

So if I had a safer route from home to work, I
would ride my bike very clearly. I understand the
difficulties of the design team and the City staff that
are -- that have been working on this for many years.

I want -- I think it's important though since this
has gone on so long, 8 to 9 years, that everybody involved
understands that we're in the middle of a kind of a paradigm
shift from an automobile culture to an urban culture. And
in some ways this culture is kind of an old way of life.

The idea that somebody said this evening that there
were at one point were seating benches on the bridge is
something that points to an idea about inhabiting the City
in a different way.

And I think it would be very useful for everybody
involved to sort of turn the design problem on its head and
perhaps consider the bridge not as a conduit but perhaps as
a destination. If you stood at the top of that bridge, you
recognize its elevation reveals the basin in a beautiful,
beautiful way.

And imagine if there were wider sidewalks, benches,
brought back lighting that would actually encourage people
to stroll and to ride their bikes. So I sort of throw that
out to the design team to sort of challenge them to perhaps
looking at a little different --

Some different design parameters that could
actually work to question those assumptions and those
parameters to kind of work through some solutions. Thank you.

MR. VALLIANATOS: Hi. I'm Mark Vallianatos. I'm a resident of Glassell Park and I'm a professor of Occidental College. I'm teaching just this semester a class on transportation and streets.

A couple weeks ago, I was talking with my students about how the current streets in Los Angeles got to be in the state that they're in in terms of danger to pedestrians, cyclists, and some unpleasant environment threat in the city.

The answer is really that there was a several-decade period in which we used the rural highway design standard to do streets inside of cities. You build things wide. You make streets wide. You make lanes wide. You make -- to allow people to drive fast and not get in accidents rather than designing to be more narrow to be slow and to be safe. You need to have this kind of highway like roads inside of cities.

I think this is a teachable moment that has brought many people out here today because as the speaker before me just said, times are changing. People want to have good places. We want the streets for all. They want the ability to walk and bike safely.

But luckily, looking at your designs, looks like
you're making progress along those lines. And it seems like there's a decent solution and there's a good solution looking at those maps. And there's lots of ways.

The decent solution is if you take out the four feet that you're using for the crash barrier, you can create five feet bike lanes on both sides and hopefully protect the bike lane. The better solution that people have been referencing is you can have one lane in each direction with a very wide sidewalk, very large bicycle track that people can walk and bike on.

And you can also have access for emergency vehicles. That would be kind of a futuristic design to help put this bridge on the map. It would be great for Los Angeles. We have an indication we're starting to get serious about public health. But access for all making the city a green, wonderful place to be. Thank you.

MS. BYERS: Hi. Thank you for taking our comments and taking our opinions and consideration. My name is Chrystina Byers. Everyone knows me as Katell. I live in Legion Heights. I'm three generations, my grandfather and my father. My grandfather actually died drinking water out of the LA River. He got typhoid fever.

So I have a long history with Los Angeles. I drive a lot because I work down by the airport. And I'll tell you as a driver, if their sign says 35 miles an hour, most times
I'm driving 40. Definitely. Most -- sometimes even 45. So if the posted sign on that bridge is 35, people will be driving 45.

It needs to be at least 25 miles per hour to keep people at 35 miles per hour because I know I do it myself. I think you have to have calming things like not just crosswalks. I mean, what are we using, human bodies to slow down traffic? That's kind of creeps.

If I were a bean counter, that would make me really nervous thinking about all the lawsuits in the future. You know, it's time we start separating the bike lanes from cars. And I'm with everybody here, so I'm not going to repeat anything else.

But my vision would be to have the center of the bridge for pedestrians and bikes and one lane for cars going, what, eastbound and one lane going westbound. It's for the pedestrians and bikes, and the cars are given a little bit of allotment to go across the bridge. That would be my dream.

MS. PADILLA: Chris Redwine, David Diaz, Eric Bruins.

MR. HAGER: Good evening. My name is Justin Hager. I'm here today wearing two hats, one is as the communications director for California State Assemblyman Mike Gatto; the other is as a resident of Silver Lake/Los Feliz for the last year and a half. I would like to start with my personal
When I moved here 16 months ago from Sacramento, I was told that Los Angeles was the City of Dreams. However, moving from Sacramento, one of the biggest disappointments has been the fact that that city, which Los Angelenos take so much pride in bashing, is so much further advanced in its bicycle and multimodal transit infrastructure.

The other comment I would like to make as an individual is on behalf of my friend, Damian, who was recently hit in a hit-and-run. I know there are several other hit-and-run victims here.

The most important method of addressing the hit-and-run epidemic in this city is providing infrastructure that helps avoid hit-and-run scenarios in the first place. Without bike lanes, we cannot do that.

Now speaking on behalf of the assemblyman, many of you have seen the letter he sent encouraging the City to look into increased bike lanes. I'd like to read a small portion of that:

"I'm writing as an elected official and concerned citizen to support the inclusion of bicycle lanes in the proposed project to modernize the Hyperion viaduct. The Hyperion Avenue viaduct and the surrounding communities of Atwater Village, Silver Lake, Los Feliz, and Glendale are within the boundaries for the 43rd assembly district which I
"I applaud the current proposal for its improvement to the LA River bike path particularly the completion of the interchange between the bike path and Glendale Boulevard. However, local access improvements on one end of a project area are insufficient without a bridge project that provides safe accommodation between Silver Lake and Atwater Village.

"Without accommodation on Hyperion Avenue, cyclists who wish to travel east/west and cross the Los Angeles River and the 5 Freeway will continue to face dangerous obstacles and significant inconvenience. However, as long as we can find a plan that keeps automobile traffic moving and provides safe bike lanes, we will have succeeded in the redesign."

Thank you for your time.

MR. REDWINE: How's it going? My name is Chris. I'm not originally from Los Angeles. I'm from the east coast. I've been in LA for about ten years, biking for about two years. I don't live in Silver Lake. I don't live anywhere close to Atwater right now.

I've actually lived all over LA, but I don't always bike the Hyperion Bridge, but when I do, I want it to be safe because I do randomly ride all over Los Angeles every day, every night. I don't drive. I haven't driven in two years.
So there's pretty much -- every street in Los Angeles -- there's pretty much not any street in Los Angeles that I haven't ridden a bike down. So I'd like you all to keep that in mind, that are plenty of people in this city that use other forms of transportation; bicycles, walking.

And keep that in mind when you're building your plans. Definitely want to have bike lanes for that bridge. I have ridden over that bridge several times, especially late at night, and it's ridiculously scary.

I feel bad for some of the people up here that have witnessed that some of the crazy accidents. And Adam himself, glad you're still with us today, man, seriously. Please make it safe. Thank you.

MS. PADILLA: Nathan Purkiss, Craig Collins, Tricia Robbins-Kasson.

MR. DIAZ: Good evening. My name is David Diaz. I live here in the Los Feliz district on Franklin. And I guess I want to say thank you very much for listening to our comments and our input.

I want you to know that I am for a seismic retrofit of any bridge, any mode of transportation, or way to get people across to their -- from their house to their livelihood. I think it's important and that their safety be number one priority in this.

I am not for the crash barriers that are being
currently proposed on the bridge as I feel that when I biked
on that bridge before, I felt like I was taking my life in
my own hands. I believe in public health.

I believe that in order to support public health we
need to encourage people to get out of their cars and start
building some sense of community with their neighbors, and I
don't really see much of that here.

I know how I get when I get behind the wheel of a
car. I hate myself. I turn into this monster who's like,
dude, screw you, get out of my way. And I feel that when I
run across that bridge, those motorists were doing that with
me.

And I don't want to think that any planner or
engineer or designer is in charge of my life, my bike, my
safety in putting motorists and cars before me. I'm a
person, too, and I have value and my life has value, so just
put that into consideration.

And any design that does not encourage people
increasing their speed, taking those turns at 55, or people
have passed there, you know that. Just please keep this in
mind.

And, yes, I do support Mike Gatto, the fourth
paragraph of that letter that Justin just mentioned dated
October 9. Those are all the great points right there.

Yeah, full speed ahead with what he suggested. Please
follow up on that. Thank you.

MR. BRUINS: Good evening. My name is a Erik Bruins.

I'm with the LA County Bicycle Coalition. Thank you to the City for hearing our concerns tonight. I trust we'll be able to resolve some of these design issues.

First I want to acknowledge the project has been a long time in the making. It predates a lot of the plans and policies that I'm about to mention, but the project is subject to whatever plans and policies were in effect on the environmental assessments date of August 2013 of this year which includes the following:

In 2007 the City issued and adopted its LA County revitalization master plan calling on incredible investment along that border but also improved access so that way the communities can enjoy that investment.

In 2008 CalTrans deputy directive 64R1 instructed CalTrans staff to integrate all road users into project planning, design, construction, and operations. CalTrans staff are instructed not only to review projects but to encourage and advocate for the accommodation of bicyclists and pedestrians by the local agency partners.

In 2011 the City of Los Angeles adopted this bicycle plan after years of public input. That public input resulted in the back flow network which includes a bike lane on Hyperion Avenue through the project area.
The lack of compliance with these plans and policies is a significant impact under SEQUA. LACBC reviewed 10 years of collision history in the project area and found that one of the greatest safety risks under current conditions is not from the lack of a median barrier. It's from divers picking up too much speed on the bridge and carrying that speed into the commercial areas on either end, Silver Lake and Atwater Village. Collisions resulting from excessive speed outweigh the risk of head on collisions on the bridge by an order of magnitude.

The proposed project would design the bridge to handle faster traffic instead of mitigating the impact of excessive speed on those surrounding communities. LACBC has offered a revised cross section that takes the opposite approach by encouraging multimodal travel through enhanced pedestrian and bicycle facilities.

Our proposal handles the same volume of motor vehicle traffic but at lower speeds compatible with urban life in Silver Lake and Atwater Village. Bridges are really a reflection of our transportation priorities as a city where our space is most constrained.

And so I encourage the City to build a bridge that we'll still be proud of in 50 years. Thank you.

MR. COLLINS: I'm Craig Collins. I'm the president of Silver Lake Red Forest Conservancy, and I want to thank DOD
and DOT for all of the effort in what's really a very good project in many ways.

And I think we've got a tremendous opportunity to make something that we are tremendously proud of because bridges really are a very powerful force in our life because they are a physical and human manifestation of connectivity that we live with.

And so what we see here is the lack of connectivity on some really key areas especially for bicycles. A very casual review of the plan shows there's a complete lack of connectivity at each end which makes this project, especially for bicyclists, at risk of becoming a bridge to nowhere to steal a term from elsewhere.

So let's take a quick look at a few of those. Obviously at each end of Hyperion Bridge is where the need for improving that nexus is most critical. And I'm sure that with everything you've heard with your expertise at your disposal, you'll be able to do that.

But it's not just the bikes that have suffered from the lack of connectivity here because my understanding in the original plan that traffic that would be moving northbound on Glendale Boulevard and wished to go into onto Interstate 5 north, rather than having make the obnoxious u-turn at Glen Felix, would have been able to use the underutilized u-turn route underneath the Hyperion Bridge to
go directly on there.

What happened to that plan? That's something that can be accomplished very easily and reduce by approximately 50 percent the amount of traffic that is having to make that obnoxious u-turn. So that's something that can be taking a look at. It could be accomplished at very little cost with one little signal light in the intersection.

But I want to bring in one little bit of revision that is completely missing here that's part of the wonderful use of recreating the pedestrian route over the LA River.

And that is to use the abutments leading up to that bridge to create a public space at the level of that bridge so that we have a true pedestrian plaza over the Los Angeles River that will make this a tremendous home for people.

That's something that we can accomplish especially with the savings that we create by getting this project right. So thank you very much.

MR. PURKISS: Good evening. My name is Nathan Purkiss. I'm a resident of Los Feliz Village. I wanted to speak today as a respective of motorists. I thank you City departments for being here and listening to us today.

Every single day I drive from Los Feliz Village to Atwater Village to go to yoga class. I do it seven days a week. I do it on the weekends. And my understanding of this project what you're trying to do is to balance the
needs of pedestrians, bicyclists, and motorists and their safety.

If you were to remove one lane on the Hyperion Bridge, it may cause a little bit more traffic, but I might actually stop being a motorist those seven days a week and actually take my bicycle and ride over the bridge.

And as I drive every single day and I look at every single car out on the road, and I'm one of them, I think how many other people are driving a half a mile to go exercise? I have the opportunity to go running in my neighborhood or, you know, basically I have to take my car, and it's ridiculous. And I also wanted to bring up another example. I was just in San Francisco a week ago and they just built the new Bay Bridge that connects Oakland to San Francisco.

It's an iconic bridge. It's an amazing bridge. It took many years to build. You know, a lot of people said you're going to be sacrificing time and seismic safety if you insist upon having a bicycle lane on this bridge. And who's going to bicycle from Oakland to Treasure Island anyway?

Well, they put a bike lane on that bridge and they're amazed at how many people are actually using it. Now that it opened, it's one of the biggest features. People are really using it.
So I think that what would be great for the City departments is to look at your constituency and think about creating a paradigm shift so that people like me can be one less motorist on the road. Thank you.

MS. PADILLA: Andy Lenigan, Jennie Chamberlain, and Matthew Mooney.

MS. ROBBINS-KASSON: Good evening. My name is Tricia Robbins-Kasson. Thank you for hearing our testimony this evening and paying attention to things that we're asking for. Thank you to all of the city departments that are here to our public works commissioners. We really appreciate it.

And thank you all of you for being here tonight and creating a robust conversation about what we need. It's you who are so important in making sure that things happen. So many times I've been at public meetings and almost nobody shows up, so thank you very much for being here.

In thinking about what I'd like to talk about tonight, I started looking through the paper, and I saw this article that was written on the 25th by Paul Whitefield called "LA Is a Bike Friendly Place? Forget It; It's Too Dangerous."

And in it he recounts a movie where he saw a bicyclist winds up getting hit, and it's a hit-and-run. Then he says, you know, "You think this is just art; but in the end it actually turns out to be life."
And he talks about walking around Pasadena around Rose Bowl with his wife and seeing a Mercedes passing them and then a few minutes later hearing a thud. Turning around and realizing the Mercedes had made a u-turn right into the path of a bicyclist who hit the side of the car.

And in this recount the driver of the Mercedes jumps out and says, "Look what you did to my vehicle." And so my point with this is that so many times we are so busy considering the needs of the motorists and the needs of the cars that we forget about everybody else.

And so I used to work for the City and I was really involved in bringing the park lights to Highland Park and to downtown. And there are so many countries I have done studies about.

When you have things in the public right of way, it actually makes drivers slow down, take notice, and be better drivers. And I think that creating a more multimodal bridge will do everybody a service in the City of Los Angeles.

So I'm so glad that our mayor has recognized that we need to have great streets because we truly do. And I think the redesign of this bridge will really contribute to that. Thank you.

MR. LENIGAN: Good evening. My name is Andy Lenigan. And as a resident of Los Angeles and Los Feliz neighborhood, I'm speaking tonight in opposition to the Glendale/Hyperion
complex of bridges improvement project as it currently stands. I want to differentiate traffic issues from seismic. Seismic: a-okay; traffic issues: issues.

All right. The proposed traffic design is unsafe for pedestrians, unsafe for bicyclists, unsafe for motorists, and completely unnecessary in my opinion based on the date in the study titled Initial Study Proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration Environmental Assessment is Problematic in section 4 of Evaluation dated August 2013 and approved September 4th, 2014.

The existing bridge structure was observed at its peek traffic volume to carry 1,025 vehicles per hour in the northbound direction. This is with two lanes in each direction. During construction traffic will be limited to one lane each direction with the speed limit at 25 miles per hour. This next sentence is a direct quote from this report:

"At this speed the capacity of one uninterrupted lane would be as high as 1,500 vehicles per hour with an average gap of 65 feet between vehicles.

"One motor vehicle lane in each direction at lower speeds in the current posted limit is more than enough to carry the volume of traffic this bridge sees every day and won't exceed 1,500 car per hour at its peek until 2025 using LADOT's 1 percent growth formula."
"Please explain to me why this bridge is at higher speed limit, bank turns, a freeway-style median, and no bike lanes."

In further investigation of this project, I found it to be in violation of NEPA, SEQUA, executive order 12898, CalTrans guidelines for bicycle and pedestrian access, and ignored a 2010 city of Los Angeles bicycle plan.

Nobody wants to see infrastructure delayed, but the current proposed design is so unsafe for pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists, that I would rather throw a legal monkey wrench at it than see it as designed. Thank you.

MS. CHAMBERLAIN: Hi. Thank you. I'm Jenny Chamberlain. I live in Silver Lake. I've lived here since 2000. I frequently get to Atwater. And I came here tonight just to put a face. We talk a lot about active transportation and how our neighborhood supports that.

I just want to talk a little bit about my story. We -- my husband works in Eagle Rock. He bikes frequently. He has to go over Fletcher or he has to go over Hyperion. And every day I'm like, "Call me when you get there," because you don't know how it's going to go. It's not safe.

He needs to do the exercise. He needs to get to work safely. I wish he wouldn't, but that's what he does. Since my kids were young, since they could ride a bike, they'd be like, "Can we go to Buena Vista?" I was like,
"Oh, I don't have a car."

"Oh, we can bike." "No. You're five and it's not safe." Then they're like, "Okay. We can walk." I'm like, "Actually, it's not safe. We can't get over the bridge: It's a quarter mile away, and we can't walk over the bridge to get dinner because it's not safe to just cross it. And I don't know when it's going to be safe, but it needs to be safe. People need to be able to get to Trader Joe's from Atwater. They need to be able to get to coffee shops from Silver Lake. We're like one community, and we are constantly driving.

My friends from Atwater came to visit us. They're like, "Oh, we'll walk." Before her phone went out, I was like, "Don't try to walk." "It's a quarter mile." "It's not connected."

Her and her kid took forty-five minutes to walk, again, a quarter mile because it's not safe and they couldn't figure out how to cross the bridge.

And I've carried the bikes up the stairway. I've carried my bike. I've carried my two kids' bikes. Going back down, carrying them up. It doesn't work. We have a lot of families here, a lot of people who want to use the various places.

I like to go to the Atwater library. I like to go to the Post Office. There's tons of services on either side
of the bridge that we all use on a daily basis from yoga --
thank you for bringing that up -- to everything else.
Thank you.

MS. PADILLA: Alex de Cordoba, Daveed Kapoor,
Josephine Kane.

MR. MOONEY: Mathew Mooney. Comprehensive mobility
project chair. What you've heard tonight is that we want a
livable bridge. We want complete streets. Cities all over
the country are re-looking at their streets and their urban
form.

Los Angeles as a world city has to stay competitive
with the other cities in this county and up to date and
progressive. The city has changed since the design of this
bridge initially began.

At the beginning of this bridge design, the City
only had 36 miles of rail. Now nearly 100 plus miles of
rail with 70 stations. At the beginning of this design of
this bridge, bike lanes were only at one 150 miles. Now
we're at 350 miles plus. The city has changed.

The current proposal for the bridge does not
promote walkable communities. The current proposal of this
bridge does not promote easy access transit. And the
current proposal of this bridge does not promote equal
access by stakeholders.

This is not just about bicycles. This an equal
access issue. Negative impacts of pedestrians and bicycles the current proposal has. This bridge current proposal is out of step with the trajectory of the City.

It's out of step with Mayor Garcetti's great streets initiative and is out of step with the newly appointed used department of transportation's Anthony Fox appointed by President Obama.

Remember, what we design today will stand for the next fifty years. Making this bridge a great livable bridge is in step with Mayor Garcetti's great streets initiative.

Making this bridge a great livable bridge is in step with connecting and building great communities. Making this bridge a great and livable bridge is in step with the future of this great and unique city of Los Angeles. We want our city back away from the oil, gas, and rubber corporations.

MR. DE CORDOBA: Good evening. My name is Alex de Cordoba. I am speaking to you as a victim of a hit-and-run driver. On behalf of all cyclists and pedestrians who have been hit by cars and killed by cars, I'd like to just say that this city has failed pedestrians and cyclists.

We have departments that are focused on maximizing the throughput of vehicles at the expense of the safety and well-being of the residents of the City. I believe that
when the City decided to do these improvements to the bridge,
they were looking more for the interests of vehicles and not
for the interests of cyclists and pedestrians.

And when they say that they're designing it for
safety, it's safety after they've designed it to move cars
as quickly as possible. So I simply don't believe that
safety is the number one concern in the design of this
bridge.

I believe that it could be designed in a much
better way that could accommodate all the people, cyclists,
pedestrians, and drivers in a way that's safe and that
accommodates the communities on either side of the bridge.

We have a new mayor. We're all super excited for,
you know, his project to restore the LA River. Here's a
great opportunity to create some public space. Here's an
opportunity to have those seating around the bridge.

I would love to be able to see a bridge that I
could walk across, maybe enjoy the sun setting, maybe enjoy
all the new birds that are going to be, you know, living
down in the river now.

I would love to see a bridge that, you know,
embraces the City and makes it somewhere that I would
actually want to go to as a destination, not just as a means
of getting from one side to another as quickly as possible.

Thank you.
MS. PADILLA: Marino Pascal, Kelly Thompson, Steven Trapasso.

MR. KAPOOR: I'm Daveed Kapoor. Seismic safety is of course a requirements but crash barriers will not make us safer. Crash barriers will encourage drivers to speed and increase accidents.

Crash barriers will make cycling across the bridge incredibly dangerous. I believe in our US Constitution, and it guarantees equal rights for all.

This proposed retrofit discriminates against non-motorized users and those who cannot afford to operate a car. The crash barriers are not compatible with the historic character of the bridge.

There should not be barriers along the median or along the sidewalks. The engineers who designed this bridge in the thirties would be appalled by this brutal retrofit. The city is doing to our beautiful historic bridges now what the Army Corps did to our river decades ago.

A retrofit done for mechanical engineering that blights and inherently beautiful place. What is safest is a high quality environment for all users.

I support sidewalks on both sides, only one 25 mile per hour car lane in each direction, and a landscape buffered cycle track 12 foot wide to accommodate emergency vehicles. Please see that the RAC alternative design in the
back of the room and please change the design to accommodate all users.

MR. PASCAL: Hello. My name is Marino Pascal. I live in Glassell Park. Thanks for having this meeting today. Thanks for listening to us. A lot of great speakers today.

And I've never seen so many people come to a bike-related event to speak. This is -- you came to, I think, the ground zero of the bike community in Los Angeles. Silver Lake, Highland Park, Glassell Park and seriously.

There's a lot of cyclists living in this area, and the only way we can cross the river is Los Feliz, Hyperion, and Fletcher. It's like there's no other option.

And each one of those bridges has freeway on-ramps and off-ramps, and we've built a lot of bike lanes the last couple of years, but they're like bike lanes to nowhere.

When you come to the river, whoops it's a cliff. You're on your own. The original plan has this little bike/pedestrian bridge on the side. But that to me it seems more like a toy like when -- like you ice skating? Well, every Christmas we'll build an ice skating rink in Pershing Square so you can play with your skates.

That's what this little bridge reminds me. It's not a transportation solution. It's like ride your bike from your house down the river for a little bit and go back. My stepdaughter, she used to work on -- near LACC, and she
would ride her bike Hyperion to LACC -- that's Hollywood --
and she was sideswiped once.

It's really scary. And going downhill from Silver
Lake to Hyperion, it's steep. So me on my bike, I do
30 miles an hour just from gravity not -- and when it's so
fast, we need to have room. We cannot ride on the shoulder.
Thank you very much.

MS. PADILLA: Melissa Casey, Barry Greenstein, Slobhan
Dolan.

MS. THOMPSON: Hello. My name is Kelly Thompson, and I
live in Cypress Park. I'm first and foremost a mother of a
beautiful young teen who goes to school at the Immaculate
Heart School in Los Feliz and who I would love for her to be
able to ride her bike to work -- or to school and back to
her tutor across the bridge.

I would just like to say that thank you for having
us here, and I really hope that you will consider everything
that you've heard. And I'd also like to express my
exhaustion for having to constantly come to these meetings
and talk about the safety of bicyclists and pedestrians in
this town.

And I'm -- you know, a lot of us are like come on,
people. Let's think globally now. Let's just do it. It's
like, if I have to fight for my right to my uterus -- the
right to my uterus and bike lanes, and it's just like come
on.

Since the fifties and sixties I've been fighting for the other one. Don't make me do this one until I die too, thank you.

MS. CASEY: My name is Melissa Casey. Thank you very much for having us at this meeting. Born and bred in Los Angeles. I just want to say that this is an ageist issue. I live and I -- I live in condo complex that hosted -- original owners were Centenarians before they died.

Thank you. My mother-in-law is 91. I have an 8 and 1/2 year old daughter. No one here is speaking for those people that actually can't avail themselves of cars as readily as we all can.

I take the 201 bus on occasion to my mother-in-law's house in Glen Oaks Canyon from Rowena and Silver Lake Boulevard with my daughter, and I point out the landmarks along the way.

These are things you can do eventually on your own. Go to the Americana and walk safely for instance. I'd like to see a city where my daughter -- I didn't have it when I was growing up.

Whoever was here from Sacramento -- I think he left -- if you think it's bad now, you have no idea what it was like when I was growing up in the City. It has gotten better. We can do better. We can make this an intermodal
connected city.

Not just for Silver Lake and Atwater because we are in the middle of it. We're -- everything has to connect through us basically.

And I'd like to see a place where my 91-year-old mother-in-law, me when I turn 91 years old with any hope can take a bus, can walk to a bus, can walk to a streetcar, can take a safe passage basically and get myself independently around this great city. Thank you.

MR. GREENSTEIN: My name is Barry Greenstein. I grew up here in Los Angeles. I ride a bike and I drive a car. And it seems to me that people were talking about how do you slow down traffic.

It seems a no-brainer. You put more people and more bikes on the bridge, make it friendly, and people will slow down. Think about when you're riding and you see a group of people walking down the street or bicyclists.

What is your first reaction? To slow down. It seems really simple. And the more -- I've heard so many people say they won't go on that bridge or not as often as they would like to. So if you made wide bike lanes and pedestrian sidewalks, more people would use it.

More people would be on the bridge. I think people would slow down and they'd probably bring it down that 35 miles an hour. Thank you.
MS. PADILLA: John Brown, Troy Herrera, Charles Dandino.

MS. DOLAN: Hi. My name is Slobhan Dolan. I've been an Atwater Village resident for over six years. And I don't know, what the hell did everybody else think when you saw crash barriers? Crash barriers?

Well, like how fast are you going? Where the hell are you going that fast? You're not keeping your money in Atwater, and you're not keeping your money in Silver Lake. I do on my bike. I keep my money local. I like being in my neighborhood. That's why I've been there for six years.

I actually really like my life. I don't want to be a crash barrier. I think engineers are soulless. I can't believe they would even make this plan and think we'd be okay with this. I'm a car driver and I'm a biker and I also walk to Silver Lake very often to get my groceries.

But I'm not any one thing. I'm all of this. I'm a person. This plan is not for people. I think we have a problem. I think we need to go back and redo the plans. Crash barriers?

MR. BROWN: Good evening. My name is John Brown. I'm a resident of West LA. Thank you for having this meeting. I want to speak out in favor of a bike plan that also offers pedestrian paths and bike lanes on both sides of the bridge with the necessary stoplights and whatnot to accommodate it on either side.
I don't know how many of you all know this, but I believe it was a 2010 or 2011 insurance industry survey found Glendale to be the third most dangerous city in the country to ride bikes -- or, I mean, not to ride bikes, but to drive. So riding bikes would be more dangerous even.

And, you know, with that in mind, the third most dangerous city of the county to seriously consider putting in a 55-mile-per-hour freeway between two areas of 35-mile-an-hour surface streets seems nothing short of insanity.

You know, I think we need to think about building for the future. LA's pretty maxed out as far as cars go. I drove here from west LA, and it took me over an hour. There's not an easy route. They're not going to stack the 10 and the 110 to put more cars through. We're maxed out.

So in order to provide more throughput, you know, the only way we're going to get more cars through is to get more people out of cars and onto bikes. So I'd like to see as this being thought of as a step to the future, provide more bike infrastructure.

Someone earlier said that, you know, maybe not every road is designed for bikes, and I think that's an outdated way of thinking. You know, if I came up here and said, you know, maybe not every road is designed for cars, you gentlemen would probably be rolling your eyes and we
probably wouldn't even be having that meeting.

Going forward we need to make sure the road is
designed for all users; bicyclists, pedestrian, and
motorists. And I think adding bike lanes and pedestrian
paths on this road rather than a 55-mile-per-hour road of
crash barriers is the way to do it. Thank you.

MR. HERRERA: My name is Troy. LA resident. Lived here
my whole life. I ride bikes. Everyone who knows me knows I
ride bikes all the time. I'm not afraid of that bridge or
any bridge because I'm foolish, and I ride around like my
life doesn't matter.

But even just today with 15 to 20 people on that
bridge, I almost wanted to catch up to a car that I saw cut
off me, that turned and cut off Jim, who also talked. And I
know that a lot of people who rode here with aren't going to
talk tonight, but I'll speak for them if they're not coming
up.

I will say that, you know, obviously this bridge is
dangerous, and we don't need to reiterate that. We don't
need speed dividers or crash barriers. Just make it so that
the cars can drive safely with people on the bridge. It's
not that hard.

Let's cut down lanes to single lanes. I mean, two
lanes on one side. If they can't handle it, give them two
lanes on one side, but cut it down and make it so that we
can have bike boulevards on each side. And don't tell me
that the car culture in LA won't allow it.

There's a car culture in Germany and they have bike
lanes everywhere. And you know what? Make the cars wait.
Make them wait. They'll wait for what, 5, 10 minutes and
then they'll drive off at 60 miles an hour anyways because
we're in LA and that's what they do?

I personally don't see why they have it designed
the way they do. Obviously I'm glad that you had us all
here. And from what everyone else has been saying, and I've
been to other meetings like this, they are not this packed,
so take that as maybe a little warning.

Like don't ignore the 2010 bike plan. Don't ignore
the cyclists in Los Angeles because we're growing. If you
go to any SEQUA event, ride your bike and you'll see that
we're going to keep growing.

And you are going to have to make space for us or
we're going to have more bodies in the streets from car
crashes and from hit-and-runs. And I'm a victim of a
hit-and-run.

I used to always take (inaudible) and I got railed
from behind and went through someone's windshield and landed
in their passenger seat. And you know what? That little
strip on the ground of paint didn't save me. You want to
put up a divider and divide two fast cars driving at each
other, but you're just going to put a piece of paint down and not protect us. I think that's just ridiculous.


MR. DANDINO: Hi. My name is Charles Dandino, and I live in Silver Lake and ride my bike to work in Pasadena every day where I'm an engineer. We're not all soulless, but that's actually a good point.

We do work typically in metrics and we have our heads in a spreadsheet, and it's important to pull your head out of that spreadsheet and realize that this is a personal issue and people are on the line.

So I would like to ask not that everybody ride their bicycle in the dark and the cold and the rain home tonight, but those of you who don't ride bikes even just in your car, in your car with the seatbelt secured and the crumple zone and the airbags, ride at a bike pace.

Just over the bridge and back in where the bike lane would be and see how you feel about it. You know, bike pace is 12 to 15 miles an hour especially up that hill, probably slower. Just get a sense for that. Not fully exposed, protected by your cars. That's my only request. Thank you.

MS. KNAPP: Hi. My name is Karen Knapp and I'm a member of the Atwater Village Neighborhood Council, but
I'm here as a private citizen. I've heard so many things and now that I'm here, I don't even know what I'm going to say.

But I think it's a tough situation we're in because that bridge is one of two streets that gets us from either Hollywood or Silver Lake into Glendale and on freeways and it is a main thoroughfare, and I think it would be tough to make it one lane each way.

Maybe it could work, but I keep thinking that if we have a good pedestrian pathway that bicyclists could also use that. However, there is the tunnel that is too narrow to do anything with. Even pedestrians can't get through there. So I think there needs to be a solution for that as well because everybody has to go up over the hill.

So I don't think it's that big a deal to have 400 feet that bicyclists have to deal with the pedestrian lane because they're going run into an obstacle when they hit the tunnel.

But frankly, I would a love to see some sort of transportation between Atwater and Silver Lake like an electric bus that would get us over the bridge and we could communicate with each other in a more ecologically sound way.

And I just don't know if there's a way that pedestrians, cars, and bicyclists all satisfied on that one
little old bridge. Thank you.


MR. ISAACS: Hey, how's it going? My name's Steve Isaacs and I'm a resident of Hollywood which sucks. It sucks there to ride a bike. It's very congested. It's got some great history, but it's a difficult place to get around.

I love coming over to the east side. It's a better place. It's growing so fast in the 20 plus years I've lived here. It's wonderful to see what's happening. And Tom had such a beautiful vision of what could happen with these two connected areas, Silver Lake and Atwater Village.

I've chosen to become a bicycle commuter because I hit personal critical mass with the expense, the inconvenience, with hating my city, with hating Los Angeles by being in a car, and I've become a bicycle commuter and I love it. I love it, love it, love it.

I love everything about it except the danger. The danger is pronounced. It's obvious. It's clear. If you're not a bicyclist then you're probably almost hitting one all of the time. And this city can be so much greater. It can be so much more powerful, and we could really, like, show what we -- how we can transform this place.

Let me leave you with this: This is a seismic
refit of the bridge. I am so much more afraid of being
taken out by a motorist on that bridge than I am of an
earthquake.

MS. BARNETT: Hi. My name is a Karen Barnett. I'm a
resident of Atwater. I actually live on the river, and I am
confused about this bridge a little bit, but I have two
bikes and two cars. But one of my cars is electric and it's
an NEV and it tops about 26.

And I drive over that because it's rated for 35
miles per hour or less, and cars do go a little fast. But
as a walker, cars go a little fast; and as a cyclist, cars
go a little fast.

So I think that the whole problem is that cars go
too fast. You have to change the drivers along with the
bridge for safety as much as you can, but it really is a
river issue.

And why I came here was to actually ask about the
sound studies because sound mitigation is needed for Atwater
Village because the construction project is three years
long.

And I couldn't find any sound sensors along the
river; 50 feet, 100 feet, 300 feet, whatever you guys use
from the bridge. I think they're missing. I think they're
necessary because we have a lot of noise concerns. Thank
you.
MR. EDEWARDS: Hi. Good evening. My name is Jonathan Edewards, and I'm here representative of the Pasadena Complete Streets Coalition in Pasadena. There's so many reasons to pursue complete streets. It's healthier. It's better for the environment.

The earth's resources are limited, and there simply is no more room for more people driving more automobiles. We must have complete streets. Streets designed for pedestrians, cyclists, autos, people of every age and ability.

And, you know, this bridge affects not just the residents of Atwater, Glendale, and Silver Lake. It affects all of us in Southern California because the way that we design our public resources in our public infrastructure perpetuates the mode of travel.

It's an investment in a way of life and a way of travel. So if we design this bridge for autos primarily, it's going to make -- it's going to encourage people to drive more. It's going to force people to drive more. It's going to prevent people from walking and from biking.

If we invest in creating a better quality of life, invest in people reclaiming public spaces, then that will encourage reclaiming public space not just in this area, but it will serve as an inspiration, an example, and a shift in a paradigm of how we expect what's considered normal life in
Greater Los Angeles.

Please redesign the bridge for complete streets.

MS. PADILLA: Andres Miyares, Dee Dee Wei, and Veronica Jayreou.

MR. JACOBBERGER: Good evening. My name is Jeff Jacobberger. I'd just like to say a word to the folks from Atwater Village. I realize you feel like all your years of hard work is really being threatened by bicyclists showing up at the 11th hour and seeming to disrupt this project.

But the only reason the bike advocates are showing up at the 11th hour is because nobody asked our opinion until the 11 hour. And I think if we'd all been included in the conversation from the beginning, we'd have a good project that we can all agree on and can move forward with.

There's a lot of good things in this project that you worked for like the revised exit off the 5 that keeps people from doing that whip around Glen Feliz. And I think bicyclists and pedestrians appreciate your concern and your effort and your work on a lot of those design elements.

However, the problem with ISCA is it rests on the premise that the absence of bike lanes is equivalent to bike lanes, and that's just not true.

And it's especially true on a road that curves like the Hyperion Bridge because the problem is, you know, whatever the merits might be of a lane with a wide shoulder
on a straightaway, when you do that on a curve, all that
means is that cars go faster because they cut the corner on
that curve.

I ride my bike on Riverside Drive in Toluca Lake
all the time, and the scariest part of that drive is that
one little corner I have to take where Riverside curves to
the right and cars are, you know, whip really close to the
curb to make that corner.

I would just say your proposal of a three-foot or
four-foot buffer, that's not wide enough to be a bike lane.
And bicyclists are going to have to take the lane, but all
the motorists are going to think there's a bike lane, and
you're just going to create road rage against bicyclists and
really threaten us.

There's an ability to put bike lanes on the bridge
and bike lanes need to be on the bridge so that bicyclists
can safely cross.

MR. MIYARES: Hello. My name is Andres Miyares. I live
in Highland Park, but I go to school at Marshall. So every
day -- well most days when I ride my bike to school, I'm
going across the Hyperion Bridge. And to be honest, it's
not a fun experience.

There's that one kind of like turn where cars are
hugging the corner and you're just like oh, please, I hope I
don't get hit. And that's really the point. Oh God, I
feared for my life ten times just going across that bridge. And then getting on the sidewalk too is a really hard thing because you have to -- there's like -- there's Glendale that's going down here and then Hyperion that's going down here, so you have to stay on one of those lanes and then you have to go to that little median, pick up your bike, get on the sidewalk.

And then again there are kids who are walking to Marshall or whatnot, so you have to then again get off your bike, and then you have to walk up the stairs. The treacherous stairs. I don't want -- if there's a bike lane, I'd prefer that to be there. I really hope that happens. I just want my bike ride to school to be a peaceful place and I don't want to die someday just going school. Thank you.

MS. WEI: Hi. My name is Dee Dee Wei. I'm actually new to the City. I've been here for just a little bit over one year, and I currently live in Silver Lake.

I just first want to say how scary it is to hear all these near-death accidents and hit-and-runs, but I think it's great that we're having this conversation tonight. It's been really awesome to see how many people show up. Thank you for taking the time to listen.

But to echo to what everyone else has said or most everyone else, the plan is incomplete and can be improved by making it more friendly for pedestrians and bicyclists.
So, you know, although my history here with LA has been short -- I've only been here for one year. And now I love it here.

I can imagine making a life here, but it took me 3 to 6 months to appreciate the City because every time I got in my car, every time I went on a walk, or every time I went on a run, I was filled with hate, fear, and stress.

So I really hope that LA can move away from that stereotype as a city that is, you know, stuck in its cars and stuck in traffic and spend more time in their cars than socializing with people and toward a city that actually builds community.

Because it's not just about safety. It's about building community and, yeah, making it safe for everyone.

Thank you.

MS. PADILLA: I have five more cards. So it's Elson Trinidad, Hyeran Lee, Wesley High, Erik Tompkins, Daniel Barr, and Peter Safonov. And I think that's it; right? Okay.

MS. JAYREOU: Hi. My name is Veronica Jayreou. I volunteer at the bike event in Cypress Park. I bike all along everywhere. I also drive my car, and I do like driving fast. But I really do think that this is the scariest bridge to go over.

I've been over it maybe once or twice like five
years ago, and it was the scariest thing in my -- like
first, the road is cut up. There was so many potholes. And
then there's cars just going, like, 50 miles an hour behind
you. So I feel like this is a chance to change that
Autobahn of a block to a great community.

There's great plans over there where the bike --
there's a center way for bikes. If that's done well, it
could be really -- it can be a good thing. Also, the
alternatives to all these bridges are -- all the river
path, which right now is really dangerous.

It's as dangerous as the Below Nut path. People get
beat up. We've had a number of our volunteers get beat up
just on the river path. And we've had to put away a lot of
gang members, but we can can't get them all. So now they're
retaliating towards all the bicyclists.

So the bike path is really dangerous. It's not a
great alternative, and this could be -- if we change this to
a really safe place for bicyclists, safe place for
pedestrians, make it more green, make it a place where
people want to be at, then we can really change.

This can be the bottom stone of just changing the
city completely. We're already on its way with (inaudible)
doing so well and more people are getting on their bikes.

And I feel bad promoting bikes if the City does not
change -- I can't believe that Tom LaBonge put this through.
We gave him a golden spoke like five years ago. I want to revoke that golden spoke for him just passing this through.
I cannot believe it. I mean -- thank you.

MS. LEE: Hello. My name is Hyeran Lee. I study urban planning at UCLA. I also do an internship in Los Angeles County Bicycle Coalition.

I first want to mention that we are in the era of complete streets strategy era and of Los Angeles River Renovation -- in the process of Los Angeles River Renovation plan and also thousands of miles of bike lanes on the -- in the bicycle master plan.

And in this era, the City is proposing this dangerous bridge that will eventually harm all users on the street. And I also want to mention that since we have $50 million, it's going to be a great opportunity for both communities at the edge of the bridge and also all the users in Griffith Park and other LA River.

If you make it complete street -- if you apply complete street strategy and then improve the accessibility to the LA River and then these great amenities in Griffith Park, then we're going to -- we can increase public health benefits and also maximize the benefits that these amenities that these villages have can offer. Thank you so much.

MR. TRINIDAD: Good morning. My name is Elson Trinidad. I'm from east Hollywood. The corridor is not just -- we're
not just talking about a single street between two neighborhoods. We're talking about a whole corridor stretching from west Hollywood all the way to Laverne Hills.

So this is a very important link for all the communities involved. I'm here as both a cyclist and a motorist. What a concept. We're not exactly mutually exclusive.

As a cyclist, I echo all the sentiments that have been said before and also want to add that this isn't a bike plan and without common sense linkages, the bike plan would not work. As a motorist, I don't think the traffic plan works as a motorist.

I think it's too fast. When I drive down the bridge, I'm treated to a wonderful view of Glendale and San Gabriel mountains, and I think if you drive too fast, you miss out on the view. You might want to slow down.

You also have a wonderful business district along Glendale Boulevard that you're going to miss out on if you're driving too fast. Not to mention if you're careening down the bridge northbound, you're only to going to stop at Glenhurst at the red light where the street divides into various lanes.

So and also as a pedestrian, you know, we talk about safe routes to school. I went to Marshall High. A lot of friends who grew up in Atwater Village had to walk
the bridge, and I think it's obviously dangerous to walk the bridge.  

I think it's more dangerous to walk the bridge than even bike it. So to close, this bridge was built in the 20th century. We need to look at 21st century solutions. We need a solution that benefits all users of transport to go across the bridge. Thank you.

MR. HIGH: Good evening. My name is Wesley High. I cycle a lot. I drive a lot. I live in Los Angeles. I live in Silver Lake. This bridge connects two great communities. We have, like, vibrant pedestrian, cycling, outdoor life, and this bridge is just like freeway connecting them both.

When I drive across it, it doesn't seem right to drive that fast. When I ride across it, it doesn't seem right for them to be driving that fast. I think it is a good opportunity to change the plan and incorporate bike lanes, incorporate pedestrian sidewalks, wider sidewalks.

I forgot what else I was going to say. Should have written it down. But I just want to emphasize that it's very dangerous on the bridge, and this is a very important opportunity because now's your chance to do it.

We have elected officials who supported this bridge in their video, but now they're off talking to other people like White House right now with our mayor talking about how we need to revitalize the river. Which this is, I think,
part of the river even though it goes across the river.

You look down upon the river, you enjoy the river, and you can sit on the bridge and view the river. Mitch O'Farrell has also Tweeted like six hours ago that we are supporting the LA River revitalization. So they may say that in their videos, but I think there's a bigger picture we need to take advantage of. Thank you.

MS. TOMPKINS: Hello. My name is Erin Tompkins. Once again, thank you guys for hearing us out tonight. As a commuting cyclist and driver, and now a licensed motorcyclist even though I don't have a motorcycle yet, I believe that we need to encourage safety all around.

And this is a good chance to do that, to actually have some sort of building block to where all bridges and all roads should try to obtain to. You guys have a really good chance right now to do something like that. What should I say?

Biking not only reduces traffic, but it encourages citizens to be healthier. Not to mention that if we make LA the capitol of bikes, imagine pedestrians and tourists going further than Hollywood Boulevard because that can get really old really quickly and riding bicycles and seeing what we have to offer.

With that said, I encourage a lot of my non-cycling friends to go biking all the time and give them tours of LA
usually like very friendly streets like 7th Street, which has a cool bike lane. Just getting there is its own thing.

One of the streets we avoid is Hyperion Boulevard because it's -- if you're not experienced and you don't know how to take someone buzzing you, you can easily get super hurt, and I would never want to see one of my friends do that. I've seen it before.

So one of my suggestions for making it safer I'd say from my hometown of D.C. which is Rock Creek Parkway where they shut it down during rush hour just to go one way in each direction.

But if that's too radical, mostly just slowing down the speed limit on Hyperion would help out enormously because when -- if you ever do -- many people here do bike, getting buzzed is the worst feeling ever because you feel as though this could be it or anything can happen; the wind can just push you into a wall.

And I've seen it happen. So thank you guys again, and I hope you can make this user friendly.

MR. BARR: Good evening. My name is Daniel Barr. I'm a resident of Pasadena. I rode over the Hyperion Bridge to get here tonight, and I'm grateful to be here and not in an emergency room. I do not support the proposed plan.

I think it is flawed, and I support an alternative plan. I agree with a lot of the people that came up and
spoke tonight that the current plan is not safe and that the alternative should be considered. Thank you.

MS. SAVAGE: Hi. My name is Kathryn Savage, and I strongly oppose the current plan for a few reasons. One concern I want to -- want to point out is that includes the median barrier.

And if there's an accident on the bridge and one side gets blocked by cars, how will an emergency vehicle get through on the other side and through the barrier? I also oppose it because it does not provide safe, equal access to pedestrians, cyclists, and drivers.

All of us deserve to be able to ride safely across the bridge. I want to point out that taking separated paths like the LA River and pedestrian/bike bridges is nice, but they're not replacements for city streets. They're isolated with few exits, entrances, and often very few people especially at night.

As a young woman, it makes me nervous to ride on them alone at night. Fortunately, I have the right to ride my bike on city streets through the community safely, and this proposal has to reflect that right to safety which means at the very least much slower car speeds, bike lanes, full sidewalks, and full crosswalks. Thank you.

MR. SAFONOV: My name is Peter. I'm a bicycle mechanic in Studio City. More importantly, I'm a road user in
Los Angeles, and as a cyclist and a motorist in LA, I feel failed by the posed language. As a cyclist, it's obvious why. It's already a scary ride, and the idea that it could be made even worse is just appalling to me.

And as a motorist, I also feel failed because it's another reminder that motorists like myself and so many others are taught to be entitled to the road and that more vulnerable road users are not to be considered.

I was reminded of this when I took my drivers test. There was no mention of any bicyclists in any of the questions. I was reminded of this on my way here when I saw a bicyclist being harassed by a motorist when he was trying to make a legal left turn. And I'm reminded of this every time a cyclist I know is hit by a motorist.

You know, I see this all the time. As a mechanic, every time a bicycle is hit by a car, I see what happens to the bicycle and the person, and it's heartbreaking. And this bridge is just another reminder of this toxic culture that teaches selfishness to those in power and the vulnerable road users just need to get out of the way.

Thank you.

MR. BISAHAH: My name is Mark Bisahah. I submitted a card. They forgot to call it, so I will fill it out afterward. I want to say that I'm in favor of the current plan. The faster we can move cars, the better. Come on,
this is 1955.

Our Buicks and Mercurys have the latest safety technology like in vacuum drum breaks. If we're to create a happy motoring utopia that we all deserve, we need to make it fast and easy for motorists to get wherever they want to go and get there now.

So let's look to the future. Let's enter the 1960s with modern, car-centered bridge that's designed for the fastest possible speeds. Great work. Thank you.

MR. BRADY: Thank you very much. That concludes the hearing. And as I said, if you didn't submit written comments tonight, you can always do that until November 7th.

(Hearing concluded at 8:25 p.m.)
1) Reduce vehicle speed on Hyperion Avenue
2) Provide bike lanes on Hyperion Avenue (perhaps protected by barrier)
3) Add full-width crosswalk on Atwater Side of Glendale and Hyperion
4) Eliminate median and railing barriers, and/or banked turns
5) Non-specific approval
6) Non-specific disapproval
7) This is not a pedestrian-friendly design
8) Do not increase or improve access to cyclists on Hyperion
9) Propose a multi-modal design/be consistent with Bike Plan & Caltrans Safety Policy
10) Enhance safety for everyone
11) There should be narrower car/traffic lanes and reduce traffic lanes
12) There should be well-marked crosswalks and wayfinding signs
13) Preserve the historic bridge design
14) There should be wider sidewalks
15) Address traffic congestion
16) Consider proposed alternative designs
17) Provide accessibility to LA River
18) Provide a public hearing
19) Review related projects, specifically the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers document, Los Angeles River Ecosystem Restoration Integrated Feasibility Study that could potentially impact the detention/infiltration basin in Sunnynook River Park
20) Emergency vehicles possibly will not be able to get through due to crash barrier
21) We would like to participate in advisory board
22) Security Measures for Pedestrian Bridge
23) On-demand traffic light at I-5 exit
24) What are the number of lanes on pedestrian bridge/access?
25) Will there be a link between pedestrian paths on both sides of the bridge?
26) Keep the median barriers in the plan.
27) Reduce the bridge to one lane in each direction.
28) Provide benches on the sidewalks on the bridge.
29) Design the center of the bridge for pedestrians and bikes.
30) Create a public space on the bridge for pedestrians.
31) Provide noise mitigation during construction.
32) Will project provide proper bike/pedestrian detours, signage, and safe alternative routing if existing bike facility is impacted by construction?
33) Must maintain Metro facilities and services during project
34) Will bus shelters, benches and other amenities be installed?
35) Be consistent with Caltrans Complete Streets Policy (DD-64-R1) and FHWA Routine Accommodations Policy (23 C.F.R. § 652.5)-elderly and handicapped
36) Provide a signalized crosswalk with refuge areas at both sides of street at east end of bridge complex
37) Caltrans and the City of Los Angeles Cannot Certify the IS/EA if a Fair Argument Can Be Made That the Project Will Create Significant Impacts for Bicyclists
38) A wide shoulder/shoulder is not a bike lane
39) Review flood maps
Los Angeles Walks Comments on Glendale Boulevard-Hyperion Avenue Complex of Bridges Improvement Project

Dear Ms. Podesta,

Los Angeles Walks is concerned that the proposed design for the Hyperion Ave viaduct will not be safe and inviting for pedestrians and cyclists. We suggest improvements to the design to create a bridge that is safe for all users. Los Angeles Walks is a pedestrian advocacy organization dedicated to promoting walking and pedestrian infrastructure in Los Angeles, educating Angelenos and local policymakers concerning the rights and needs of pedestrians of all abilities, and fostering the development of safe and vibrant environments for all pedestrians. We view the viaduct as an important link between two walkable Los Angeles communities – Los Feliz/Silver Lake and Atwater where linkages are very limited due to the Los Angeles River and Interstate 5. It is therefore extremely problematic that the proposed project is designed to freeway standards at 55 miles per hour, with a crash barrier and wide vehicle lanes that tend to encourage fast driving. These design standards are not appropriate in urban settings and would disadvantage pedestrians and cyclists and be a safety hazard for all users. Fortunately, modifications to the distribution and width of facilities on the right of way can significantly improve the viaduct as a complete street and provide a vital community connection.

A More Walkable Viaduct Design

There are a number of factors that have been shown to make streets safe and inviting places to walk. On roads with busy vehicle traffic, pedestrians need separate facilities, direct routes, safe places to cross the street and surroundings that feel safe. As required by law the viaduct project calls for a sidewalk on one side of the Hyperion Viaduct. If, however, the roadway is designed with wide lanes and a crash barrier so as to allow and encourage fast driving, many residents will not feel comfortable walking on the sidewalk. Perceived safety and comfort are very important to pedestrians and the rush of cars moving at near
freeway speeds next to sidewalks will discourages walking. Calming the traffic on the viaduct through design changes is essential to making it a good pedestrian environment.

Removing the median crash barrier, not super-elevating turns, and using lane widths appropriate for an urban setting rather than for a rural highway lane will provide a calmer and more pedestrian-friendly traffic environment. This allows for wider sidewalks and for bike lanes on both sides of the bridge. The cross section should be as follows (design by Los Angeles County Bike Coalition - LACBC):

69’ Hyperion Viaduct Cross-Section

58’ Hyperion Avenue Cross-Section (under Waverly)
Additional Crossings and Safety Measures
We appreciate the addition of a new pedestrian walkway across the former red car trolley piers and encourage its construction as it provides important connections to the Los Angeles River Ped-Bike Path. The addition of this walkway does not reduce the need to make the Hyperion viaduct, the most direct route across the river and the freeway, into a safe and welcoming route for pedestrians and cyclists. Walking is the lowest speed form of mobility and there is research showing that walkers are not likely to use bypasses and indirect routes (they will hopefully use the pedestrian walkway to access the river.)

Enhanced pedestrian crossings are needed to allow pedestrians to safely cross the often high-speed traffic between Hyperion Avenue and Glendale Blvd. The proposed project does not provide access to the single-side Hyperion Avenue sidewalk from the south side of Glendale Boulevard. A signalized crosswalk with refuge areas across both streets at the east end of the bridge complex would allow pedestrians to cross safely and would also assist cyclists.

A Complete Street
Los Angeles Walks encourages Caltrans and LADOT to listen to community voices calling for a safe viaduct rather than a freeway-style design. We look forward to working with you to create a rehabilitated bridge that promotes safe transportation for all.

Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions or concerns. My contact information is listed above.

All the best,

Deborah Murphy, Executive Director

Cc:
Honorable Eric Garcetti
Honorable Tom LaBonge
Honorable Mitch O’Farrell
Eric Bruins, LACBC
Margot Ocanas, LADOT Pedestrian Coordinator
Michelle Mowery, LADOT Bike Coordinator
October 10, 2013

Ms. Tami Podesta, Branch Chief
Division of Environmental Planning
California Department of Transportation District 7
100 South Main Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012

RE: Glendale Boulevard-Hyperion Avenue Complex of Bridges Improvement Project

Dear Ms. Podesta,

On behalf of the Los Angeles River Revitalization Corporation, I write to express our concerns about the modernization plan for the Hyperion Ave viaduct that excludes safe cyclist and pedestrian infrastructure. Bridges are critical connection points in our transportation network and should safely accommodate both motorized and non-motorized modes of transport. We believe the Hyperion Ave viaduct should provide pedestrian and cyclist access to the existing 10 miles LA River Greenway.

The LA River Corp is a non-profit venture charged with catalyzing responsible real estate and related economic development along the Los Angeles River. We apply an entrepreneurial approach to the implementation of the LA River Revitalization Master Plan, our blueprint to restore the river’s ecological functions and transform it into a valuable, celebrated resource for the City. In addition, our major campaign, Greenway 2020, calls for a continuous 51-mile non-motorized corridor along the LA River, which would connect communities from Long Beach to Canoga Park. This includes safe linkages to existing neighborhood bike and pedestrian networks.

LA River Corp acknowledges the proposed improvements to access to the LA River Bike Path. The new ramp completing the interchange with Glendale Boulevard in particular is a valuable contribution to the City’s bikeway network. However, this improvement does not supersede the even more critical need to provide east-west connectivity across the LA River and 5 Freeway. That connectivity can only be through Hyperion Avenue. In order to promote and fully use the proposed bridge, the current project must be reevaluated and be designed with adequate width for bicyclists and pedestrians.
The LA River Corp implores you to rethink the existing plans for the Hyperion Ave Viaduct. It is the greatest barrier to safe bicycle and pedestrian access across the 5 Freeway and LA River. Safe and convenient transportation options are critical along the LA River corridor.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Omar Brownson
Executive Director
October 24, 2013

Dear Mayor Garcetti, Councilmember LaBonge, Councilmember O'Farrell, and Ms. Podesta,

Friends of Griffith Park wishes to raise its concerns with current plans for the Hyperion-Glendale viaduct complex crossing the Los Angeles River. Griffith Park encompasses land on both sides of the Los Angeles River and is a resource for all Los Angeles citizens.

The Hyperion Avenue Bridge can be an important component for many routes to Griffith Park via various transit modes for Angelenos from communities on both sides of the River. The current bridge renovation plan seems to prioritize automobile traffic to the detriment of other transit modes. This would limit access to passive recreation resources and would adversely impact communities adjacent to the bridge. It appears inconsistent with both the 2010 LA Bike plan and hopes for the Los Angeles River.

Friends of Griffith Park hopes that the plan can be improved. The Hyperion Bridge can accommodate multiple transit modes and provide green routes between Los Angeles communities and businesses, Los Angeles River parks, the Los Angeles River Path, and Griffith Park.

We applaud the project’s sensitivity to preservation. An even better appreciation for the viaduct’s historic beauty can be achieved by providing safe access for slower-going transit modes.

Sincerely,

Gerry Hans
President
www.friendsofgriffithpark.org
gerry@friendsofgriffithpark.org
October 28, 2013

Tami Podesta  
Division of Environmental Planning  
California Dept. of Transportation District 7  
100 S. Main St.  
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Re: Hyperion-Glendale Bridge complex

Dear Ms. Podesta,

The Oaks Homeowners Association would like to express its concerns with current plans for the rehabilitation of the Glendale Hyperion viaduct, particularly with plans for Hyperion Avenue. While the Los Feliz Oaks are not directly adjacent to the Los Angeles River or this complex, Hyperion Avenue is a major route across the River for Oaks Residents who frequently shop, eat, and visit friends in Silver Lake and Atwater Village.

We see parallels in these Hyperion Avenue plans with misguided and thankfully unsuccessful attempts to widen Los Feliz Boulevard in our community decades ago. Plans to widen automobiles lanes, install a concrete median, remove sidewalks, provide no bike paths, and provide incomplete pedestrian crossings on Hyperion Avenue are inconsistent with Caltrans complete streets policies and the 2010 Los Angeles Bike Plan and visions for the Los Angeles River. These plans will be harmful both to adjacent communities and to visitors and residents hoping to access the LA River or to cross it via green transportation modes.

This project sets important precedent. Please renovate the Hyperion Avenue Bridge with 21st Century thinking considering all transit modes and considering effects on adjacent areas.

Sincerely,

Caroline Schweich
President

cc: Mayor Garcetti, Councilmember Tom LaBonge, Carolyn Ramsay, Councilmember Mitch O'Farrell
October 25, 2013: Press Contact: Hector Huezo, H.L.Huezo@gmail.com

Dear City of Los Angeles Board of Public Works,

At a regular meeting of the Neighborhood Council Alliance of River Communities, the member representatives of the alliance consented on submitting the following resolution regarding the Glendale Boulevard-Hyperion Avenue Complex of Bridges Improvement Project:

WHEREAS, the City of Los Angeles has made great strides to improve accessibility for pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists on streets throughout the city; and

WHEREAS, the current project proposal for the Historic Glendale Boulevard-Hyperion Avenue Complex of Bridges Improvement Project outlines several improvements to the existing viaduct complex, including improved pedestrian, bicycle and motor vehicle travel through widening of Glendale Boulevard Bridges; realignment of the northbound I-5 off-ramp; a new pedestrian bridge; a new bike path access ramp; and reconfiguration of the Hyperion roadway and sidewalks, among other improvements; and

WHEREAS the current improvement project could potentially fall short of realizing a multi-modal transit route, particularly for the lack of a bicycle lane on Hyperion Bridge, the elimination of sidewalk on the bridge’s east side, and high speed limit, all of which must be taken into account for a bridge system that is safe for all and further connects the neighborhoods of Atwater Village, Silver Lake and Hollywood; and

WHEREAS the improvement project has the potential to fulfill the objectives of the Mayor of Los Angeles’ Great Streets Program, which focuses on improving selected corridors the city through coordinated efforts of several city departments, including the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power and the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (MTA); and

WHEREAS a plan that fulfills the aims of the Great Streets Program, the 2010 City of Los Angeles Bicycle Plan, and CalTrans policy, including adequate sidewalk space and bicycle lanes, could further solidify the neighborhoods of Atwater Village, Silver Lake, and Hollywood as motor- pedestrian- and cyclist-friendly neighborhoods of Los Angeles;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Alliance of River Communities calls on the California Department of Transportation and the City of Los Angeles to address the challenges of the current Historic Glendale Boulevard-Hyperion Avenue Complex of Bridges Improvement Project proposal to building complete, multimodal streets in accordance with existing policies and in fulfillment of their commitment to improving transportation access and safety for all residents of Los Angeles.

Sincerely,

The Neighborhood Council Alliance of River Communities, ARC
October 3, 2013

Ms. Tami Podesta, Branch Chief  
Division of Environmental Planning  
California Department of Transportation District 7  
100 South Main Street  
Los Angeles, California 90012

Glendale Boulevard-Hyperion Avenue Complex of Bridges Improvement Project  
Compliance with Complete Streets Policy & 2010 Bicycle Plan

Dear Ms. Podesta,

The Los Angeles County Bicycle Coalition (LACBC) has grave concerns about the proposed project to modernize the Hyperion Ave viaduct without safe accommodations for bicyclists. Bridges are critical linkages in any transportation network and should be designed with a clear purpose of connecting communities, but instead of connecting the vibrant walkable and bikeable communities of Silver Lake and Atwater Village, the proposed project would construct a freeway-like viaduct that perpetuates unsafe conditions and isolates Angelinos from the community destinations they would like to access on foot and by bike. Such a project has no place in present-day Los Angeles and is incompatible with City, State, and Federal policy.

2010 City of Los Angeles Bicycle Plan

The 2010 Bicycle Plan, a chapter of the City’s Transportation Element, sets long-term objectives for development of the City’s multimodal transportation system. LACBC led the charge for the plan’s adoption and is a careful steward of its implementation. As the proposed project’s life is longer than the Bicycle Plan’s horizon, consistency with the Bicycle Plan is a relatively simple determination of whether the project provides the facilities identified in the Bicycle Plan or not. In this case, the Bicycle Plan calls for bike lanes on Hyperion Avenue and a bike route on Glendale Boulevard. The proposed project, however, only includes the bike route on Glendale with no accommodations on Hyperion Avenue.

LACBC explicitly acknowledges the proposed improvements to access to the LA River Bike Path. The new ramp completing the interchange with Glendale Boulevard in particular is long overdue and a valuable contribution to the City’s bikeway network. However, this improvement does not supplant the even more critical need to provide east-west connectivity across the LA River and 5 Freeway. That connectivity can only be provided by Hyperion Avenue. LACBC rejects the IS/EA’s assertion that the project is consistent with the 2010 Bicycle Plan without such accommodation on Hyperion Avenue. Furthermore, this inconsistency with the 2010 Bicycle Plan is a significant impact under CEQA on both Land Use and Planning and Traffic and Transportation/Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities. The IS/EA is also deficient for failing to distinguish between the operational characteristics of bicyclists and pedestrians, or analyzing required widths for shared-use facilities.
Caltrans Complete Streets Policy (DD-64-R1)

As this project includes a portion of the State highway system and is subject to Caltrans’s delegated NEPA authority, Caltrans staff reviewing the project are responsible for adherence to Deputy Directive-64-R1 (Complete Streets), which “views all transportation improvements as opportunities to improve safety, access, and mobility for all travelers in California” and calls on all agency staff to provide “for the needs of travelers of all ages and abilities in all planning, programming, design, construction, operations, and maintenance activities and products on the State highway system.”

This policy reflects a clear intent not just to include elements that benefit bicycling and walking, but to actually provide for the mobility needs of bicyclists and pedestrians. A bridge project that does not provide safe accommodation across the entire span of the project cannot be deemed to be consistent with this policy, despite local access improvements on one end of the project area. A bridge modernization spanning from Atwater Village to Silver Lake must also provide for the safe and convenient mobility of pedestrians and bicyclists between the two communities.

FHWA Routine Accommodations Policy (23 C.F.R. § 652.5)

The proposed project is majority federally funded through the Highway Bridge Program and subject to Federal-aid highway regulations, including (emphasis added):

The safe accommodation of pedestrians and bicyclists should be given full consideration during the development of Federal-aid highway projects, and during the construction of such projects. The special needs for the elderly and the handicapped shall be considered in all Federal-aid projects that include pedestrian facilities. Where current or anticipated pedestrian and/or bicycle traffic presents a potential conflict with motor vehicle traffic, every effort shall be made to minimize the detrimental effects on all highway users who share the facility. On highways without full control of access where a bridge deck is being replaced or rehabilitated, and where bicycles are permitted to operate at each end, the bridge shall be reconstructed so that bicycles can be safely accommodated when it can be done at a reasonable cost. Consultation with local groups of organized bicyclists is to be encouraged in the development of bicycle projects.

LACBC calls on the project to safely accommodate bicycles in a dedicated facility as provided in the City’s Bicycle Plan and consistent with State and Federal policies cited above.

Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities Must Be Safe, Convenient, and Comfortable

The policy imperative to include bicycle and pedestrian facilities is clear, but it is not sufficient to squeeze in minimum facilities in a City that intends to encourage bicycling and walking as modes of transportation. The project must be reimagined to achieve the appropriate prioritization of modes within available right-of-way. Special care must be taken when design assumptions for one mode imperil the safety and comfort of another. Specifically, a reduction in design speed to that
appropriate for a city street will not only provide a safer facility for all users in and of itself, but also leave adequate width for enhanced facilities for bicyclists and pedestrians.

At a lower design speed, freeway-scale safety countermeasures are no longer appropriate. Removing the median crash barrier, not super-elevating turns, and striping urban lane widths will provide a calmer traffic environment that does not encourage motorists to pick up speed before entering the communities on either end of the viaduct. Community stakeholders consistently reiterated the need for such calming during project scoping. Super-elevating the roadway would lock in the proposed cross-section and preclude the future reallocation of right-of-way. The median crash barrier would also prevent emergency vehicles from navigating around backed up traffic. If absolutely necessary, a less intensive median treatment, such as Qwick Kurb®, can provide a similar deterrent to head-on collisions with a narrower profile, leaving more width for bicycle and pedestrian facilities while still allowing for emergency vehicle access.

LACBC believes the following cross-section is more appropriate for multimodal travel across the viaduct:
Additional Safety Measures for Pedestrians and Bicyclists

Special attention must also be given to either end of the span to ensure safe approaches for pedestrians and bicyclists to the facilities on the viaduct. The existing merge at the east end of the bridge complex is particularly hazardous in its current configuration. Adding bicycle lanes to the viaduct will necessitate advanced design to assist bicyclists transitioning from Hyperion Avenue to Glendale Boulevard and vice versa.

At this same location, enhanced pedestrian crossings are necessary to allow pedestrians to safely cross often high-speed traffic. The proposed project does not provide access to the single-side Hyperion Avenue sidewalk from the south side of Glendale Boulevard. This configuration would require pedestrians to choose among walking several blocks out of their way, taking a circuitous route, or braving high-speed traffic without a crosswalk.

A crosswalk spanning both Glendale Boulevard and Hyperion Avenue at the east end of the bridge complex would remedy these safety issues for both pedestrians and bicyclists. This crosswalk should be signalized and have refuge areas in the gore points between the merges. If designed well, this treatment would allow confident bicyclists to merge with traffic while giving less-confident bicyclists an opportunity to stop at a refuge and use the crossing to resume travel. Innovative treatments such as a bicycle left turn pocket could assist bicyclists merging from westbound Glendale to westbound Hyperion.

A Complete Streets Approach is Warranted and Feasible

If the above suggestions are incorporated, this rehabilitation project can leave a legacy that both respects the structure’s historical significance and modernizes the viaduct to meet future travel needs. The current viaduct is the greatest barrier to safe bicycle and pedestrian access across the 5 Freeway and LA River. LACBC implores the City to implement its Bicycle Plan and provide its residents with safe and convenient transportation options in this critical transportation corridor.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments. I am available to discuss these concerns at your convenience.

Sincerely,

Eric Bruins
Planning and Policy Director
EXECUTIVE DIRECTIVE NO. 20

Issue Date: July 1, 2011

SUBJECT: Implementation of the 2010 Bicycle Plan

It is no secret that the quality of life in Los Angeles is directly influenced by the quality of one's daily commute. And for too many Angelenos, getting to work each and every day is synonymous with endless rows of honking cars, congestion and pollution. Recognizing Angelenos are hungry for more options than the single passenger automobile, I asked them to envision a new blueprint for traveling seamlessly throughout our City by supporting Measure R, a plan to invest in LA's infrastructure while also creating over 100,000 local jobs. With its passage, the City finally had the consensus to create a world-class, multi-modal transit network that links each and every neighborhood in Los Angeles.

The 2010 Bicycle Plan is the latest major milestone in putting our Measure R funds to work. By designating over 1600 miles of bicycle lanes throughout the City, this comprehensive plan supports bicycling as a viable transportation option at a time of spiking gas prices. Not only will this save Angelenos money, it will encourage them to lead healthy, active lifestyles. And by getting residents out of their cars and onto their bikes, we will also be able to better maintain our roads. This plan is not just healthy for us, bikes are healthy for our infrastructure too. And because bicycling is an emissions-free way to commute and travel, it's making the City cleaner and greener — for every car trip replaced by a bicycle, we are reducing emissions and improving our air quality.

To write this plan, we solicited feedback from different stakeholders throughout the City and conducted exhaustive research. I am proud of this final product that reflects diverse public input, detailed field work, and best practices from cities around the country. By promoting bicycles as a viable mode of transportation, we are creating a more livable and sustainable City for future generations.
2010 Bicycle Plan

The 2010 Bicycle Plan (http://www.labikeplan.org/public_involvement/) designates a 1,680 mile bikeway system comprised of three main bikeway networks: the Backbone Network, the Neighborhood Network and the Green Network.

- The 707 mile Backbone Network, comprised primarily of bicycle lanes, will enable access via arterial streets to major employment centers, transit stations and stops, and educational, retail, entertainment, and recreational resources.

- The 834 mile Neighborhood Network includes local streets with low traffic volumes and slower speeds where bicyclists of all experience levels can feel comfortable. The Neighborhood Network parallels the Backbone Network and will enable bicycle riders to access schools, libraries, shopping districts, parks and open space via slower streets with less automobile traffic. This network will also give neighborhoods a toolbox for reclaiming their streets by reducing cut-through automobile traffic and redesigning the roadways to reduce automobile speeds.

- The 139 mile Green Network enhances access with bicycle paths and shared use paths to the City’s green open spaces such as the Los Angeles River.

When completed, the three networks will give the vast majority of Angelenos access to a City bikeway within one mile of their home.

Implementation Plan

The updated Bicycle Plan is novel because an implementation plan was adopted concurrently and for the first time ever. The goal is to develop our streets and bike paths into a citywide network that can be used by all levels of cyclists, from experienced commuters who ride their bike daily to casual recreational riders.

The implementation plan includes a commitment to build 40 miles of bikeways a year, four times more than the previous average, and focuses on closing gaps in the existing network and creating new bikeways in lower income and underserved communities. To be successful, all relevant City departments, commissions and agencies need to work together and incorporate bike-friendly practices into their policies and operations.

Bicycle Plan Implementation Team (BPIT)

The Department of City Planning and Los Angeles Department of Transportation are leading the Bicycle Plan Implementation Team, or BPIT, that is charged with implementing the 2010 Bicycle Plan. The current departmental leads of the BPIT are Claire Bowin (DCP) and Michelle Mowery (LADOT).
Incorporate Bicycle Facilities and Bike-Friendly Features in All Public Works Construction, All Public Facilities, and Other City Sponsored Projects

In addition to the implementation of specific elements of the city’s adopted 2010 Bicycle Plan, it is paramount that city agencies integrate bicycle facilities and bike-friendly features – especially related to cyclist safety – into the design and construction of public works projects (streets, bridges, etc.) and municipal facilities (city office buildings, libraries, yards, etc.). This includes new construction as well as rehabilitation and maintenance work. In addition, the city should require joint development and private development to do the same.

For example, grates on city streets should be oriented to minimize bicycle accidents. City bridge reconstruction should accommodate bike lanes when called for in the Bicycle Plan. Existing municipal facilities should add or upgrade bike parking and other amenities. Joint developments should include the same. Private developments should be required to provide bicycle facilities.

The following City departments shall incorporate bicycle facilities and bike-friendly features in their projects: Convention Center, General Services, Housing, Public Works, and Transportation.

In addition, the commissions of the Community Redevelopment Agency (CRA) and the following proprietary departments are requested to direct their respective general manager to incorporate bicycle facilities and bike-friendly features in their projects: Airports (Los Angeles World Airports), Harbor (Port of Los Angeles), and Water and Power (DWP).

The following City departments shall be responsible for developing code amendments requiring private development to incorporate bicycle facilities: Building and Safety, Planning.

Develop Consistent Bicycle-Related Standards and Integrate them into Departmental Guidelines and Enforcement Procedures

The 2010 Bicycle Plan marks a major shift away from the City’s past piecemeal implementation of bicycle-related policy and programs. Instead, the plan envisions a citywide network that will deliver a consistent experience in terms of the type and quality of bikeways and bicycle facilities. Creating such a network depends on the development of and adherence to uniform design, installation, inspection, and enforcement standards.

Moreover as the City builds more bikeways and bike parking facilities and integrates bicycles into City codes, it will be imperative for City agencies both to enforce existing standards and to develop appropriate additional standards to protect these new resources.
The following City departments shall develop consistent standards and guidelines governing the design, implementation, and maintenance of bikeways and bicycle facilities: Building and Safety, Convention Center, Planning, Public Works, and Transportation.

In addition, the commissions of the Community Redevelopment Agency (CRA) and the following proprietary departments are requested to direct their respective general manager to develop consistent standards and guidelines related to bicycle facilities: Airports (Los Angeles World Airports), Harbor (Port of Los Angeles), and Water and Power (DWP).

Expand Existing Public Education Campaigns and Training Programs to Include Bicycle Related Information

Knowledge is a crucial asset in creating a supportive environment for bicycling in Los Angeles. Accurate information and public awareness is especially important in improving the safety of the City’s roadways for all types of users including bicyclists.

The City currently conducts numerous public education and safety campaigns that could easily be enhanced to include bicycle-related material. To build on these existing resources, the following departments shall incorporate and integrate bicycle-related education and training materials – especially safety information – into existing outreach and educational campaigns: Fire, Personnel, Police, Recreation and Parks, and Transportation.

The following departments shall facilitate bicycle events that support public education efforts and encourage bicycle riding such as CicLAvia, and seasonal and recreation rides: Fire, Police, Public Works, and Transportation.

Summary of Required Actions

Pursuant to this Executive Directive, the following instructions shall be implemented:

1. All General Managers, Directors, and Administrators of Departments, Offices, and Agencies and Boards and Commissions of City Government identified in this Executive Directive shall incorporate bicycle facilities and bike-friendly features in all public works construction, all public facilities, and other city sponsored projects, including joint development and redevelopment projects.

2. The Department of City Planning and Department of Building and Safety shall develop changes to the Zoning Code and Building Code that include bike infrastructure requirements and construction standards.

3. All General Managers, Directors, and Administrators of Departments, Offices, and Agencies and Boards and Commissions of City Government identified in this
Executive Directive shall incorporate consistent standards governing the design, implementation, and maintenance of bikeways and bicycle facilities.

4. All General Managers, Directors, and Administrators of Departments, Offices, and Agencies and Boards and Commissions of City Government identified in this Executive Directive shall incorporate and integrate bicycle-related education and training materials – especially safety information – into existing outreach and educational campaigns and support bicycle events.

5. This Directive shall remain in effect unless rescinded or superseded by another Directive, ordinance, and/or other applicable law.

Executed this 29 day of June, 2011

ANTONIO R. VILLARAIGOSA
Mayor
October 30th, 2013

Ms. Tami Podesta, Branch Chief
Division of Environmental Planning
California Department of Transportation District 7
100 South Main Street
Los Angeles, California 90012

RE: HYPERION VIADUCT RETROFIT AND RESTORATION PROJECT

To Whom It May Concern:

The Atwater Village Chamber of Commerce strongly advocates that all consumers have safe and easy access to the business establishments of all our members, especially those located on Glendale Blvd – Atwater’s "main street" commercial corridor.

Our Hyperion Bridge provides that easy and reliable access for many consumers, mostly motorists, visiting Atwater Village. This is especially true for those motorists visiting from the Silver Lake and Los Feliz communities.

However the bridge has started to show its age; it's in dire need of restoration and seismic retrofitting. As such, the Atwater Village Chamber wholeheartedly supports the current project proposal as it now stands without any “road diet” or vehicular lane reduction. We find that the plan already includes numerous vehicular, pedestrian and cyclist safety features. Some of those safety features include a 35MPH speed limit, the realignment of the Interstate 5 freeway off-ramp and a pedestrian / bike bridge over the Los Angeles River on the old Red Car pylons. In addition, the project will restore all historical elements of the bridge and retrofit it to weather large earthquakes.

More importantly, we find that the current plan will continue to provide consumers easy and reliable access to our "main street" commercial corridor. This plan is right for everyone... for pedestrians, cyclists and motorists.

Thank your consideration.

Atwater Village Chamber of Commerce
PO Box 39754
Los Angeles, CA 90039
board@atwaterchamber.org
818.732.1413
November 7th, 2013

Tami Podesta, Branch Chief
Division of Environmental Planning
CA Dept. Transportation Dist. 7
100 South Main Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012

RE: Support for the Glendale Boulevard-Hyperion Avenue Bridges Improvement Project

Dear Ms. Podesta,

Friends of the Los Angeles River (FoLAR), is in full support of the modification of the above referenced viaduct to correct safety and operational deficiencies, meeting current seismic performance standards and restoring the original design details to the railings. We are excited for the proposed addition of a median barrier, and the addition of a pedestrian crosswalk across Glendale Boulevard that will include an access ramp from northbound Glendale Blvd. to the L.A. River bike path. We at FoLAR appreciate the mitigation measure to address construction impacts by creating an alternate pedestrian crossing over the former Red Car piers during construction. Looking to the future these will be positive additions to enhance the public’s river experience, including safety by improving access to and from the east side of the river to the existing trail section including Griffith Park.

Sincerely,

Lewis MacAdams
President/Founder
Bicycle Advisory Committee of the City of Los Angeles

October 7, 2013

Tami Podesta
Branch Chief, Division of Environmental Planning
California Department of Transportation District 7
100 South Main Street
Los Angeles, California 90012

Re: Glendale Boulevard-Hyperion Avenue Complex of Bridges Improvement Project Initial Study with Proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration/ Environmental Assessment and Programmatic Section 4(f) Evaluation

Dear Ms. Podesta:

The Bicycle Advisory Committee of the City of Los Angeles (“BAC”) was established in 1973 “to act in an advisory capacity to . . . the various agencies of the . . . City of Los Angeles in the encouragement and facilitation of the use of the bicycle as a regular means of transportation and recreation.” Since adoption of the 2010 Bicycle Plan by a unanimous vote of the Los Angeles City Council, the BAC has also been charged with monitoring the “progress of Bicycle Plan implementation.” Policy 3.2.1. We take seriously our obligation to ensure that Los Angeles’ elected and appointed officials fulfill their duties to fully implement the Bicycle Plan.

The California Department of Transportation (“Caltrans”) and the City of Los Angeles (“City”) propose to rebuild the Hyperion Avenue bridge and viaduct over the Los Angeles River and Interstate 5 (the “Hyperion Bridges”), to rebuild the Glendale Avenue bridges over the Los Angeles River (the “Glendale Bridges”), and make other changes such as modifications to freeway ramps to/from Glendale Boulevard to I-5.

Caltrans and the City propose to rebuild the Hyperion Bridge and the Glendale Bridges without providing bicycle lanes on any bridge. Thus, the project fails to safely accommodate those who need to bicycle between (1) Atwater Village, other Northeast Los Angeles communities, and the City of Glendale on the east side of the Los Angeles River; and (2) Hollywood, Silver Lake, and other parts of Los Angeles on the west side of the River.

In an effort to avoid full-scale review of this project under the California Environmental Quality Act (“CEQA”) and the National Environmental Policy Act (“NEPA”), Caltrans and the City have prepared the Glendale Boulevard-Hyperion Avenue Complex of Bridges Improvement Project (“Project”) Initial Study with Proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration/ Environmental Assessment and Programmatic Section 4(f) Evaluation (“IS/EA”). The IS/EA recognizes that the 2010 Bicycle Plan calls for bicycle lanes on the
Hyperion Bridge, but states without analysis that the Project’s refusal to do so nevertheless is “consistent with the [2010 Bicycle] plan because bicyclists can use the shoulder.”

**The BAC emphatically rejects the assertion that wide shoulders are equivalent to bicycle lanes; they are not.** The IS/EA ignores applicable federal, state, and local laws and regulations that require full accommodation of bicyclists, including: the 2010 Bicycle Plan, Caltrans’ Complete Streets Policy, and Federal Highway Administration (“FHWA”) routine accommodations regulations.

Without bicycle lanes on the Hyperion Bridge and Glendale Bridges, the Project creates significant adverse impacts for bicyclists. Thus, Caltrans and the City must either revise the Project to include bicycle lanes, or prepare a complete Environmental Impact Report (“EIR”) and Environmental Impact Statement (“EIS”) to fully and fairly evaluate the impact of the proposed project on bicyclists and consider alternatives that would fully accommodate bicyclists in all aspects of the Project.

**The Proposed Project Fails to Include Bicycle Lanes on the Hyperion or Glendale Bridges, Both of Which Are Critical Links for Bicyclists Across the Los River and Interstate 5**

The Glendale-Hyperion Bridge Complex consists of a network of bridges, streets, and freeway ramps which cross and connect to the Los Angeles River (including the River Bikeway) and Interstate 5. Both Hyperion Avenue and Glendale Boulevard are important links for local and regional bicycling.

The Los Angeles River, Interstate 5, and the steep hills immediately west of Riverside Drive all create substantial physical barriers for bicyclists who need to travel safely between Atwater Village and the rest of Northeast Los Angeles and Hollywood/Silver Lake. The Hyperion Bridge, in particular, allows bicyclists to reach Silver Lake, Los Feliz, and Hollywood without climbing the short, steep hills that must be scaled on Glendale Boulevard or Fletcher Drive. However, Glendale Boulevard is also an important facility for bicyclists. It provides the most direct route between Atwater Village and portions of Silver Lake, Echo Park, Historic Filipinotown, Westlake, and other neighborhoods. Because Glendale Boulevard intersects with, rather than crosses over Riverside Drive, it provides important access to destinations along Riverside Drive that, because of Interstate 5, cannot be accessed easily from the River Bikeway.

Despite the importance of these connections for local and regional bicycling, the Project does not include bicycle lanes on either Hyperion Avenue or Glendale Boulevard.

**Caltrans and the City of Los Angeles Cannot Certify the IS/EA if a Fair Argument Can Be Made That the Project Will Create Significant Impacts for Bicyclists**

The Project is subject to CEQA, under California law, and NEPA, under federal law, both of which require fair and unbiased review of potential environmental impacts of projects before the project may be approved. Here, Caltrans and the City propose to certify a Mitigated Negative Declaration (“MND”) based upon the IS/EA, and therefore to avoid the requirement to prepare a full EIR/EIS.

Of particular relevance here, Caltrans and the City must evaluate whether the proposed project “conflict[s] with adopted policies, plans or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?”
In *Taxpayers For Accountable School Bond Spending v. San Diego Unified School District*, 215 Cal. App. 4th 1013 (2013), the court summarized the legal standard applicable to Initial Studies:

[T]he [California] Supreme Court has recognized that CEQA requires the preparation of an EIR ‘whenever it can be fairly argued on the basis of substantial evidence that the project may have significant environmental impact.’ *(No Oil, Inc. v. City of Los Angeles* (1974) 13 Cal.3d 68, 75 [118 Cal. Rptr. 34, 529 P.2d 66]; see also *Laurel Heights Improvement Assn. v. Regents of University of California* (1993) 6 Cal.4th 1112, 1123 [26 Cal. Rptr. 2d 231, 864 P.2d 502].) Thus, if substantial evidence in the record supports a ‘fair argument’ significant impacts or effects may occur [and will not be mitigated], an EIR is required and a negative declaration cannot be certified.” *(Quail Botanical Gardens Foundation, Inc. v. City of Encinitas* (1994) 29 Cal.App.4th 1597, 1601–1602 [35 Cal. Rptr. 2d 470], fn. omitted.) CEQA “creates a low threshold requirement for initial preparation of an EIR and reflects a preference for resolving doubts in favor of environmental review [(i.e., an EIR)] ... .” *(Sierra Club v. County of Sonoma* (1992) 6 Cal.App.4th 1307, 1316–1317 [8 Cal. Rptr. 2d 473] (Sierra Club).)

In short, Caltrans and the City must prepare an EIR if the refusal to include bicycle lanes conflicts with adopted policies regarding bicycle facilities, and that a “fair argument” can be made, based on “substantial evidence,” that the proposed mitigation measure – wide curb lanes – does not reduce the adverse impact on bicyclists to a level of insignificance. Application of this standard compels rejection of the IS/EA.

**Federal, State and Local Regulations Require Caltrans and the City to Fully Accommodate Bicyclists on the Hyperion Bridge and Glendale Bridge**

Numerous statutes and regulations require full accommodation of bicyclists – including full and fair consideration of the costs and benefits of bicycle lanes – on the Hyperion Bridge and Glendale Bridges.

**Federal Requirements**

This Project involves the expenditure of federal funds. It therefore requires compliance with the following Federal Highway Administration (“FHWA”) regulation:

The safe accommodation of . . . bicyclists should be given full consideration during the development of Federal-aid highway projects, and during the construction of such projects. Where current or anticipated . . . bicycle traffic presents a potential conflict with motor vehicle traffic, every effort shall be made to minimize the detrimental effects on all highway users who share the facility. On highways without full control of access where a bridge deck is being replaced or rehabilitated, and where bicycles are permitted to operate at each end, the bridge shall be reconstructed so that bicycles can be safely accommodated when it can be done at a reasonable cost. Consultation with local groups of organized bicyclists is to be encouraged in the development of bicycle projects. *(23 C.F.R. § 652.5, emphasis added.)*
Here, the IS/EA merely contains a conclusory (and inaccurate) statement that a wide shoulder is equivalent to a bicycle lane. Instead of reflecting “full consideration” of bicyclists, it reflects no consideration of the safe accommodation of bicyclists seeking to travel anywhere other than the Los Angeles River Bikeway. The bridges do not have full control of access, and bicyclists are permitted under California law to operate at each end of each bridge. Therefore, the bridges must be reconstructed to safely accommodate bicyclists, especially because this can be accomplished at little to no additional cost.

Neither Caltrans nor the City consulted with the Bicycle Advisory Committee during the planning process. To our knowledge, neither Caltrans nor the City consulted with any other bicycle advocacy organization, including the Los Angeles County Bicycle Coalition. The BAC fails to understand how Caltrans and the City can give “full consideration” to the needs of bicyclists without consulting with organizations established precisely for this purpose.

**State Requirements**

Because of Caltrans’ involvement, this Project is subject to the State of California’s “Complete Streets” policy, set forth in Deputy Direction DD-64-R1, which has been official Caltrans policy for five years, since October 2008. Because the IS/EA does not even mention, much less discuss, this policy, the environmental analysis is by definition incomplete and inadequate.

The Complete Streets Directive establishes the following policies (with our emphasis):

- “The Department views all transportation improvements as opportunities to improve safety, access, and mobility for all travelers in California and recognizes bicycle, pedestrian, and transit modes as integral elements of the transportation system. . . . Addressing the safety and mobility needs of bicyclists, pedestrians, and transit users in all projects, regardless of funding, is implicit in these objectives.”
- “The intent of this directive is to ensure that travelers of all ages and abilities can move safely and efficiently along and across a network of ‘complete streets.’”
- The “California Vehicle Code . . . and Streets and Highways Code . . . identify the rights of bicyclists and pedestrians, and establish legislative intent that people of all ages using all types of mobility devices are able to travel on roads. . . . Therefore, the Department and local agencies have the duty to provide for the safety and mobility needs of all who have legal access to the transportation system.”

In furtherance of these policies, Caltrans must:

- “Ensure bicycle, pedestrian, and transit user needs are addressed and deficiencies identified during system and corridor planning, project initiation, scoping, and programming.”
- “Ensure projects are planned, designed, constructed, operated, and maintained consistent with project type and funding program to provide for the safety and mobility needs of all users with legal access to a transportation facility.”
As discussed below, the Project plainly is not designed to meet the needs of bicyclists of all ages and abilities. The IS/EA is therefore deficient.

**City Requirements and Policies**

“The 2010 [Bicycle] Plan is a comprehensive update of the City’s existing Bicycle Plan. .... The 2010 Plan is a part of the Transportation Element of the City’s General Plan and is the City’s blueprint for meeting the needs of all bicyclists. (Bicycle Plan, ch. 1, p. 17 (“Purpose”).) In particular:

The 2010 Plan is to be used by: the City Council, the Mayor, the City Planning Commission, the Board of Transportation Commissioners, the Board of Public Works, the City’s Bicycle Advisory Committee, other concerned governmental agencies ... . For City policymakers this 2010 Plan provides: a reference to be used in connection with their actions on various City development matters as required by law; guidance for decisions regarding allocation of funding for bicycle projects and programs; and technical guidance for the development and implementation of facilities.

The 2010 Bicycle Plan explicitly requires the City to “consider bicycle facilities when designing or retrofitting bridges.” Policy 2.3.1. Other than the inaccurate, conclusory statement equating shoulders with bicycle lanes, the IS/EA contains no indication that the City considered bicycle lanes on the Hyperion Bridge or Glendale Bridges.

**The 2010 Bicycle Plan explicitly includes proposed bicycle lanes on Hyperion Boulevard.** The proposed Project therefore conflicts with the transportation element of the City’s General Plan.

**The 2010 Bicycle Plan calls for bicycle lanes along the entire 4.5 mile length of Glendale Boulevard,** from the Glendale City Limit to its southerly terminus at 1st and 2nd Streets, except for the short portion of Glendale Boulevard that crosses the Los Angeles River and Interstate 5. It seems evident that the Bicycle Plan’s omission of bicycle lanes from this short stretch of Glendale Boulevard reflects the *existing configuration* of these bridges, rather than a deliberate decision to override the numerous policies requiring full accommodation of bicyclists – *i.e.*, bicycle lanes – on the Glendale Bridges. Rather, the Bicycle Plan, when read as a whole, indicates that the City should seize this opportunity to close a short gap in what otherwise would be a continuous 4.5 mile bicycle lane along the entire length of Glendale Boulevard.

The IS/EA states that, under the Project, both Glendale Bridges “would be restriped to accommodate a 6-foot shoulder.” This is wider than the 5-feet that the City of Los Angeles generally requires for a bicycle lane. On the Glendale Bridges, it appears that Caltrans and the City are designing the bridge retrofit so that bicyclists could be fully accommodated, but are flatly refusing to make such an accommodation. This is unacceptable.

**Caltrans and the City Arbitrarily Selected Auto-Centric Design Standards**

In large part, the failure to include bicycle lanes in the Project appears to stem from a decision by Caltrans and the City to engineer the project for a motor vehicle design speed of 55 mph, far above the appropriate maximum speed of 35 mph on these urban streets. This decision explains why the Project
includes an exceptionally wide and sturdy center barrier and minimum lane widths of 12 feet, far above what is necessary for safe driving on urban streets.

The Project appears to be designed around engineering standards established by the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO), which have been roundly criticized for applying freeway-based standards to urban streets and failing to accommodate bicyclists and pedestrians. The FHWA has explicitly approved use of more bicycle- and pedestrian-friendly standards set forth in publications from the National Association of City Transportation Officials (NACTO), which are tailored to urban streets like Hyperion Avenue.¹

The selection of freeway-oriented design standards is particularly inappropriate here. The portion of Glendale Boulevard immediately north of the Project constitutes part of the Atwater Village Pedestrian-Oriented District;² the Silver Lake-Echo Park-Elysian Valley Community Plan includes a policy to “preserve existing pedestrian-oriented commercial areas” along “Hyperion Avenue from Rowena Avenue to Griffith Park Boulevard.”³

The IS/EA emphasizes the need to protect pedestrians from the “safety hazards caused by high-speed vehicular traffic.” The BAC questions why Caltrans and the City therefore do not consider important to discuss or analyze the importance of protecting bicyclists from that high-speed vehicular traffic. Instead, Caltrans and the City have decided to subject bicyclists to even faster vehicle speeds. That does not improve conditions for bicyclists; that makes conditions worse for bicyclists.

The selection of design standards matters a great deal in this case. If a more appropriate motor vehicle design speed is chosen, five feet of the Hyperion Bridge’s width need not be devoted to a crash barrier, and lane widths could be reduced to 10 or 11 feet. In that case, there would be ample room for marked bicycle lanes, and full accommodation of bicyclists on the Hyperion Bridge.

A Wide Shoulder Is Not Equivalent To A Bicycle Lane

The Project’s 14-Foot Curb Lanes on the Hyperion Bridge May Not Be Shareable

The IS/EA states that the Project will include 14-foot curb lanes on the Hyperion Bridge, and that motor vehicles and bicyclists can share such lanes. There is substantial evidence that this conclusion does not adequately state or analyze the impact to bicyclists of the proposed Project.

The Federal Highway Administration – the source of funds for this project and the source of the requirement that bicyclists be fully accommodated – also funds the Pedestrian and Bicycle Information Center at the University of North Carolina (“PBIC”). The PBIC states that the recommended width of a shareable lane is at least 14 feet, the width of the lane included in the Project. However, the PBIC states that the “measurement should be from the edge line or joint of the gutter pan to the lane line.”⁴ It appears from the IS/EA that the 14-foot lane is measured from the curb. While the drawings are not detailed, it seems unlikely that the Hyperion Bridge would be constructed without drains or a gutter.

pan. In any event, it is not clear from the IS/EA that Caltrans or the City appropriately applied the 14-foot shareable lane standard.

Moreover, the IS/EA ignores the fact that portions of the Hyperion Bridge have a long grade that would enable bicyclists to pick up speed in the downhill direction. It also ignores the City’s practical inability to keep curbs free of debris on streets like Hyperion. The PBIC states that a 15-foot width is preferred for a shared curb lane “where extra space [is] required for maneuvering (e.g. on steep grades) or to keep clear of . . . obstacles.” In short, the IS/EA fails to explain how Caltrans and the City determined that, in this particular context, a 14-foot curb lane is shareable.

**Bicycle Lanes Provide Important Safety Benefits to Bicyclists and Motorists**

In general, the lack of exposure data – how many bicyclists ride on particular streets and how the number of bicyclists changes when infrastructure is added – has made it difficult to determine whether bicycle lanes improve safety for bicyclists. However, at least two recent studies show that marked bicycle lanes make street safer for bicyclists.

A comprehensive study of bicycle collisions resulting in emergency room visits found that marked lanes on major roads without curb parking, such as the Hyperion Bridge, provide a significant safety benefit over unmarked roadways such as those proposed by Caltrans and the City. (Teschke, et al. Route Infrastructure and the Risk of Injuries to Bicyclists: A Case-Crossover Study. *American Journal of Public Health:* December 2012, Vol. 102, No. 12, pp. 2336-2343.) Another study of bicycle lanes in New York City found no increase in the number of bicycle collisions after the installation of bicycle lanes, *despite the increased number of bicyclists.* (Chen, et. al. Evaluating the Safety Effects of Bicycle Lanes in New York City. *American Journal of Public Health:* June 2012, Vol. 102, No. 6, pp. 1120-27.) Thus, the authors suggested that bicycle lanes actually reduced the collision risk.

Observations of bicyclist and motorist behavior on streets with marked bicycle lanes explain why they are considered to offer safety benefits. The NACTO Bikeway Design Guide states that bicycle lanes:

- Create separation between bicyclists and automobiles;
- Increase predictability of bicyclist and motorist positioning and interaction; and
- Visually remind motorists of bicyclists’ right to the street.

More simply, when there is a striped bicycle lane and a narrow travel lane, both bicyclists and motorists “know their place” and generally adjust their speeds to stay in their marked lanes, rather than weaving about in a wide curb lane. That is why the City of Los Angeles chose to enact a Bicycle Plan calling for installation of bicycle lanes and has implemented many miles of connected bicycle lanes – instead of relegating cyclists to the shoulder.

**The Vast Majority of Bicyclists and Potential Bicyclists Prefer Bicycle Lanes**

A shared lane is not equivalent to a bicycle lane. That might be true for experienced bicyclists who are comfortable riding in mixed-flow lanes, but is most certainly not true for the vast majority of existing and potential bicyclists who clearly prefer well-defined bicycle lanes. All of the policies cited above require Caltrans and the City to accommodate all bicyclists.
“Goal One” in the 2010 Bicycle Plan is to “increase the number and types of bicyclists who bicycle in the City.” Good bicycle planning recognizes that bicyclists fall into various categories based on their experience and skill level, which translates into their comfort level riding on various types of bicycle facilities.

At pages 36-37, the 2010 Bicycle Plan uses the Federal Highway Administration’s “A, B and C” categorization of bicyclists. Advanced Category “A” riders “are typically comfortable riding with motor vehicle traffic.” However, even many advanced riders are not comfortable sharing a lane with motor vehicles on a roadway with a design speed of 55 mph – as Caltrans has stated is the case with the Hyperion Bridge. Basic Category “B” adult riders “prefer designated facilities such as bicycle lanes or wide shoulder lanes on busier streets.” Children or Category C riders generally require “well-defined pavement markings between bicycles and motor vehicles.

The Southern California Association of Governments (“SCAG”) is the federally-recognized Metropolitan Planning Organization charged with developing a Regional Transportation Plan (“RTP”) for six Southern California counties. SCAG’s 2012 RTP includes an Active Transportation Component describing (as does the City of Los Angeles Bicycle Plan) three categories of bicyclists:

1. Fully-Confident Cyclists, who are confident sharing lanes with traffic in almost all conditions. These make up about 1% of the population. (Again, we note that many otherwise fully-confident cyclists will not ride on a roadway with a design speed of 55 mph.)

2. Enthused and Confident Cyclists, who “prefer using designated bicycle facilities” and who “comprise the majority of the tremendous growth in commuter cycling in Portland after investments were made in bicycling infrastructure.” These make up about 7% of the population.

3. Interested But Concerned Cyclists, who “make up the majority of cyclists.” “They would ride if they felt safer on the roadways” and “if cars were slower and less frequent.” “These riders tend to use sidewalks, school grounds, parks, bicycle lanes, and Class I bicycle paths as their preferred riding environments.” “Older teenagers also fall into this group.” These make up about 60% of the population.

In short, by designing the Hyperion Bridge for a speed of 55 mph, the Project will accommodate only a tiny fraction of bicyclists. That falls far short of complying with policies requiring Caltrans’ and the City’s best efforts to accommodate all bicyclists.

The IS/EA acknowledges that the Project fails to accommodate bicyclists of all ages and skill levels by stating, with respect to both bridges, that “bicycle use on the roadway is primarily used for transportation as a commuter route of the local transportation system.” The IS/EA provides no evidence to support that assertion. Moreover, even if the statement were true, it would prove nothing more than that the existing bridges – lacking bicycle lanes – discourage all but the most confident cyclists. The IS/EA’s statement can fairly be read as an admission that the lack of bicycle lanes – something the IS/EA proposes – discourages all but the most confident and expert cyclists.

---

5 SCAG’s RTP is at [http://rtpscs.scag.ca.gov/Documents/2012/final/SR/2012fRTP_ActiveTransportation.pdf](http://rtpscs.scag.ca.gov/Documents/2012/final/SR/2012fRTP_ActiveTransportation.pdf).
The IS/EA states that a large share of the pedestrians on the Hyperion Bridge appear to be students who attend John Marshall High School on the south side of the bridge, but who live on the north side of the bridge in Atwater Village (page 2-41). It is therefore logical to assume that Marshall High students represent a significant portion of potential bicyclists. The City, State, and Federal governments have policies of encouraging walking and bicycling to school.6 The Hyperion Bridge in particular should be designed to accommodate high school age bicyclists. The IS/EA’s failure to analyze or discuss significant impacts on this important population makes the document legally inadequate.

Sidewalks on Hyperion Avenue Cannot Substitute for Bicycle Lanes

Because the IS/EA admits that the post-Project roadways on the Hyperion Bridge and Glendale Bridges will accommodate only a tiny minority of highly-confident bicyclists, the IS/EA seems to implicitly argue that other bicyclists can be accommodated on the bridges’ proposed sidewalks. However, the new sidewalks cannot accommodate bicyclists.

First, the proposed sidewalks are far too narrow to be shared by bicyclists and pedestrians, particularly on the Hyperion Bridge where bicyclists can travel very quickly in the downhill direction.

* * *

The Bicycle Advisory Committee regrets that this letter is necessary. We would have preferred for Caltrans and the City to consult with BAC and LACBC during the design process to develop a project that truly meets the needs of Los Angeles’ bicyclists. Caltrans and the City should revise the Project to include bicycle lanes on the Hyperion Bridge and the Glendale Bridges. Should they choose to take that path, the BAC looks forward to working with Caltrans and the City to revise the Project. In the alternative, BAC believes that the IS/EA fails to adequately analyze the adverse impacts on bicyclists, and requests that Caltrans and the City prepare an EIR/EIS.

Respectfully,

Jeff Jacobberger
Chair, Bicycle Advisory Committee of the City of Los Angeles, for the unanimous Committee

cc: Office of the Mayor
    Department of Public Works
    Department of Transportation

---

6 See http://www.saferoutesinfo.org/
The Hyperion Bridge Project needs to be redesigned. The Redesign of all future public works projects need to embrace a new and progressive set of criteria. First: Water must be treated as a resource to be slowed and kept on site, instead of moving into the ocean as fast as possible. Two: Paved roadways must be designed to embrace as many different uses as possible. The term complete streets in all of its many aspects must become an excepted term of art.

In keeping with the above two part design colloquium the Hyperion design project needs an extensive and complete reassessment. Beginning at Rowena heading northerly on Hyperion Ave., transform the 60 feet currently of utilized as four lanes of automotive, light trucks, and buses into one lane north and down hill with two lanes south and up hill. This will accommodate; three 11 foot lanes for automobiles, two 6 foot bicycle lanes, two 3 foot separations to be placed between the cars and bicycle/pedestrian space and two 4 foot pedestrian sidewalks. These new pedestrian and bicycle accommodations will require shade trees, permeable pavement, water catchments and road separation from the fast automotive traffic. The water catchments are to be designed to absorb all rain, at rates; of up to 4 inches in one week, 12 inches in one month or a potential 50 inches in one year. The absorption area will be the entire 100 feet of city right of way and any other current feed areas that can not be adsorbed and kept in the grounds where those rains fall.

The entire length of Hyperion from Rowena to Glendale Blvd and all other roads connected with this project must be constructed to accommodate cars, bicycles and pedestrians, water and plantings must also be considered from the above standard. Any existing regulation countermanding these design criteria will need to be reviewed for life safety concerns. City municipal code and zoning requirements can be granted variances and modifications as necessary. There are already several state water conservation requirements that require similar conservation strategies on private property. We are asking to apply those standards to this and all future public works projects. AB 1358 is germane here. As are several other recently enacted legislative directives. Please come to understand that the base line design criteria needs to be, how will our great grand children's great grand children be affected by our actions today?

This early view of the nearby Colorado Street Bridge clearly shows cyclists two abreast, and pedestrians using sidewalks on both sides of the bridge. This is how these bridges were intended to be used. The use of the bridge is
as valid historically as the design of the balustrade, and every effort should be made to restore and preserve this important structure both in form and function.
November 6, 2013

Via E-mail (Tami.Podesta@dot.ca.gov); Original to Follow

Tami Podesta
Branch Chief
Division of Environmental Planning
California Department of Transportation District 7
100 South Main Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Re: Comments on Initial Study with Proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration/Environmental Assessment for Glendale Boulevard-Hyperion Avenue Complex of Bridges Improvement Project.

Ms. Podesta:

On behalf of Angelenos for a Great Hyperion Bridge, we provide these comments on the Initial Study with Proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration / Environmental Assessment ("IS/EA") for the Glendale Boulevard-Hyperion Avenue Complex of Bridges Improvement Project ("Project"). Angelenos for a Great Hyperion Bridge fully supports the renovation and improvement of the Glendale Boulevard and Hyperion Avenue bridges. However, the Project, as currently proposed, fails to adequately provide for bicycle and pedestrian access along the Project’s roadways.

As currently proposed, the Project would modify the Hyperion Avenue bridge by adding a center median barrier, consolidating the existing two sidewalks into a single sidewalk, and widening the four mixed automobile travel lanes to 12-feet and 14-feet lanes. The Glendale Boulevard bridges would be widened approximately eight feet as well, providing wider automobile lanes. There would be no separate designated bicycle lanes on either street.

The IS/EA fails to adequately analyze the Project’s consistency with the 2010 Los Angeles Bicycle Plan, fails to adequately analyze the Project’s circulation impacts, and improperly defers the formulation of mitigation measures that could ensure the safety of all users of the Project, including bicyclists, pedestrians, and motorists. Therefore, the City must either modify the Project to provide for access for all users of the roadway, including pedestrians and bicyclists, or prepare an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) to fully analyze the Project’s impacts on pedestrian and bicycle users. An EIS is required as well.
Angelenos for a Great Hyperion Bridge proposes a feasible alternative that would provide adequate space for bicyclists and pedestrians. As described in more detail below, this alternative would create a 3-lane automobile travel lane configuration, which would allow for dedicated bicycle lanes and American Disabilities Act compliant sidewalks on both sides of Glendale Boulevard and Hyperion Avenue.

A. The Initial Study and Environmental Assessment Are Incomplete, Misleading, and Inadequate, and the Failure to Adequately Analyze the Project’s Impacts on Pedestrians and Bicycles Requires the Preparation of an EIR and EIS.

A lead agency's initial study is intended to provide the lead agency with adequate information regarding a project to determine the appropriate environmental review document and "documentation of the factual basis for the finding in a negative declaration that a project will not have a significant effect on the environment." (Center for Sierra Nevada Conservation v. County of El Dorado (2012) 202 Cal. App. 4th 1156, 1170, citations omitted.) Failure to adequately analyze all of a project's potentially significant impacts or provide evidence to support conclusions reached in the initial study is a failure to comply with CEQA. The conclusions reached by the initial study must be supported by information in the record. (Lighthouse Field Beach Rescue v. City of Santa Cruz (2005) 131 Cal.App.4th 1170, 1201.)

“If there is substantial evidence, in light of the whole record before the lead agency, that a Project may have a significant effect on the environment, an environmental impact report shall be prepared.” (Public Resources Code § 21082.2, subd. (d).) “Since the preparation of an EIR is the key to environmental protection under CEQA, accomplishment of the high objectives of that act requires the preparation of an EIR whenever it can be fairly argued on the basis of substantial evidence that the project may have significant environmental impact.” (No Oil, Inc. v. City of Los Angeles (1974) 13 Cal.3d 68, 75; Laurel Heights Improvement Assn. v. Regents of University of California (1993) 6 Cal.4th 1112, 1123.) “There is ‘a low threshold requirement for preparation of an EIR’ (No Oil, Inc., supra, 13 Cal.3d 68 at 84), and a ‘preference for resolving doubts in favor of environmental review’ (Sierra Club v. County of Sonoma (1992) 6 Cal.App.4th 1307, 1316–1317). The City will be in violation of CEQA if it adopts the proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration for the Project, since there is substantial evidence supporting a fair argument that the Project may have a significant impact on the environment.

Similarly, an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) “must be prepared if substantial questions are raised as to whether a project may cause significant degradation of some human environmental
factor.” (California Wilderness Coalition v. U.S. Dept. of Energy (9th Cir. 2011) 631 F.3d 1072, 1097.) The plaintiff need not show that significant effects will in fact occur, but if the plaintiff raises substantial questions whether a project may have a significant effect, an EIS must be prepared. (Ibid.) Courts have noted that “[t]his is a low standard.” (Ibid.)

B. The IS/EA Fails to Adequately Analyze Consistency with the 2010 Los Angeles Bicycle Plan.

1. Background on 2010 Bicycle Plan.

The California Complete Streets Act (Assembly Bill 1358) requires cities updating their General Plans to identify how they will provide for the routine accommodation of all users of the roadway, including motorists, pedestrians, bicyclists, children, individuals with disabilities, seniors, and users of public transportation. In compliance with the California Complete Streets Act, the City of Los Angeles prepared the 2010 Bicycle Plan (“Bicycle Plan”), a component of the City of Los Angeles’ Transportation Element of the City’s General Plan.

The Bicycle Plan clearly states its purpose:

The 2010 Bicycle Plan (2010 Plan) represents a new commitment by Los Angeles to complete streets. It is part of a move away from the auto-centric approach of the past, and toward a sustainable transportation system – a system which supports motor vehicle use, but also enables the use of streets by other modes, such as bicycling, walking, and transit.

(Exhibit A, 2010 Bicycle Plan, p. 9.) The Bicycle Plan also identifies the current lack of an adequate bikeway network. “[T]he lack of support for a bikeway implementation strategy has provided bicyclists not with an integrated and connected network of bicycle facilities but with piecemeal segments of disconnected paths, lanes, and routes throughout the City.” (Id., p. 110.)

2. Standard for Determining a Project’s Consistency with the City’s General Plan.

All counties and cities must adopt a general plan for the physical development of their land. (Gov.Code, § 65300.) The general plan functions as a “constitution for all future developments” and land use decisions must be consistent with the general plan and its elements. (Citizens of Goleta Valley v. Board of Supervisors (1990) 52 Cal.3d 553, 570.) A “project is consistent with the general plan if, considering all its aspects, it will further the objectives and policies of the general plan and not obstruct their attainment.” (Corona-Norco Unified School Dist. v. City of Corona (1993) 17 Cal.App.4th 985, 994.)
A project is inconsistent if it conflicts with a general plan policy that is fundamental, mandatory, and clear. (Families Unafraid To Uphold Rural etc. County v. Board of Supervisors (1998) 62 Cal.App.4th 1332, 1336.)


The Project location is included in the 2010 Bicycle Plan as a future designated bicycle route and bicycle lane. Hyperion Avenue is listed as a future bicycle lane (dedicated bicycle-only lane), and Glendale Boulevard is listed as a future bicycle route (in-road bicycle and vehicle shared roadway). (Exhibit A, Bicycle Plan, Appendix D, p. 13 [Glendale Blvd. from Glenfeliz Boulevard to Hyperion Avenue is a future bicycle route], p.14 [Hyperion Avenue from Greensward Road to Fountain Avenue is a future bicycle lane].)

Objective 2.3 of the Bicycle Plan is to “Design and maintain all streets so that they incorporate Complete Street standards.” (Exhibit A, Bicycle Plan, p. 89.) Policy 2.3.1 is to upgrade bridges, intersections, freeway ramps, tunnels, and grade separations so they do not impede safe and convenient bicycle passage. To comply with this policy, planners must “consider bicycle facilities when designing new or retrofitting bridges.” (Ibid.)

The Project fails to adequately demonstrate compliance with these policies, or provide an explanation, with supporting evidence, regarding why compliance is infeasible. The IS/EA claims the Project adheres to the Bicycle Plan. The IS/EA makes the following claim, without providing any analysis:

Adhering to the 2010 City of Los Angeles Bicycle Plan, the new shoulder on Glendale Boulevard could facilitate future development of a bicycle route. Though the proposed project will not include a bicycle lane on Hyperion Avenue, the project is consistent with the plan because cyclists can use the shoulder.

(IS/EA, p. 2-6 – 2-7.)

The 2010 Bicycle Plan specifically included Hyperion Avenue as a future dedicated-only bicycle lane. The City’s claim that the Project is consistent with the Bicycle Plan “because cyclists can use the shoulder” is meritless.

The City’s claim that the Project is consistent with the Bicycle Plan’s inclusion of Glendale Boulevard as a future bicycle route is also meritless. The General Plan’s Circulation Policy 2.3.1 is to upgrade bridges and freeway ramps that impede safe and convenient bicycle passage. To comply with this policy, planners must consider bicycle
facilities “when designing new or retrofitting bridges.” (Exhibit A, Bicycle Plan, p. 89.)
The time to implement the Bicycle Plan is when designing the retrofitted bridges, not at
some unstated future time. Moreover, the Initial Study fails to explain how a shoulder on
Glendale Boulevard could facilitate future development of a bicycle route or why the
bicycle route is not being incorporated into the Project now.

Additionally, the General Plan’s Circulation Policy 1.1.6 is to “[i]ncrease the
number of bicycle lanes and/or improve the quality of the street right-of-way for
bicyclists.” (Exhibit A, Bicycle Plan, p. 74.) With the objective of improving the safety
and quality of the bicycling experience on Major Highway Class II roadways and
Secondary roadways, the General Plan calls for City departments to update the roadways
in the Backbone Network “to incorporate modified street standards that include the
addition of bicycle lanes and/or other engineering treatments.” (Ibid.) Glendale
Boulevard is a Class II highway and Hyperion Avenue is a secondary highway. (IS/EA, p.
2-6.)

C. The IS/EA Fails to Adequately Analyze the Project’s Circulation
Impacts.

There is substantial evidence supporting a fair argument that the Project’s
components, including wider lanes (IS/EA, p. S-2), banked turns (IS/EA, p. 2-40), and the
addition of a median barrier (IS/EA, p. S-2), may result in higher average vehicle speeds.
In turn, higher average vehicle speeds may result in a higher rate of collisions and
potential injury to pedestrians and bicyclists.

Since the first community meeting in 2002, members of the community have
expressed concern about the high rate of vehicle speeds on Hyperion Avenue and
Glendale Boulevard. (IS/EA, pp. 4-1 – 4-2.) Numerous members of the community have
further testified that while bicycling or walking across the Project site, they and their loved
ones have been severely injured. The IS/EA recognizes that there was opposition to the
lane widening due to concerns that this would result in higher vehicle speeds, which poses
a danger for pedestrians and bicyclists, as well as other drivers. (IS/EA, p. 4-2.) The
IS/EA also recognizes that there is excessive speeding on these streets. (IS/EA, pp. 1-7, 4-
7.)

The IS/EA fails to analyze current average vehicle speeds on the Project’s streets,
nor how these speeds would change with the Project. Moreover, while the IS/EA
provides collision rates for the Interstate 5 off-ramps (IS/EA, p. 1-8), no collision rates are
provided for Hyperion Avenue and Glendale Boulevard. The current collision rates
should be compared to collision rates for the Project with these Project components
included. The IS/EA fails to adequately analyze the impact of these Project features on
pedestrians and bicyclists.
Additionally, the Project, as currently proposed, fails to provide adequate access to pedestrians. The Project does not provide access for pedestrians on the east end of the bridge to the south side of Glendale Boulevard. Pedestrian safety impacts may be significant without sidewalks on both sides of the roadways and a crosswalk across the roadway on the east side of the Project.

D. The IS/EA Improperly Defers the Formulation of Mitigation Measures that Could Ensure Bicyclist, Pedestrian, and Motorist Safety.

The IS/EA claims, “The City’s Department of Transportation is considering measures that can be implemented to reduce excessive speeding along Hyperion Avenue on the viaduct complex.” (IS/EA, p. 4-7; see also IS/EA, p. 4-8 [showing “Address speeding problem on Hyperion Avenue” as being “Under consideration by LADOT.”]) Mitigation measures must be incorporated into the Project before approval. However, the deferral of mitigation measures is improper. One court explained:

[I]t is improper to defer the formulation of mitigation measures until after project approval; instead, the determination of whether a project will have significant environmental impacts, and the formulation of measures to mitigate those impacts, must occur before the project is approved.


Thus, the City must analyze these public safety impacts in its environmental review documents and formulate mitigation measures before project approval.

E. Proposed Alternatives Satisfy the Project’s Goals, Comply with the 2010 Bicycle Plan, and Eliminate Circulation Impacts.

Since the IS/EA fails to adequately analyze the Project’s impacts and there is a fair argument that the Project may have a significant effect on the environment, an EIR and EIS must be prepared. The EIR/EIS must then analyze Project alternatives.

The key components of the alternative supported by Angelenos for a Great Hyperion Bridge are a 3-lane automobile travel lane configuration on Hyperion Bridge with a two- to four-foot median buffer (narrowing to two-feet at the bridge’s narrowest point), a buffered dedicated bicycle lane in each direction on Hyperion and Glendale bridges, American Disabilities Act compliant sidewalks on the north and south sides of the bridges, and a signalized pedestrian crosswalk across Glendale Boulevard and Hyperion Avenue on the eastern portion of the bridges.
A key project feature of this alternative incorporates what is known as a “road diet,” which would reduce the automobile travel lanes from two lanes in each direction to two lanes in one direction and one lane in the other direction. This would provide additional space for dedicated bicycle lanes and ADA-compliant sidewalks.

The City has confirmed that a road diet is feasible as “one lane in each direction would be able to adequately accommodate this traffic flow” (IS/EA, p. 2-31), even at the construction speed limit of only 25 miles per hour (IS/EA, p. 2-32):

During the construction of the Hyperion Avenue improvements, traffic flow would be limited to one lane in each direction for at least 11 months. The affected segment of Hyperion Avenue would be approximately 1,800 feet long. Table 2.4-2 shows the critical existing hourly volumes occurring during the morning peak hour in the southbound direction (1,295 vehicles per hour) and evening peak hour in the northbound direction (1,325 vehicles per hour) (MGE, 2012). With these peak hour traffic volumes and the standard traffic requirements, one lane in each direction would be able to adequately accommodate this traffic flow.” (IS/EA, p. 2-31 – 2-32.) Since one lane in each direction would be able to adequately accommodate this traffic flow, the elimination of one automobile lane would not create traffic congestion.

F. The Project Is Inconsistent with State Policies Encouraging Modifying Transportation Routes to Increase Use by Pedestrians and Bicyclists.

As proposed, the Project is inconsistent with state policies that encourage restriping transportation routes to increase use by pedestrians and bicycles, even when such restriping may reduce the route’s motor vehicle capacity. AB 2245 (Smyth), enacted by the California Legislature in 2012, exempted environmental review for projects where a street is restriped to include a bike lane. (Public Resource Code § 21080.20.5.) Although public hearings, a traffic and safety assessment, and mitigation of traffic and safety impacts is still required, an agency is no longer required to prepare an environmental impact report if a bike lane would cause potentially significant traffic impacts. AB 417 (Frazier), signed into law just last month, exempts bicycle transportation plans prepared for urbanized areas from CEQA compliance with respect to impacts on traffic. Therefore, a bike lane could be included without an EIR, but if a bike lane is not included, the Project would require an EIR.
G. A Previous Los Angeles Superior Court Ruling Confirms that a MND that Fails to Adequately Study Impacts to Bicyclists is Deficient.

In 2001, our firm represented the Friends of the Los Angeles River in the case Friends of the Los Angeles River, et. al v. City of Los Angeles (Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BS067338) (hereinafter “FOLAR v. City of Los Angeles”). In that case, Petitioners argued that the adverse impact on biking on San Fernando Road and the Los Angeles River bike path must be studied, as biking is an important alternative form of transportation. A member of the Board of Directors of the Los Angeles County Bicycle Coalition (“LACBC”) had testified that the widening of the road at issue in that case would adversely impact the ability of bicyclists to use it as a bike route. Recognizing that “residents’ observations, based on personal knowledge, may constitute substantial evidence that a project will have a particular environmental effect” (Gentry v. City of Murrieta (1995) 36 Cal.App.4th 1359, 1380), the Court agreed with petitioners that there was a fair argument that the project may have a significant impact on biking. Thus, the Court granted the petition for a writ of mandate, requiring the City of Los Angeles to prepare an EIR before proceeding with the project. Subsequently, the project site was sold to the State and turned into Rio de Los Angeles State Park.

Like the Project in FOLAR v. City of Los Angeles, this Project also proposes to widen streets. Also, like the Project in FOLAR v. City of Los Angeles, numerous members of the community and organizations, including the LACBC, have expressed their concerns about bicycle impacts. And the MND in the present case suffers from many of the same deficiencies as the MND in FOLAR v. City of Los Angeles.

H. Angelenos for a Great Hyperion Bridge Joins Comments Made By Local Officials and Organizations.

Angelenos for a Great Hyperion agrees with and incorporates the written and oral comments submitted by Assemblyman Mike Gatto, Glendale Councilmember Laura Friedman, the Alliance of River Communities, and the Bicycle Advisory Committee of the City of Los Angeles.

State officials, including Assemblyman Mike Gatto, are concerned the Project is designed to encourage unsafe high speeds that would endanger bicyclists, pedestrians, and those who live in the communities of Atwater Village, Silver Lake, Los Feliz, and Glendale. For this reason, Assemblyman Gatto supports the inclusion of bicycle lanes and pedestrian facilities incorporated in the alternative design proposed by the Los Angeles County Bicycle Coalition. (Letter of Assemblyman Mike Gatto, October 8, 2013.)

Glendale Councilmember Laura Friedman is concerned with the safety, traffic, and quality of life aspects of the Project’s current design. She supports the inclusion of a
bicycle lane in the Hyperion Bridge to encourage bicyclists and pedestrians, reduce traffic, and to protect vital connections between Los Angeles and Glendale. (Letter from Glendale Councilmember Laura Friedman, October 11, 2013.)

The Alliance of River Communities, which includes fourteen neighborhood councils, passed a resolution in support of a project that fulfills the Mayor’s Great Streets Program, the 2010 City of Los Angeles Bicycle Plan, and Caltrans policies regarding adequate bicycle and pedestrian space. As proposed, the Project is inconsistent with these programs, plans, and policies. (Letter from Alliance of River Communities, October 25, 2013.)

The Bicycle Advisory Committee of the City of Los Angeles, which emphatically rejected the assertion that wide shoulders are equivalent to bicycle lanes, also argued that the IS/EA fails to adequately analyze the adverse impacts on bicyclists. (Letter from the Bicycle Advisory Committee of the City of Los Angeles, October 7, 2013.)

Conclusion

We hope the City and Caltrans will work cooperatively with Angelenos for a Great Hyperion Bridge, as well as other community groups, in order to incorporate the Project features described in the alternative proposed by Angelenos for a Great Hyperion Bridge. As discussed above, the proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration violates CEQA and NEPA, and it would be vulnerable to a lawsuit should the City and Caltrans decide to approve the MND as proposed. Therefore, we urge the City to carefully reconsider these inadequacies and consider the alternative proposed by Angelenos for a Great Hyperion Bridge.

Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21092.2, we hereby request notification, by mail or e-mail, of any notices regarding this Project. Thank you for your time and consideration in this matter.

Sincerely,

Josh Chatten-Brown
Attorney for Angelenos for a Great Hyperion Bridge
EXHIBIT A
Executive Summary

The 2010 Bicycle Plan (2010 Plan) represents a new commitment by Los Angeles to complete streets. It is part of a move away from the auto-centric approach of the past, and toward a sustainable transportation system—a system which supports motor vehicle use, but also enables the use of streets by other modes, such as bicycling, walking, and transit, and acknowledges the use of streets for other purposes, such as recreation, retail and public gatherings.

Bicycling has an overwhelming positive benefit for public health: a bicyclist gets healthier every mile that he or she rides, rarely injures others in a collision, and doesn’t pollute. Bicycling’s claims on public space are substantially less than those of other modes. Bicycle lanes, for example, take about as much space as a sidewalk, and substantially less than a lane of parking, and bike parking takes up negligible square footage.

The 2010 Plan designates an ambitious 1,684 mile bikeway system and introduces a comprehensive collection of programs and policies. Among the elements of the 2010 Plan are several innovations in bicycle planning for Los Angeles. Four of them deserve special mention: a Citywide Bikeway System comprised of three bikeway networks, Bicycle Friendly Streets, the bundling of programs and policies into ten categories, and a multi-pronged implementation strategy.

The 2010 Plan introduces three new bikeway Networks: the Backbone, the Neighborhood Network, and the Green Network. The character, choice of street segments, and processes of implementation for these three networks are intertwined, and build off the existing 334 miles that have been installed over the past thirty plus years. These networks give life and character to the 2010 Plan’s ambitious 1,684 bikeway system.

The 2010 Plan introduces the Bicycle Friendly Street (BFS). A Bicycle Friendly Street uses a holistic engineering approach to render a neighborhood street extremely inviting to bicyclists (and pedestrians). By introducing signage, pavement markings, bulb-outs or even traffic diverters, a BFS creates a pleasant and safe environment for relaxed riding, especially for bicyclists more sensitive to motor vehicle traffic. The creation of BFSs will restore
Lead Department: DOT, DPW
Objective: Bicycle Friendly Streets.
Schedule: 2011-2035

Policy 1.1.5
Upgrade Bicycle Routes
Program
A. Enhanced Bicycle Routes
Upgrade existing routes with shared lane markings and signage to increase motorist awareness of bicycle presence.
Lead Department: DOT
Objective: Improve safety and quality of bicycling experience on Bicycle Routes by increasing motorist awareness of the presence of bicyclists.
Schedule: 2011-2015

Policy 1.1.6
Increase the number of bicycle lanes and/or improve the quality of the street right-of-way for bicyclists.
Programs
A. Major Highway Class II Street Designation Review
In collaboration with bicyclists, community stakeholders, and City departments update the Major Highway Class II roadways, included in the Backbone Network, to include modified street standards that include the addition of bicycle lanes, bicycle-bus-only lanes and/or other engineering treatments.
Lead Department: DCP, DOT, DPW
Objective: Improve safety and quality of bicycling experience on Major Highway Class II roadways.
Schedule: 2010-2020

B. Secondary Road Mobility
In collaboration with bicyclists, community stakeholders, and City departments, update Secondary streets included in either the Backbone and/or Neighborhood Bikeway Network, to incorporate modified street standards that include the addition of bicycle lanes and/or other engineering treatments.
Lead Department: DCP, DOT, DPW
Objective: Improve safety and quality of bicycling experience on Secondary Streets.
Schedule: 2011-2035

C. Local and Collector Street Mobility
In collaboration with bicyclists, community stakeholders, and City departments update Local and Collector streets included in either the Backbone and/or Neighborhood Networks, to incorporate modified street standards that could include reduced street lane width, the addition of bicycle lanes, Bicycle Friendly Street features or wide curb lanes.
Lead Department: DCP, DOT, DPW
Objective: Improve safety and quality of bicycling experience on Local and Collector Streets.
Schedule: 2011-2035

D. Modified Cross-Sections
Using the Modified Cross-Sections included in the Technical Design Handbook and Street Classification Study, develop and adopt new street cross-sections that accommodate a range of bikeway facilities as Standard Cross-Sections in the City’s Standard Plans.
Lead Department: DCP, DOT, DPW
Objective: Adopt Standard Cross-Sections that incorporate bikeway facilities.
applicable sources (as available) that reflects the number and types of all collisions (auto, bicyclist, pedestrian) that are occurring throughout the City. Coordinate this effort with support and data from LAPD, LAFD, and LAUSD.

Lead Department: DCP

Objective: Direct funding dollars and improvements to locations with moderate to high SWITRS collisions particularly those along the Backbone Network and in school zones.

Schedule: 2011-2035

Policy 2.2.5
Establish and promote a hotline for reporting behavior or conditions that endanger bicyclists, and incidents and conflicts involving motorists and bicyclists.

Program
A. Bicycle Infrastructure and Incident Reporting Program
Develop and maintain a program to allow bicyclists and other concerned citizens to report infrastructure obstacles or failures or to report aggressive behavior by motorists or motorist harassment.

Lead Department: LAPD

Objective: Reduce bicyclist/motorist collisions.

Schedule: 2011-2015

Engineering and Maintenance

Objective 2.3.
Design and maintain all streets so that they incorporate Complete Street standards

Policy 2.3.1
Upgrade bridges, intersections, freeway ramps, tunnels, and grade separations that impede safe and convenient bicycle passage.

Programs
A. Signalization Program
Upgrade, repair, or adjust intersection signalization to accommodate bicyclists in accordance with CA MUTCD. Focus initial efforts on the Backbone and Neighborhood Networks.

Lead Department: DOT

Objective: Upgrade, repair, or adjust signals per year per Caltrans Guidelines.

Schedule: 2011-2015

B. Bridge Design Program
Consider bicycle facilities when designing new or retrofitting bridges. Any modifications to an existing bridge that has been designated, or determined to be eligible, as a Historic Resource should avoid adversely impacting character-defining features. Particular attention should be made to bridge underpasses that cross existing or future bicycle paths to ensure that the paths are integrated into the design and construction of the facility.

Lead Department: DOT, DPW

Objective: Increase bicycle access on grade-separated projects.

Schedule: 2011-2015
The Five-Year Implementation Strategy

The Five-Year Implementation strategy focuses on initiating at least 200 miles on the Backbone and Neighborhood Networks every five years. Today these two networks include 285 of the overall existing system of 334 miles. While the 285 miles of bikeways on streets is not insignificant, the lack of support for a bikeway implementation strategy has provided bicyclists not with an integrated and connected network of bicycle facilities but with piecemeal segments of disconnected paths, lanes, and routes throughout the City. Nevertheless, these 285 miles, while fragmented, do provide the City with a baseline on which to build the connected, integrated network. It is important to point out that of these 285 miles, 97 miles of existing routes are proposed to be upgraded to bicycle lanes.

Therefore, in order to complete the Backbone and Neighborhood Networks the City has committed to build a total of 1,356 miles. This total includes the 97 miles of routes that will be converted to lanes as well as the 531 miles of new bikeways that are left to build on the Backbone and the 729 miles of bikeways remaining on the Neighborhood Network.

Over the 33 years between 1977 and 2010 the City built an average of 10.1 miles of street facilities per year. At this current average it would take 135 years to complete the Backbone and Neighborhood Networks. With growing public, political, and institutional support the 2010 Plan proposes a more aggressive implementation strategy that would build (funding and staffing dependent) 200 Backbone or Neighborhood Network miles every five years. At this new invigorated pace the City would be able to complete the Backbone and Neighborhood Networks within 35 years.

The first 200 miles would add to the baseline of 285 miles and would be selected based upon the Bicycle Funding Priority Grading System established in Chapter 4. The selected 200 miles would close gaps within the current 285 miles, provide equitable geographic distribution, and put every Angeleno within approximately four miles of a facility on either the Backbone or Neighborhood Network. In subsequent five-year segments each set of 200 miles will be selected using the same weighted criteria. Each five-year round would put residents within closer and closer proximity to a bicycle facility so that ultimately, after 35 years and the completion of both networks, every Angeleno would be within approximately one mile of a bikeway.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street Name</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Miles</th>
<th>Network</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gaffey St</td>
<td>22nd St</td>
<td>36th St</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>Backbone</td>
<td>Bicycle-Friendly Street</td>
<td>Harbor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaffey St</td>
<td>Anaheim St</td>
<td>Channel St</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>Backbone</td>
<td>Lane: Existing</td>
<td>Harbor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaffey St</td>
<td>Summerland Av</td>
<td>Channel St</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>Backbone</td>
<td>Route: Existing</td>
<td>Harbor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glendale Bl</td>
<td>Riverside Dr</td>
<td>1st St</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>Backbone</td>
<td>Lane: Future</td>
<td>Central/South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glendale Bl</td>
<td>Glenfeliz Bl</td>
<td>Hyperion Av</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>Backbone</td>
<td>Route: Future</td>
<td>Central/South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glendale Bl</td>
<td>Hyperion Av</td>
<td>Glendale Bl</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>Backbone</td>
<td>Route: Future</td>
<td>Central/South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenoaks Bl</td>
<td>Foothill Bl</td>
<td>San Fernando City Limits</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>Backbone</td>
<td>Lane: Future</td>
<td>Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenoaks Bl</td>
<td>San Fernando City Limits</td>
<td>Van Nuys Bl</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>Backbone</td>
<td>Lane: Future</td>
<td>Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenoaks Bl</td>
<td>Van Nuys Bl</td>
<td>Cohasset St</td>
<td>6.14</td>
<td>Backbone</td>
<td>Lane: Existing</td>
<td>Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Av</td>
<td>Vista Del Mar</td>
<td>Loma Vista St</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>Backbone</td>
<td>Lane: Existing</td>
<td>Harbor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Griffith Park Bl</td>
<td>Los Feliz Bl</td>
<td>Lucile Av</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>Backbone</td>
<td>Lane: Existing</td>
<td>Central/South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Griffith Park Bl</td>
<td>Los Feliz Bl</td>
<td>Griffith Park Bl</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>Backbone</td>
<td>Lane: Future</td>
<td>Central/South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Griffith Park Bl</td>
<td>Lucile Av</td>
<td>Sunset Bl</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>Backbone</td>
<td>Lane: Future</td>
<td>Central/South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton Av</td>
<td>Gaffey St</td>
<td>Gaffey St</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>Backbone</td>
<td>Bicycle-Friendly Street</td>
<td>Harbor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harbor Bl</td>
<td>I-110 Fwy</td>
<td>N/B On-Ramp 22nd St</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>Backbone</td>
<td>Lane: Existing</td>
<td>Harbor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry Bridges Bl</td>
<td>Figueroa St</td>
<td>Alameda St</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>Backbone</td>
<td>Lane: Future</td>
<td>Harbor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highland Av</td>
<td>Cahuenga Bl</td>
<td>Pico Bl</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>Backbone</td>
<td>Lane: Future</td>
<td>Central/South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hollywood Bl</td>
<td>Fairfax Av</td>
<td>Hillhurst Av</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>Backbone</td>
<td>Lane: Future</td>
<td>Central/South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honolulu Av</td>
<td>La Tuna Canyon Rd</td>
<td>City Limits</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>Backbone</td>
<td>Lane: Future</td>
<td>Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hope St</td>
<td>Venice Bl</td>
<td>Venice Bl</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>Backbone</td>
<td>Lane: Future</td>
<td>Central/South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hubbard St</td>
<td>San Fernando Road</td>
<td>Laurel Canyon Road</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>Backbone</td>
<td>Lane: Future</td>
<td>Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Name</td>
<td>From</td>
<td>To</td>
<td>Miles</td>
<td>Network</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hubbard St</td>
<td>4th Street</td>
<td>Gavina</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>Backbone</td>
<td>Lane: Future</td>
<td>Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huntington Dr</td>
<td>Monterey Rd</td>
<td>450' e/o Westmont Dr</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>Backbone</td>
<td>Lane: Future</td>
<td>Central/South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huntington Dr S</td>
<td>Soto St</td>
<td>Thelma Av</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>Backbone</td>
<td>Bicycle-Friendly Street</td>
<td>Central/South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyperion Av</td>
<td>Greensward Rd</td>
<td>Fountain Av</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>Backbone</td>
<td>Lane: Future</td>
<td>Central/South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial Hwy</td>
<td>Vermont Av</td>
<td>Mona Bl</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>Backbone</td>
<td>Lane: Future</td>
<td>Harbor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial Hwy</td>
<td>Aviation Bl</td>
<td>I-405 underpass</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>Backbone</td>
<td>Lane: Future</td>
<td>West/Central</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial Hwy</td>
<td>Vista Del Mar</td>
<td>Dockweiler State Beach Path</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>Backbone</td>
<td>Lane: Future</td>
<td>West/Central</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial Hwy</td>
<td>Pershing Dr</td>
<td>2000' e/o Pershing Dr</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>Backbone</td>
<td>Lane: Future</td>
<td>West/Central</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial Hwy</td>
<td>Vista Del Mar</td>
<td>Pershing Dr</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>Backbone</td>
<td>Lane: Existing</td>
<td>West/Central</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial Hwy</td>
<td>2000' E/O Pershing Dr</td>
<td>Aviation Bl</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>Backbone</td>
<td>Lane: Existing</td>
<td>West/Central</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson Bl</td>
<td>La Cienega Bl</td>
<td>Central Av</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>Backbone</td>
<td>Lane: Future</td>
<td>Central/South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenny Av</td>
<td>Westchester Pkwy</td>
<td>96th St</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>Backbone</td>
<td>Lane: Future</td>
<td>West LA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John S Gibson Bl</td>
<td>Channel St</td>
<td>Figueroa St</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>Backbone</td>
<td>Lane: Existing</td>
<td>Harbor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Brea Av</td>
<td>Franklin Av</td>
<td>Fountain Av</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>Backbone</td>
<td>Lane: Future</td>
<td>Central/South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Brea Av</td>
<td>Romaine Street</td>
<td>Adams Bl</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>Backbone</td>
<td>Lane: Future</td>
<td>Central/South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Brea Av</td>
<td>Jefferson Bl</td>
<td>Exposition Bl</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>Backbone</td>
<td>Lane: Future</td>
<td>Central/South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Brea Av</td>
<td>Rodeo Road</td>
<td>Stocker</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>Backbone</td>
<td>Lane: Future</td>
<td>Central/South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Cienega Bl</td>
<td>Fairfax Av</td>
<td>Jefferson Bl</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>Backbone</td>
<td>Lane: Future</td>
<td>West/Central</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Tijera Bl</td>
<td>Sepulveda Bl</td>
<td>La Cienega Bl</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>Backbone</td>
<td>Lane: Future</td>
<td>Central/South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Tijera Bl</td>
<td>64th St</td>
<td>290' n/o 63rd St</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>Backbone</td>
<td>Lane: Future</td>
<td>Central/South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Tuna Canyon Rd</td>
<td>Sunland Bl</td>
<td>3500' e/o Elben Av</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>Backbone</td>
<td>Lane: Existing</td>
<td>Valley</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
November 7, 2013
Ms. Tami Podesta, Branch Chief
Division of Environmental Planning
California Dept of Transportation District 7
100 S Main St, Los Angeles, CA 90012

Re: Glendale Boulevard-Hyperion Ave Bridges Improvement Project

Dear Ms. Podesta:

I want to begin by saying that the town hall meeting on October 28th for the Hyperion bridge redesign was civil, engaging, well organized, and a remarkable show of a new civic engagement in this city. Thank you. As a result of your hard work to give everyone a seat at the table, we see that you have received a number of very well thought out designs. We ask you and the city family look at all of these designs and consider the best ideas from each. They all have excellent methods of improving this design. As a public service we have created our own proposal.

We believe the “City” design on the table is a freeway over the river. It includes little traffic calming measures and will result in 55MPH traffic feeding into residential Silver Lake and Atwater. **We ask that you lower the allowed or designed speed, remove the crash barriers and that you include generous and safe lanes for both pedestrians and cyclists.**

We believe that given the renaissance of the LA River and given that the city leadership is asking the federal government to help finance an improved river, this bridge design should encourage lingering at the crossing and certainly should allow easy and safe travel by foot and bike.

Our proposal attached shows bike and pedestrian lanes. **Our proposal additionally shows an expanded boardwalk park built on the old piers to actually make the bridge a destination as opposed to just a crossing.** This would be an expansion of your very smart proposal to install a non-car bridge on the old red car piers.

Finally given that your proposal states that the bridge can easily handle rush hour with one lane each way versus two and given that you will be eliminating all 5-North Silver Lake bound traffic (the cars will no longer have to u-turn and ride over the bridge), there seems to be a good argument to **go further than our proposal** and reduce this to a one car-lane bridge each way thereby giving plenty of room for very comfortable bike and pedestrian lanes.

Very sincerely,

Tomas O’Grady
Executive Director
www.enrichla.org
323 387 3866
THIS DRAWING AND THE DESIGNS, ARRANGEMENTS, DEPICTIONS, IDEAS AND OTHER INFORMATION CONTAINED HEREIN CONSTITUTE UNPUBLISHED WORK OF SODDER STUDIO AND SHALL REMAIN PROPERTY OF SODDER STUDIO IN PERPETUITY. THIS DRAWING IS PART OF THE CONTRACT DOCUMENTS FOR THE STATED PROJECT AND SHALL BE USED ONLY AS SUCH. NO PART THEREOF SHALL BE REPRODUCED, COPIED, DISCLOSED, DISTRIBUTED, SOLD, PUBLISHED OR OTHERWISE USED IN ANY WAY FOR ANY OTHER PURPOSE WITHOUT THE ADVANCE EXPRESSED WRITTEN CONSENT OF SODDER STUDIO. VISUAL CONTACT WITH THE ABOVE DRAWINGS, OR ANY PART THEREOF, SHALL CONSTITUTE CONCLUSIVE EVIDENCE OF ACCEPTANCE OF THESE RESTRICTIONS.

PLAN LEGEND

1. RED CAR RIVER PARK
2. SUNNYNOOK PARK
3. 5 FRWY
4. RED CAR PARK
5. LOS ANGELES RIVER
6. PLAN SYMBOLS
7. PEDESTRIAN PATH
8. BICYCLE PATH
9. NODES
10. TRAFFIC LIGHT
11. COMMUNITY/WAYFINDING SIGNS
12. BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN CONNECTION, COMMUNITY INFORMATION, AND PARKING Spaces.
13. NO-TRUCK HOURS BETWEEN 6:00 AM AND 7:00 PM, 7:00 AM AND 8:00 PM FROM 8:00 AM TO 7:00 PM, AND 22:00-5:00 AM ON SATURDAYS, AND FROM 1:00 AM ON SUNDAY.
14. BICYCLE CONNECTIONS BETWEEN 5 FRWY AND THE LOS ANGELES RIVER, AND BETWEEN THE LOS ANGELES RIVER AND RED CAR BRIDGE.
15. BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN CONNECTIONS BETWEEN 5 FRWY AND THE LOS ANGELES RIVER, AND BETWEEN THE LOS ANGELES RIVER AND RED CAR BRIDGE.
16. BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN CONNECTIONS BETWEEN 5 FRWY AND THE LOS ANGELES RIVER, AND BETWEEN THE LOS ANGELES RIVER AND RED CAR BRIDGE.
17. BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN CONNECTIONS BETWEEN 5 FRWY AND THE LOS ANGELES RIVER, AND BETWEEN THE LOS ANGELES RIVER AND RED CAR BRIDGE.
18. BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN CONNECTIONS BETWEEN 5 FRWY AND THE LOS ANGELES RIVER, AND BETWEEN THE LOS ANGELES RIVER AND RED CAR BRIDGE.
19. BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN CONNECTIONS BETWEEN 5 FRWY AND THE LOS ANGELES RIVER, AND BETWEEN THE LOS ANGELES RIVER AND RED CAR BRIDGE.

GLENDALE COMMUNITY CROSSING

PLANNED IMPROVEMENTS TO BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN ROUTES BETWEEN 5 FRWY AND THE LOS ANGELES RIVER, AND BETWEEN THE LOS ANGELES RIVER AND RED CAR BRIDGE.

PEDESTRIAN WALKWAY TO RED CAR PARK AND THE BOARDWALK WITH LA RIVER AND RED CAR HISTORICAL SIGNS.

NEW BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN CONNECTION FROM GLENDALE BLVD. TO THE LA RIVER BICYCLE PATH AND RED CAR PARK. NEW CROSSWALKS, BIKE LANE, COMMUNITY SIGN, AND TRAFFIC SIGNAL.

GLENDALE BLVD. MEDIAN IMPROVEMENTS. NEW BICYCLE LANE ALONG NORTH SIDE OF THE MAIN STREET MEDIAN WILL USE THE EXISTING WALL AS A PROTECTIVE BARREN. REPLACE THE SOUTH MEDIAN ISLAND CONCRETE WITH PERMEABLE PAVING, LANDSCAPING, AND COMMUNITY WELCOME/ENTRANCE SIGN.

BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN ROUTE CONNECTIONS, BUS STOPS AND EXISTING CROSSWALKS. ADD NEW CROSSWALKS ON WEST SIDE OF GLENFELIZ BLVD., LANDSCAPE MEDIANS, COMMUNITY INFORMATION AND WAYFINDING SIGNS.
Hi Tami -

I am writing with urgency to express my concern regarding the city of los angeles's proposed retrofit of the glendale hyperion complex of bridges. There are serious negative environmental impacts with this proposal.

We need sidewalks on both sides of the main Glendale Hyperion blvd connector between Atwater Village and Silverlak; no median & sidewalk crash barriers; and no banked roadbeds.

At RAC Design Build we prepared (2) 24x36" boards (attached as jpps & pdf, also available online here: [http://racdb.com/HYPERION_Bridge_alternative.pdf](http://racdb.com/HYPERION_Bridge_alternative.pdf)) of an alternate design that we feel is ideal for our communities: one 25mph lane for cars in either direction, sidewalks on both sides and a 12' wide landscape buffered cycletrack that can accommodate emergency vehicles.

Per the Environmental document: two lanes is acceptable solution based on current peak hour traffic volume. They found current peak volume to be 1,325 vehicles/hr & that during construction two lanes @ 25mph could accommodate as many as 1,500 vehicles/hr, screencapture attached.

The crash barriers are not consistent with the historic landmark status of the bridge. Rebuild the balustrades and make them strong enough to withstand impacts, no concrete k rails should be permitted as they comprimise the original design.

Thank you for your attention. Please contact me with any questions.

Daveed Kapoor ALA
RAC DESIGN BUILD
3048 North Coolidge Avenue
Los Angeles, CA 90039
C: 323.322.5310
F: 888.305.3711
www.racdb.com
www.studiocorez.com
www.vimeo.com/racdb
HYPERION BRIDGE ALTERNATIVE
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November 6, 2013

Ms. Tami Podesta, Branch Chief
Division of Environmental Planning
California Dept of Transportation District 7
100 S Main St
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Subject: Glendale Boulevard-Hyperion Ave Bridges Improvement Project

Dear Ms. Podesta:

The Silver Lake Neighborhood Council supports the Los Angeles County Bicycle Coalition letter of October 3 as it pertains to the modernization of the bridge complex. Many of our stakeholders are very concerned that the redesign is to accommodate faster traffic with design speeds up to 55 MPH.

The Silver Lake-Echo Park-Elysian Valley Community Plan calls on the City to “preserve pedestrian-orientated areas to provide alternatives to automobile-orientated commercial activity.” Including along “Hyperion Avenue from Rowena Ave to Griffith Park Blvd.” (Policy 2.2.1). This project should enhance and extend this pedestrian orientation to connect with the similarly pedestrian-orientated Glendale Blvd in Atwater Village. We also do not support the need for a barrier between the two traffic lanes which could cause response times to increase for emergency vehicles and we feel that the project needs to comply with the Complete Streets aspect of road redesign and safety for all modes of transportation.

The Silver Lake NC Transportation and Public Works Committee would be glad to host a local informational meeting on top of the one that was held on September 25 that would allow more community members to express their concerns on this bridge project. This project will have a significant impact on our community and we feel that the agencies in charge should reach out to a larger audience. There is ample time prior to the construction to allow more input from the community as the September 25 meeting was the only general meeting where the public had any opportunity to provide input. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Rusty Millar and Barbara Ringuette
Co-Chairs Silver Lake Transportation and Public Works Committee
APPENDIX F-5: E-mail Comments
EMAIL COMMENTS DATABASE

1) Reduce vehicle speed on Hyperion Avenue
2) Provide bike lanes on Hyperion Avenue (perhaps protected by barrier)
3) Add full-width crosswalk on Atwater Side of Glendale and Hyperion
4) Eliminate median and railing barriers, and/or banked turns
5) Non-specific approval
6) Non-specific disagreement
7) This is not a pedestrian-friendly design
8) Do not increase or improve access to cyclists on Hyperion
9) Propose a multi-modal design/be consistent with Bike Plan & Caltrans Safety Policy
10) Enhance safety for everyone
11) There should be narrower car/traffic lanes and reduce traffic lanes
12) There should be well-marked crosswalks and wayfinding signs
13) Preserve the historic bridge design
14) There should be wider sidewalks
15) Address traffic congestion
16) Consider proposed alternative designs
17) Provide accessibility to LA River
18) Provide a public hearing
19) Review related projects, specifically the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers document, Los Angeles River Ecosystem Restoration Integrated Feasibility Study that could potentially impact the detention/infiltration basin in Sunnynook River Park
20) Emergency vehicles possibly will not be able to get through due to crash barrier
21) We would like to participate in advisory board
22) Security Measures for Pedestrian Bridge
23) On demand traffic light at i-5 exit
24) What are the number of lanes on pedestrian bridge/access?
25) Will there be a link between pedestrian paths on both sides of the bridge?
26) Keep the median barriers in the plan.
27) Reduce the bridge to one lane in each direction.
28) Provide benches on the sidewalks on the bridge.
29) Design the center of the bridge for pedestrians and bikes.
30) Create a public space on the bridge for pedestrians.
31) Provide noise mitigation during construction.
32) Will project provide proper bike/pedestrian detours, signage, and safe alternative routing if existing bike facility is impacted by construction?
33) Must maintain Metro facilities and services during project
34) Will bus shelters, benches and other amenities be installed?
35) Be consistent with Caltrans Complete Streets Policy (DO-64-R1) and FHWA Routine Accommodations Policy (23 C.F.R. § 652.5)-elderly and handicapped
36) Provide a signalized crosswalk with refuge areas at both sides of street at east end of bridge complex
37) Caltrans and the City of Los Angeles Cannot Certify the IS/EA if a Fair Argument Can Be Made That the Project Will Create Significant Impacts for Bicyclists
38) A wide shoulder/shoulder is not a bike lane
39) Review flood maps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Initial</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Email Address</th>
<th>Project/Location</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9/25/2013</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Duce</td>
<td>Dave</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dave_duce@hotmail.com">dave_duce@hotmail.com</a></td>
<td>Hyperion Ave</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>9/26/2013</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Blumberg</td>
<td>Bryan</td>
<td><a href="mailto:bjtwuk@yahoo.com">bjtwuk@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>Hyperion Ave</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>9/26/2013</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Caswell</td>
<td>Marc</td>
<td><a href="mailto:marcacaswell@gmail.com">marcacaswell@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>Hyperion Ave</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>9/26/2013</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Pascal</td>
<td>Marino</td>
<td><a href="mailto:pascal@locationscout.com">pascal@locationscout.com</a></td>
<td>Hyperion Ave</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>9/26/2013</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Matt</td>
<td>Ruscigno</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mattruscigno@gmail.com">mattruscigno@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>Hyperion Ave</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>9/26/2013</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Sheigh</td>
<td>Sheigh</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sheigh@gmail.com">sheigh@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>Hyperion Ave</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>9/26/2013</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Katie</td>
<td>Bennett</td>
<td><a href="mailto:katie.bennett@gmail.com">katie.bennett@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>Hyperion Ave</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>9/26/2013</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>Vallianatos</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mvalli@oxy.edu">mvalli@oxy.edu</a></td>
<td>Hyperion Ave</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>9/26/2013</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Camille</td>
<td>Dieterle</td>
<td><a href="mailto:camilledieterle@gmail.com">camilledieterle@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>Hyperion Ave</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>9/26/2013</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Roadblock</td>
<td>Don</td>
<td><a href="mailto:roadblock@midnightridazz.com">roadblock@midnightridazz.com</a></td>
<td>Hyperion Ave</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>9/27/2013</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>Pillage</td>
<td><a href="mailto:crappola@hotmail.com">crappola@hotmail.com</a></td>
<td>Hyperion Ave</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>9/27/2013</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Noah</td>
<td>Mercer</td>
<td><a href="mailto:noah_ten@yahoo.com">noah_ten@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>Hyperion Ave</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>9/27/2013</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Will</td>
<td>Bassett</td>
<td><a href="mailto:bookbike13@gmail.com">bookbike13@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>Hyperion Ave</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>9/27/2013</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Jayme</td>
<td>Filippini</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jaymefilippini@sbcglobal.net">jaymefilippini@sbcglobal.net</a></td>
<td>Hyperion Ave</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>9/27/2013</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Kayon</td>
<td><a href="mailto:johnkayon@gmail.com">johnkayon@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>Hyperion Ave</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>9/27/2013</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Risemberg</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rickrise@earthlink.net">rickrise@earthlink.net</a></td>
<td>Hyperion Ave</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>9/27/2013</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Byron</td>
<td>Head</td>
<td><a href="mailto:byronhead@airmail.net">byronhead@airmail.net</a></td>
<td>Hyperion Ave</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>9/27/2013</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Eyal</td>
<td>Amiran</td>
<td><a href="mailto:eyalamiran@gmail.com">eyalamiran@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>Hyperion Ave</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Initials</td>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>Email Address</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130930</td>
<td>0831</td>
<td>Blanchard</td>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>90041</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mlblanchard@gmail.com">mlblanchard@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130930</td>
<td>0831</td>
<td>Tompkins</td>
<td>Erial</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td><a href="mailto:etu.edu@gmail.com">etu.edu@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130930</td>
<td>0833</td>
<td>Valencia</td>
<td>Rita</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td><a href="mailto:valencia.rita@gmail.com">valencia.rita@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130930</td>
<td>0833</td>
<td>Taylor</td>
<td>Josef</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td><a href="mailto:josef.taylor@gmail.com">josef.taylor@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130930</td>
<td>0834</td>
<td>Williams</td>
<td>Rik</td>
<td>90042</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rjw297@gmail.com">rjw297@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130930</td>
<td>0835</td>
<td>Huffman</td>
<td>Nial</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td><a href="mailto:nhuffman28@gmail.com">nhuffman28@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130930</td>
<td>0836</td>
<td>Keifer</td>
<td>Hans</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td><a href="mailto:otbhans@gmail.com">otbhans@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130930</td>
<td>0836</td>
<td>McGill</td>
<td>Ron</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td><a href="mailto:underconsume@gmail.com">underconsume@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130930</td>
<td>0836</td>
<td>Klipp</td>
<td>Luke</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td><a href="mailto:lukehklipp@gmail.com">lukehklipp@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130930</td>
<td>0836</td>
<td>Cardenas</td>
<td>Natalie</td>
<td>90026</td>
<td><a href="mailto:msohno213@gmail.com">msohno213@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130930</td>
<td>0836</td>
<td>Stambler</td>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>90027</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Stambler@aol.com">Stambler@aol.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130930</td>
<td>0837</td>
<td>Thompson</td>
<td>Kalee</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kalee.thompson@gmail.com">kalee.thompson@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130930</td>
<td>0837</td>
<td>Conly</td>
<td>Darren</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td><a href="mailto:djconly@gmail.com">djconly@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130930</td>
<td>0837</td>
<td>Estrada</td>
<td>Diana</td>
<td>90027</td>
<td><a href="mailto:d.sofly@gmail.com">d.sofly@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130930</td>
<td>0837</td>
<td>Clark</td>
<td>Will</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td><a href="mailto:clarkws@gmail.com">clarkws@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130930</td>
<td>0837</td>
<td>Cork</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>90039</td>
<td><a href="mailto:johncork@mac.com">johncork@mac.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130930</td>
<td>0839</td>
<td>Matsu</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td><a href="mailto:davidmatsu@earthlink.net">davidmatsu@earthlink.net</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130930</td>
<td>0839</td>
<td>Simmons</td>
<td>Ray</td>
<td>90036</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rayinla@aol.com">rayinla@aol.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130930</td>
<td>0839</td>
<td>Morishita</td>
<td>Emily</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td><a href="mailto:more.emily@gmail.com">more.emily@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130930</td>
<td>0839</td>
<td>Handel</td>
<td>Josh</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td><a href="mailto:swiftarcher@gmail.com">swiftarcher@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130930</td>
<td>0840</td>
<td>Kerr</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td><a href="mailto:johnkerr87@gmail.com">johnkerr87@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130930</td>
<td>0841</td>
<td>Retchless</td>
<td>Brian</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td><a href="mailto:brian.retchless@gmail.com">brian.retchless@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130930</td>
<td>0841</td>
<td>Cruise</td>
<td>Kristen</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kcruise@gmail.com">kcruise@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130930</td>
<td>0841</td>
<td>Carballo</td>
<td>Nathan</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td><a href="mailto:nathan.carballo@gmail.com">nathan.carballo@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130930</td>
<td>0841</td>
<td>Martinez</td>
<td>Severin</td>
<td>90041</td>
<td><a href="mailto:martinez28@berkeley.edu">martinez28@berkeley.edu</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130930</td>
<td>0851</td>
<td>Cannon</td>
<td>Jeff</td>
<td>90026</td>
<td><a href="mailto:cannon.jeffrey@gmail.com">cannon.jeffrey@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131001</td>
<td>1501</td>
<td>Beck</td>
<td>Debra</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td><a href="mailto:prubx@comcast.net">prubx@comcast.net</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131001</td>
<td>1501</td>
<td>Hopps</td>
<td>Kevin</td>
<td>91604</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kevinhopps@me.com">kevinhopps@me.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131001</td>
<td>1501</td>
<td>Gordo</td>
<td>Roscoe</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td><a href="mailto:roscoe.gordo@gmail.com">roscoe.gordo@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131001</td>
<td>1501</td>
<td>Bogart</td>
<td>Colin</td>
<td>90027</td>
<td><a href="mailto:colintb@earthlink.net">colintb@earthlink.net</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131001</td>
<td>1501</td>
<td>Hall</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>91321</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jwhall@dslextreme.com">jwhall@dslextreme.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131001</td>
<td>1502</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Greg</td>
<td>90039</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Gregory.Thomas@nbcuni.com">Gregory.Thomas@nbcuni.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131001</td>
<td>1502</td>
<td>Stegall</td>
<td>Chris</td>
<td>91602</td>
<td><a href="mailto:cstegallucla@gmail.com">cstegallucla@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131001</td>
<td>1502</td>
<td>Potter</td>
<td>Eric</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td><a href="mailto:echoparkguitar@gmail.com">echoparkguitar@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131001</td>
<td>1503</td>
<td>Martinez</td>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td><a href="mailto:danielmartinez323@gmail.com">danielmartinez323@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131001</td>
<td>1504</td>
<td>Kanawi</td>
<td>Lance</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td><a href="mailto:lanceka@gmail.com">lanceka@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131001</td>
<td>1504</td>
<td>Beck</td>
<td>Bronwyn</td>
<td>90027</td>
<td><a href="mailto:bronwyn@jokeisup.com">bronwyn@jokeisup.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131001</td>
<td>1504</td>
<td>Deyoe</td>
<td>Sean</td>
<td>90020</td>
<td><a href="mailto:seandeyoe@gmail.com">seandeyoe@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131001</td>
<td>1504</td>
<td>Bayes</td>
<td>Joe</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jbayes@gmail.com">jbayes@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131001</td>
<td>1505</td>
<td>Ramirez</td>
<td>Mario</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td><a href="mailto:unesceptico@gmail.com">unesceptico@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131001</td>
<td>1505</td>
<td>Gratzer</td>
<td>Ryan</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td><a href="mailto:gratzer@gmail.com">gratzer@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131001</td>
<td>1506</td>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td>Dion</td>
<td>90065</td>
<td><a href="mailto:johnson.dion.b@gmail.com">johnson.dion.b@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131001</td>
<td>1506</td>
<td>Roullier</td>
<td>Stephen</td>
<td>90026</td>
<td><a href="mailto:stephen.roullier@sbcglobal.net">stephen.roullier@sbcglobal.net</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131001</td>
<td>1509</td>
<td>Mazmanyan</td>
<td>Esther</td>
<td>90026</td>
<td><a href="mailto:esther90026@gmail.com">esther90026@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131001</td>
<td>1515</td>
<td>Redwine</td>
<td>Chris</td>
<td>91402</td>
<td><a href="mailto:chrismredwine@gmail.com">chrismredwine@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131001</td>
<td>1515</td>
<td>Cuevas</td>
<td>Ben</td>
<td>90026</td>
<td><a href="mailto:bencuevas@gmail.com">bencuevas@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131001</td>
<td>1515</td>
<td>Cassellius</td>
<td>Kari</td>
<td>90046</td>
<td><a href="mailto:smellslikechanel@gmail.com">smellslikechanel@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131001</td>
<td>1518</td>
<td>Jenn</td>
<td>Jason</td>
<td>90029</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jasonrebegin@gmail.com">jasonrebegin@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131001</td>
<td>1518</td>
<td>Schindler</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td><a href="mailto:brotherwm@att.net">brotherwm@att.net</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131002</td>
<td>0724</td>
<td>Oder</td>
<td>Danila</td>
<td>90033</td>
<td><a href="mailto:doder@usc.edu">doder@usc.edu</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131002</td>
<td>0724</td>
<td>Millar</td>
<td>Rusty</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td><a href="mailto:arunner1@sbcglobal.net">arunner1@sbcglobal.net</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131002</td>
<td>0724</td>
<td>Epstein</td>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>90048</td>
<td><a href="mailto:scottevanepstein@gmail.com">scottevanepstein@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>City Code</td>
<td>ZIP Code</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>Fax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/2/2013</td>
<td></td>
<td>Winterstein Thiago</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ticoinla@gmail.com">ticoinla@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/2/2013</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fleming Leni</td>
<td><a href="mailto:lenifleming@gmail.com">lenifleming@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/2/2013</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nero Ben</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ben.nero@gmail.com">ben.nero@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/2/2013</td>
<td></td>
<td>Schnitger Sarah</td>
<td><a href="mailto:s.schnitger@gmail.com">s.schnitger@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/3/2013</td>
<td></td>
<td>Samarjian John</td>
<td><a href="mailto:samarjohn@aol.com">samarjohn@aol.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/3/2013</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chalupowicz Leonardo</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sustainsl@gmail.com">sustainsl@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/3/2013</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sitz Teresa</td>
<td><a href="mailto:teresa_stewart_sitz@yahoo.com">teresa_stewart_sitz@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/24/2013</td>
<td></td>
<td>Johnson Ryan</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rjohnson1848@gmail.com">rjohnson1848@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/24/2013</td>
<td></td>
<td>Reutimann Wesley</td>
<td><a href="mailto:wesleyreutimann@gmail.com">wesleyreutimann@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/24/2013</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fanslow K</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kfanslow@msn.com">kfanslow@msn.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/24/2013</td>
<td></td>
<td>deFerrante Robert</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rdeferrante@gmail.com">rdeferrante@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/25/2013</td>
<td></td>
<td>Edewards Jonathan</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jedewards@gmail.com">jedewards@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/25/2013</td>
<td></td>
<td>Waldner Lisa</td>
<td><a href="mailto:normandy17612@msn.com">normandy17612@msn.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/25/2013</td>
<td></td>
<td>Husseini Salah</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Salah.Husseini@disney.com">Salah.Husseini@disney.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/25/2013</td>
<td></td>
<td>Moffat Alexander</td>
<td><a href="mailto:alexander.moffat@lacity.org">alexander.moffat@lacity.org</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/4/2013</td>
<td></td>
<td>Feuille Richard</td>
<td><a href="mailto:docfuel@aol.com">docfuel@aol.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/4/2013</td>
<td></td>
<td>McMahon Tom</td>
<td><a href="mailto:tmcmahon@origprod.com">tmcmahon@origprod.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/4/2013</td>
<td></td>
<td>Allen Warren</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Warren.Allen@stjohns.org">Warren.Allen@stjohns.org</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/4/2013</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mitchell Katelin</td>
<td><a href="mailto:katelincherie@gmail.com">katelincherie@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/4/2013</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gulyan Vahe</td>
<td><a href="mailto:vahe.gulyan@gmail.com">vahe.gulyan@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/4/2013</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fay Alex</td>
<td><a href="mailto:alexcfay@gmail.com">alexcfay@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/4/2013</td>
<td></td>
<td>Grangereau Ben</td>
<td><a href="mailto:bengranger@gmail.com">bengranger@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/4/2013</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lovejoy Christopher</td>
<td><a href="mailto:lovejoy.chris@gmail.com">lovejoy.chris@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/3/2013</td>
<td></td>
<td>Strong Trenton</td>
<td><a href="mailto:trenton.strong@gmail.com">trenton.strong@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/3/2013</td>
<td></td>
<td>Valencia Juan</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jfvalencia@gmail.com">jfvalencia@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/3/2013</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hyun Benjamin</td>
<td><a href="mailto:benjaminmhyun@gmail.com">benjaminmhyun@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/3/2013</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bridge Neil</td>
<td><a href="mailto:oldhadley@gmail.com">oldhadley@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/3/2013</td>
<td></td>
<td>Horne Ezra</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ezrahorne@gmail.com">ezrahorne@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/3/2013</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hallstead Jeff</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Jeff.Hallstead@kantarmedia.com">Jeff.Hallstead@kantarmedia.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/3/2013</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hadley Jason</td>
<td><a href="mailto:oldhadley@gmail.com">oldhadley@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/3/2013</td>
<td></td>
<td>Brown Jason</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jasontbrown99@gmail.com">jasontbrown99@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/3/2013</td>
<td></td>
<td>Woodward Kyle</td>
<td><a href="mailto:klelandw@gmail.com">klelandw@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/5/2013</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gurantz Tomer</td>
<td><a href="mailto:tgurantz@yahoo.com">tgurantz@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/5/2013</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pluymers Keith</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kdpluymers@gmail.com">kdpluymers@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/5/2013</td>
<td></td>
<td>Certeza Jances</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jances.c@gmail.com">jances.c@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/6/2013</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lozada Joel</td>
<td><a href="mailto:wisperjoel@gmail.com">wisperjoel@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/7/2013</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wexman Todd</td>
<td><a href="mailto:twexman@gmail.com">twexman@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/7/2013</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chatfield Amy</td>
<td><a href="mailto:achatfie@gmail.com">achatfie@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/7/2013</td>
<td></td>
<td>Belton Mary</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mbelton@gmail.com">mbelton@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/7/2013</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nichols Mike</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mrmikenicholls@gmail.com">mrmikenicholls@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/7/2013</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hindman Miles</td>
<td><a href="mailto:wanuki@yahoo.com">wanuki@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/7/2013</td>
<td></td>
<td>Moore Alex</td>
<td><a href="mailto:alex.charlotte@gmail.com">alex.charlotte@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/7/2013</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nordberg John</td>
<td><a href="mailto:look@t.hin.gs">look@t.hin.gs</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/8/2013</td>
<td></td>
<td>Martin Kelly</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kellym43@gmail.com">kellym43@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/8/2013</td>
<td></td>
<td>Roberson Matt</td>
<td><a href="mailto:maroberson@live.com">maroberson@live.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/8/2013</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dolan Siobhan</td>
<td><a href="mailto:siobhan.dolan@gmail.com">siobhan.dolan@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/8/2013</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bollmann Erich</td>
<td><a href="mailto:erich.bollmann@gmail.com">erich.bollmann@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/8/2013</td>
<td></td>
<td>Thompson Kelly</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kthompson1346@gmail.com">kthompson1346@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/8/2013</td>
<td></td>
<td>Camastra Emily</td>
<td><a href="mailto:emilycamastra@gmail.com">emilycamastra@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/8/2013</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lawrence Aaron</td>
<td><a href="mailto:aaron.lawrence@gmail.com">aaron.lawrence@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/8/2013</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cohen Danny</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dco1@dco1.com">dco1@dco1.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/8/2013</td>
<td></td>
<td>Miller Blair</td>
<td><a href="mailto:blairmiller1@yahoo.com">blairmiller1@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/9/2013</td>
<td></td>
<td>Madono Haruna</td>
<td><a href="mailto:hmadono@gmail.com">hmadono@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/9/2013</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mooney Matthew</td>
<td><a href="mailto:matthew.mooney.53@my.csun.edu">matthew.mooney.53@my.csun.edu</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/9/2013</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wade Megan</td>
<td><a href="mailto:megan@skylightbooks.com">megan@skylightbooks.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/9/2013</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sanchez Lawrence</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Lawrence.Sanchez@cdph.ca.gov">Lawrence.Sanchez@cdph.ca.gov</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-10-17</td>
<td>08:21</td>
<td>Agner Herb</td>
<td><a href="mailto:herbagner@gmail.com">herbagner@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-10-17</td>
<td>09:19</td>
<td>Lowber Susannah</td>
<td><a href="mailto:susannahlowber@gmail.com">susannahlowber@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>90026</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-10-17</td>
<td>09:19</td>
<td>Anne Rajni</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rajnianne@yahoo.com">rajnianne@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-10-17</td>
<td>09:20</td>
<td>Joyce Rebecca</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rebeccaejoyce@gmail.com">rebeccaejoyce@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>90027</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-10-17</td>
<td>09:20</td>
<td>Nunez Gabriela</td>
<td><a href="mailto:nunez.gabriela@gmail.com">nunez.gabriela@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>91207</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-10-17</td>
<td>09:20</td>
<td>Guzman Ben</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ben.guzman23@gmail.com">ben.guzman23@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-10-17</td>
<td>09:25</td>
<td>Todd Evy &amp; Jim</td>
<td>and Jim <a href="mailto:EsterNLenny@aol.com">EsterNLenny@aol.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-10-17</td>
<td>10:29</td>
<td>Sosnick Aaron</td>
<td><a href="mailto:longlegged.guy@gmail.com">longlegged.guy@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-10-17</td>
<td>10:49</td>
<td>Culhane Michael</td>
<td><a href="mailto:michael_culhane@mac.com">michael_culhane@mac.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-10-17</td>
<td>10:55</td>
<td>Clare Bill</td>
<td><a href="mailto:bill_clare@hotmail.com">bill_clare@hotmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-10-17</td>
<td>10:55</td>
<td>Diaz Matt</td>
<td><a href="mailto:likable.enough@gmail.com">likable.enough@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-10-17</td>
<td>10:55</td>
<td>Offutt Olivia</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ooffutt@gmail.com">ooffutt@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>91768</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-10-17</td>
<td>10:56</td>
<td>Rogow Lawrence</td>
<td><a href="mailto:lrogow@loop.com">lrogow@loop.com</a></td>
<td>90036</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-10-17</td>
<td>10:57</td>
<td>Miliotis Andy</td>
<td><a href="mailto:SkiDaily@aol.com">SkiDaily@aol.com</a></td>
<td>90036</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-10-17</td>
<td>10:58</td>
<td>Bennett Rachel</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rachelacbennett@gmail.com">rachelacbennett@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>90026</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-10-17</td>
<td>11:06</td>
<td>Brocious Melody</td>
<td><a href="mailto:melodybrocious@gmail.com">melodybrocious@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>90012</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-10-17</td>
<td>11:06</td>
<td>Robbins Tricia</td>
<td><a href="mailto:tricia.d.robbins@gmail.com">tricia.d.robbins@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>90027</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-10-17</td>
<td>11:07</td>
<td>Easwaran Kenny</td>
<td><a href="mailto:easwaran@gmail.com">easwaran@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>90029</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-10-17</td>
<td>11:09</td>
<td>Bergstresser Judy</td>
<td><a href="mailto:bergstressers@sbcglobal.net">bergstressers@sbcglobal.net</a></td>
<td>91030</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-10-17</td>
<td>11:09</td>
<td>Todd James</td>
<td><a href="mailto:james@uxd.com">james@uxd.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-10-17</td>
<td>11:10</td>
<td>Bender Marianne</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mariannebender12@gmail.com">mariannebender12@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>90039</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-10-17</td>
<td>11:10</td>
<td>Todd Evy</td>
<td><a href="mailto:evy747@yahoo.com">evy747@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-10-17</td>
<td>11:30</td>
<td>High Wesley</td>
<td><a href="mailto:weshigh@gmail.com">weshigh@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>90026</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-10-17</td>
<td>11:32</td>
<td>Amon Allison</td>
<td><a href="mailto:aamon@chelsea.com">aamon@chelsea.com</a></td>
<td>90039</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-10-17</td>
<td>11:32</td>
<td>Rutherford Alice</td>
<td><a href="mailto:alice.rutherford@gmail.com">alice.rutherford@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>90027</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-10-17</td>
<td>11:33</td>
<td>Box Stephen</td>
<td><a href="mailto:stephenmarshallbox@gmail.com">stephenmarshallbox@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>90012</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-10-17</td>
<td>11:33</td>
<td>Nelson Caleb</td>
<td><a href="mailto:anago55@sbcglobal.net">anago55@sbcglobal.net</a></td>
<td>90039</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-10-17</td>
<td>11:34</td>
<td>Caplowe Casey</td>
<td><a href="mailto:casey@goodinc.com">casey@goodinc.com</a></td>
<td>90026</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-10-17</td>
<td>11:34</td>
<td>Greenhut Kimberly</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kimproduces@gmail.com">kimproduces@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>90027</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-10-17</td>
<td>12:43</td>
<td>Abler Mary</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mary.abler@gmail.com">mary.abler@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>90026</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-10-17</td>
<td>12:44</td>
<td>Cleveland Bradley</td>
<td><a href="mailto:bfcleveland@gmail.com">bfcleveland@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>90068</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-10-17</td>
<td>12:45</td>
<td>Andrews Joe</td>
<td><a href="mailto:andrews@earthlink.net">andrews@earthlink.net</a></td>
<td>90027</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-10-17</td>
<td>12:45</td>
<td>Hogg Joe</td>
<td><a href="mailto:joseph.hogg@gmail.com">joseph.hogg@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>90039</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-10-17</td>
<td>12:46</td>
<td>Campbell William</td>
<td><a href="mailto:wildbell@gmail.com">wildbell@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>90026</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-10-17</td>
<td>13:04</td>
<td>Gutierrez Gilbert</td>
<td><a href="mailto:gilbergg@usc.edu">gilbergg@usc.edu</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-10-17</td>
<td>13:05</td>
<td>Healy Susan</td>
<td><a href="mailto:HEALYDESIGN@aol.com">HEALYDESIGN@aol.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-10-17</td>
<td>13:07</td>
<td>Kuehn Aaron</td>
<td><a href="mailto:aaron@aarline.info">aaron@aarline.info</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-10-17</td>
<td>13:07</td>
<td>Chambliss Marty</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ragweedpress@yahoo.com">ragweedpress@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>90039</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-10-17</td>
<td>13:08</td>
<td>de Mesa Ray</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ray@raydemesa.com">ray@raydemesa.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-10-17</td>
<td>13:09</td>
<td>Norton Kitty</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kittynorton01@gmail.com">kittynorton01@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>90027</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-10-17</td>
<td>13:09</td>
<td>Carr Netty</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dishy512@icloud.com">dishy512@icloud.com</a></td>
<td>90039</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-10-17</td>
<td>13:10</td>
<td>Au Andy</td>
<td><a href="mailto:andyau8@gmail.com">andyau8@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>90039</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-10-17</td>
<td>13:11</td>
<td>Sentman Eli</td>
<td><a href="mailto:elis000@gmail.com">elis000@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>90039</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-10-17</td>
<td>13:27</td>
<td>Barnett Karen</td>
<td><a href="mailto:karen@urbanaid.com">karen@urbanaid.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-10-18</td>
<td>19:49</td>
<td>Hirsch Ross</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Ross.Hirsch@doj.ca.gov">Ross.Hirsch@doj.ca.gov</a></td>
<td>90013</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-10-21</td>
<td>10:12</td>
<td>Deans David</td>
<td><a href="mailto:grantdeans@gmail.com">grantdeans@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-10-22</td>
<td>09:39</td>
<td>Barber Charles</td>
<td><a href="mailto:tbarber@timbarberltd.com">tbarber@timbarberltd.com</a></td>
<td>90046</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-10-22</td>
<td>13:23</td>
<td>Lanuza Josie</td>
<td><a href="mailto:fivef0oter@gmail.com">fivef0oter@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>90012</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-10-22</td>
<td>08:53</td>
<td>Eliasoph Nina</td>
<td><a href="mailto:eliasoph@usc.edu">mailto:eliasoph@usc.edu</a></td>
<td>90089</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-10-24</td>
<td>18:19</td>
<td>Funk Mason</td>
<td><a href="mailto:masonfunk@mac.com">masonfunk@mac.com</a></td>
<td>90039</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-10-24</td>
<td>18:20</td>
<td>Guerry Steven</td>
<td><a href="mailto:steven.guerry@gmail.com">steven.guerry@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>90027</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-10-24</td>
<td>08:43</td>
<td>Allen Michael</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ratiocn8@gmail.com">ratiocn8@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-10-26</td>
<td>09:27</td>
<td>Dean Richard</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rdean@mac.com">rdean@mac.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-10-26</td>
<td>10:12</td>
<td>Tossounian Jirair</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jirair@gmail.com">jirair@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-10-26</td>
<td>10:28</td>
<td>Krajewski Joel</td>
<td><a href="mailto:joelkrajewski@gmail.com">joelkrajewski@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>90046</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>First Initial</td>
<td>Last Initial</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131028</td>
<td>Ortiz Molly</td>
<td>Molly <a href="mailto:ortiz@gmail.com">ortiz@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>10/27/2013</td>
<td>90029</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131028</td>
<td>Lee Hyeran</td>
<td><a href="mailto:hyeranlee@ucla.edu">hyeranlee@ucla.edu</a></td>
<td>10/28/2013</td>
<td>90065</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131028</td>
<td>Barin Tawny</td>
<td><a href="mailto:tawny.barin@gmail.com">tawny.barin@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>10/28/2013</td>
<td>91205</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131028</td>
<td>Hoffman JJ</td>
<td><a href="mailto:lariverride@la-bike.org">lariverride@la-bike.org</a></td>
<td>10/28/2013</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131029</td>
<td>Bracciotti Marty</td>
<td><a href="mailto:martyjoe@sbcglobal.net">martyjoe@sbcglobal.net</a></td>
<td>10/28/2013</td>
<td>91205</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131029</td>
<td>Carlson Krista</td>
<td><a href="mailto:passionforwords@gmail.com">passionforwords@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>10/28/2013</td>
<td>90042</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131029</td>
<td>Welker Andrew</td>
<td><a href="mailto:welkersemail@gmail.com">welkersemail@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>10/28/2013</td>
<td>91201</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131029</td>
<td>Burke Paul</td>
<td><a href="mailto:pjburke@pacbell.net">pjburke@pacbell.net</a></td>
<td>10/28/2013</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131029</td>
<td>Alejandre Jim</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jalejand@usc.edu">jalejand@usc.edu</a></td>
<td>10/28/2013</td>
<td>90019</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131029</td>
<td>Kerr Jacqueline</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jacquekerr@gmail.com">jacquekerr@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>10/29/2013</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131029</td>
<td>Huezo Hector</td>
<td><a href="mailto:h.l.huezo@gmail.com">h.l.huezo@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>10/28/2013</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131030</td>
<td>Schumacher Doug</td>
<td><a href="mailto:doug@zuumsocial.com">doug@zuumsocial.com</a></td>
<td>10/29/2013</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131030</td>
<td>Telleria Juliana</td>
<td><a href="mailto:pumpkinfay@hotmail.com">pumpkinfay@hotmail.com</a></td>
<td>10/30/2013</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131030</td>
<td>Riley Dan</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dprski33@gmail.com">dprski33@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>10/30/2013</td>
<td>90015</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131030</td>
<td>Meade Richard</td>
<td><a href="mailto:richardmeade@att.net">richardmeade@att.net</a></td>
<td>10/30/2013</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131030</td>
<td>Miller Mari</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mari.miller@gmail.com">mari.miller@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>10/30/2013</td>
<td>91205</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131030</td>
<td>Tokunow Alvin</td>
<td><a href="mailto:susumu101@gmail.com">susumu101@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>10/30/2013</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131030</td>
<td>Keiner Scott</td>
<td><a href="mailto:scottkeiner@gmail.com">scottkeiner@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>10/30/2013</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131030</td>
<td>Schuck James Edward</td>
<td><a href="mailto:james@jamesschuck.com">james@jamesschuck.com</a></td>
<td>10/30/2013</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131031</td>
<td>Blumenthal Scott</td>
<td><a href="mailto:scottb@roadbikecity.com">scottb@roadbikecity.com</a></td>
<td>10/30/2013</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131031</td>
<td>Brauer Andee</td>
<td><a href="mailto:aibrauer@yahoo.com">aibrauer@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>10/31/2013</td>
<td>90039</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131104</td>
<td>Dhanda Nishith</td>
<td><a href="mailto:nishifus@gmail.com">nishifus@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>11/1/2013</td>
<td>90068</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131104</td>
<td>Franklin Quinn</td>
<td><a href="mailto:quinn.pond@gmail.com">quinn.pond@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>11/1/2013</td>
<td>90039</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131104</td>
<td>Dent Catherine</td>
<td><a href="mailto:cd@catherinedent.com">cd@catherinedent.com</a></td>
<td>11/1/2013</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131105</td>
<td>Maupin Alice</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ouuu2055@gmail.com">ouuu2055@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>11/4/2013</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131105</td>
<td>Casson Edward</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ecasson@gmail.com">ecasson@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>11/5/2013</td>
<td>90039</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131105</td>
<td>Mallare Mark</td>
<td><a href="mailto:nachimark@outlook.com">nachimark@outlook.com</a></td>
<td>11/5/2013</td>
<td>90034</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131105</td>
<td>Thorne David</td>
<td><a href="mailto:david.thrn@gmail.com">david.thrn@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>11/5/2013</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131105</td>
<td>Knapp Karen</td>
<td><a href="mailto:karen@atwatervillage.org">karen@atwatervillage.org</a></td>
<td>11/5/2013</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131105</td>
<td>Meltzer Julia</td>
<td><a href="mailto:julia@clockshop.org">julia@clockshop.org</a></td>
<td>11/5/2013</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131105</td>
<td>Meltzer Adam</td>
<td><a href="mailto:meltzer17@gmail.com">meltzer17@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>11/6/2013</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131107</td>
<td>Romero Paul</td>
<td><a href="mailto:paul_romero818@yahoo.com">paul_romero818@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>10/5/2013</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131107</td>
<td>Wedeen Nancy</td>
<td><a href="mailto:nanpsycle@icloud.com">nanpsycle@icloud.com</a></td>
<td>10/4/2013</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131107</td>
<td>O'Rourke Shannon</td>
<td><a href="mailto:shannonorourke@me.com">shannonorourke@me.com</a></td>
<td>10/4/2013</td>
<td>90027</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131107</td>
<td>Dapper David</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dpdapper@me.com">dpdapper@me.com</a></td>
<td>10/5/2013</td>
<td>90015</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131107</td>
<td>Brouwer Greg</td>
<td><a href="mailto:gbrouw@yahoo.com">gbrouw@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>11/7/2013</td>
<td>90039</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131107</td>
<td>McArthur Meher</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mehermc@aol.com">mehermc@aol.com</a></td>
<td>11/7/2013</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131107</td>
<td>Rice Sascha</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sascha@sascharice.com">sascha@sascharice.com</a></td>
<td>11/7/2013</td>
<td>90039</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131107</td>
<td>Jurca Catherine</td>
<td><a href="mailto:cathjurca@gmail.com">cathjurca@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>11/7/2013</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131107</td>
<td>Chamberlain Jennie</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jennie.chamberlain@gmail.com">jennie.chamberlain@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>11/7/2013</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131107</td>
<td>Harvey Brandon</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sandover@gmail.com">sandover@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>11/7/2013</td>
<td>90026</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131107</td>
<td>Chamberlain Daniel</td>
<td><a href="mailto:daniel.chamberlain@gmail.com">daniel.chamberlain@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>11/7/2013</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131107</td>
<td>Shifflett Michael</td>
<td><a href="mailto:doctor@thedilettantes.net">doctor@thedilettantes.net</a></td>
<td>11/7/2013</td>
<td>90026</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131107</td>
<td>Berolzheimer Paul</td>
<td><a href="mailto:zerodbspl@yahoo.com">zerodbspl@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>11/7/2013</td>
<td>91205</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131107</td>
<td>Olander Jeannie</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jeannieolander@gmail.com">jeannieolander@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>11/7/2013</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131107</td>
<td>Smith Robert</td>
<td><a href="mailto:fixer@livenation.com">fixer@livenation.com</a></td>
<td>11/7/2013</td>
<td>90028</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131107</td>
<td>Bouville Fabienne</td>
<td><a href="mailto:fbouvil@yahoo.com">fbouvil@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>11/7/2013</td>
<td>90039</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131107</td>
<td>Suskin Mitch</td>
<td><a href="mailto:msuskin@kamosuskin.com">msuskin@kamosuskin.com</a></td>
<td>11/7/2013</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131107</td>
<td>Snyder Ryan</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ryan@rsa.cc">ryan@rsa.cc</a></td>
<td>11/6/2013</td>
<td>90024</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131107</td>
<td>Del Castillo Doris</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dorisdelc@sbcglobal.net">dorisdelc@sbcglobal.net</a></td>
<td>11/7/2013</td>
<td>90039</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Subject: 130930 0821

From: Dave Duce [mailto:dave_duce@hotmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, September 25, 2013 10:34 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org
Subject: Glendale/Hyperion Bridge Bike Lane

Hello Tami,

Recently I attended the community workshop for the Glendale Hyperion Bridge Project.

I understand there is a need to retrofit the Glendale/Hyperion Bridge for seismic code, and appreciate the effort to preserve the historic fabric and nature of the bridge, this is great news. Thank you Caltrans staff and City of LA staff for pushing this bridge rebuild project forward.

I am a resident/property owner in Atwater Village and Franklin Hills. I use the Glendale Hyperion Bridge at least four times a day, many days more than that. I am a pedestrian, cyclist, driver and fan of the bridge.

Cars and bikes sharing lanes when their speeds are so different is a recipe for a fatality. We need at least an up-hill/SB bike lane or someone will die on the semi-blind corner. Speeds on that stretch are already around 50+mph, with the addition of planned K-rails, driver perceived safety levels will increase and speeds will also increase, yet cyclist are expected to share the same lane. Many students commute to Marshall High on that road. It’s a numbers game, someone will get run over if we do not separate bikes and cars. I urge you to drive and observe the speeds as they are currently on the Glendale/Hyperion Bridge, or better yet ride or walk over the bridge and judge the safety levels yourself for families with kids.

Why are the LA Master Bike Plan and Complete Streets not being implemented on this perfect occasion to do so?

Please don’t deprive the residents of Silver Lake, Franklin Hills access to the Bike Trails of the LA River Plan, this will be viewed as a mistake as future generations who look back at the choices we make today.

We love our bridge, it’s an iconic neighborhood symbol and an homage to our veterans. Lets keep it as a neighborhood bridge and increase its functionality by allowing all people to use it safely.

Dave Duce
Pedestrian, Cyclist, Driver, Admirer of LA

-----
Subject: 130930 0822
From: Bryan J. Blumberg [mailto:bjtwuk@yahoo.com]
Sent: Thursday, September 26, 2013 8:24 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Subject: Glendale-Hyperion Complex of Bridges Improvement Project COMMENT
CARD

Date: Thursday, September 26, 2013

Please submit any comments on the proposed project tonight by placing this card in the comment box or send it by October 11, 2013 via email to Tami.Podesta@dot.ca.gov, or by mail to:

Tami Podesta, Branch Chief
Division of Environmental Planning
California Department of Transportation District 7
100 South Main St, Los Angeles CA 90012

Name: BRYAN J BLUMBERG
Address: 4246 Holly Knoll Drive, Los Angeles, CA 90027-3243
Email: bjtwuk@yahoo.com

Organization represented, if any: Citizen of the City of Los Angeles

Comment:
There were 23 bicyclists who lost their lives in Los Angeles County in 2012. So far, before the end of the 9th month of 2013, there have already been 28 deaths of bicyclists in Los Angeles County. As the death toll of bicyclists rises, it is irresponsible to spend $50,000,000 remodeling the Hyperion Viaduct without providing for the safety of all who cross it.

I live in the Franklin Hills and travel by bicycle for most of my daily errands. Whether I go to Downtown Los Angeles, Glendale, Burbank, North Hollywood or Sherman Oaks, I either use the LA River bikeway or cross it. The only streets in the entire area which can be used are Los Feliz Blvd, Hyperion Avenue or Glendale Blvd. None of them are safe for bicyclists.

In Atwater, Glendale Blvd. has a bike lane which leads to the Hyperion Viaduct, but crossing Hyperion by bicycle is very risky today. In Los Feliz, Griffith Park Blvd. has a bike lane leading to Los Feliz Blvd, but Los Feliz Blvd is dangerous for bicyclists particularly where it crosses the Golden State Freeway. Recently Rowena Avenue was put on a road diet and given bicycle lanes, but Glendale Blvd from the LA River Bike Path to Rowena has substandard lanes and metal grates.

By widening traffic lanes on Hyperion and installing a center median wall, I fear that motor vehicles will travel at higher than posted speed limits, which will make it even more dangerous for bicyclists than it
already is.

In order to protect the lives of all of the citizens of Los Angeles, including bicyclists, please reconsider your plan. Please include a bike lane on Hyperion Avenue.

===========================
BRYAN J. BLUMBERG
4246 Holly Knoll Drive
Los Angeles, CA  90027-3243 USA
phone:  323-660-1888
email:  bjtuk@yahoo.com <bjtwuk@sbcglobal.net>

-----
Subject: 130930 0823-1
From: Marc Caswell [marcacaswell@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, September 26, 2013 9:26 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: Hyperion/Glendale Bridge Proposal is in Violation of Caltrans DDR61-R1

Ms. Podesta & Honorable LA City Representatives:
As someone who lives just a few miles from Hyperion/Glendale Bridge I am astonished and outraged by this new proposal -- which fails to include basic amenities for people who bicycle and walk.
The failure to recognize the LA Bicycle Plan's proposal for a bike lane is in direct violation of Caltrans Deputy Directive 61-R1
which calls on staff to "Ensure incorporation of bicycle, pedestrian, and transit travel elements in all Department transportation plans and studies."
Failure to include even a basic bicycle lane -- let alone a sidewalk on only one side of the road; and to design it freeway-level speeds so close to Ivanhoe Elementary School, Griffith Park and Red Car River Park is reckless and callous to the nearby residents.
To design a street for such high speeds without the basic infrastructure for safe bicycling, in direct violation of Caltrans DDR61-R1, places Caltrans and the City/County of Los Angeles in various states of legal liability should someone be injured while bicycling on this street.
I urge you to reconsider the proposal and include, at a minimum, a standard 5-foot bicycle lane in each direction.
Sincerely,
Marc Caswell
Silverlake Resident
415-418-0657<tel:415-418-0657>
-----
Subject: 130930 0823-2
From: Marino Pascal [pascal@locationscout.com]
Sent: Thursday, September 26, 2013 11:27 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org; councilmember.cedillo@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Safe bridge for bicycles and pedestrians
This issue is close to me because my daughter was hit by a car while biking on Hyperion Ave bridge.
As someone who bikes and walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:
Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge
There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.
Sincerely,
Marino Pascal
2525 Crestmoore Pl
Los Angeles, CA 90065
--
Marino Pascal
323-963-FILM (3456)
http://locationscout.com
-----
Subject: Please, No Hyperion/Glendale Freeway

Tami,

Hello. As a public health professional, I'd like to express my concern about 'improving' the Hyperion /Glendale bridge by increasing traffic speeds to 55 MPH. This bridge is a connector between two dense neighborhoods that are very walkable and bikeable. The bridge currently is dangerous enough for anyone willing to brave it without being enclosed in a personal automobile- something I have to do often. Why make it less friendly to everyone else when Los Angeles, the country and even the world is working to expand travel options to include everyone- not just those in a car, in a rush.

This bridge is very important for all types of people with varying transportation choices. It's 2013, automobile-centric design is on the way out. Let's keep Los Angeles moving forward in a progressive, safe way.

And doesn't the 2010 Bike Plan call for bike lanes anyway? This seems like a no-brainer.

Thank you for considering this,

Matt Ruscigno, MPH, RD

ps. If you need more info on how gas taxes don't cover road costs:
http://shar.es/Kcawq

ps.

www.truelovehealth.com
www.twitter.com/mattruscigno <http://www.twitter.com/truelovehealth>
-----
Subject: 130930 0824-2
From: sheigh [sheigh@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, September 26, 2013 9:57 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: Hyperion Ave. - Safety First, Community Second, Freeway Speeds Last

I live in Silver Lake and support the businesses in Atwater Village. I
cross Hyperion Ave. on my bicycle, or on foot, with my dog to travel to and
from both Silver Lake and Atwater. I travel to support the small businesses
blossoming in Atwater. The farmers markets, the outdoor cafes and bistros,
the juice shops, the yoga and dance studios, the pet shops, the Atwater
library.

As you consider plans to revamp the Hyperion-Glendale complex of bridges
you must prioritize the safety of our local residents and the visitors to
our neighborhoods.

Another key consideration for future growth is the emergent LA River
business district, ideal for cyclists, runners, skaters and even kayakers
and bird watchers.

As an active resident of the area, making Los Angeles more livable, to me,
means making our roadways more safe. This includes providing safe passage
for the walkers and cyclists who tragically and unnecessarily make up 39%
of the road fatalities in Los Angeles each year.

The reckless pursuit of vehicular speed on our neighborhood roadways will
only worsen if our footbridge is built to freeway standards at 55 MPH with
no bike lanes and no safe areas for pedestrians.

As someone who bikes or walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it
is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me.
Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate
speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project
to include:

- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and
  pedestrians and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even
  faster

A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people
access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists
an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan
and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest
barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This
project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,
Sheigh Crabtree
Teviot Street, Silver Lake, 90039

-----
Subject: 130930 0825-1
From: Katie Bennett [katie.bennett@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, September 26, 2013 11:31 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: Concern for Hyperion Bridge Design - use NACTO Design Standards

As a native Angeleno, who just moved from Mid-City to Silverlake, a move motivated by better bike amenities and proximity to my friends and community, I am am saddened to learn that cyclist have to fight for their safety; again. I frequently travel between Silver Lake and Atwater Village via Hyperion Ave and it is already terrifying when I am on my bike, and sometimes even in my vehicle. It is essential that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone's needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:

- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians
- Traffic lane design to discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster

A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge.

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy and NACTO's design principles (of which LA is an active member). The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,
Katie Bennett
3255 Descanso Drive
-----
Subject: 130930 0825-2
From: Mark Vallianatos [mvalli@oxy.edu]
Sent: Thursday, September 26, 2013 11:37 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: Safe, complete street on hyperion viaduct
I'm a professor at Occidental College who teaches the College's course on
transportation policy and streets. I also walk, bike, ride transit and
drive between Silver Lake and Atwater Village.
The semester is barely a month old and my students have already heard me
explain how, in the 'bad old days,' road engineers designed streets with
wide lanes and 'forgiving' design features supposedly to protect speeding
drivers. You don't have to be a transportation researcher to understand
that incorporating these rural highway features in urban settings end up
encouraging dangerous speeds. Roads designed with wide lanes and crash
barriers kill pedestrians, cyclists and drivers directly by encouraging
fast driving, and indirectly by discouraging healthy, active transportation
because residents are scared to use streets designed like speedways.
When I described these past mistakes in road design to my class and
explained how streets are currently being changed to protect all users --
and designed to discourage speeding - little did I know that the City and
Caltrans were working on a project straight out of the discredited speedway
playbook. I'm very disappointed to see that the design of the Hyperion
viaduct includes wide lanes, banked turns and crash barriers that
psychologically encourage drivers to speed. I'm also dismayed that there is
no bike lane on Hyperion.
Please redesign this important linkage with narrower travel lanes (the
newly released NACTO Urban Street Design Guide
http://nacto.org/usdg/typically recommends 10 and 11 feet lanes on
most city streets), without
crash barriers or banked turns, bike lanes, with wider sidewalks, and with
a complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct.
Sincerely,
mark vallianatos
3591 canada st, LA, 90065
--
mark vallianatos
policy director, urban & environmental policy institute
adjunct professor, urban & environmental policy
occidental college
mvalli@oxy.edu<mailto:mvalli@oxy.edu>
323 259 1458
----
Subject: Bicycle lanes critical on Hyperion roadway development!

Dear Leaders,

As someone who bikes or walks frequently between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone's needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:

- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster

A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge. There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,

Camille Dieterle
3220 Descanso Drive.
LA< CA 90026

-----
Subject: 130930 0825-4
From: Roadblock [roadblock@midnightridazz.com]
Sent: Thursday, September 26, 2013 11:23 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: mayor.garcetti@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
tom.labonge@lacity.org
Subject: Hyperion Bridge Public Hearing Request
Hi Tami
I would like to make a request for a public hearing for the Hyperion / Glendale Aqueduct project. Please inform me of the procedure to do so. I was told last night at the meeting that I need to follow a certain procedure to make this happen and I absolutely want this. There is NO WAY I will let our only route to Glendale be re-designed into a freeway like corridor. Too many of my friends have been maimed / killed on that road as it is. Thank you.
-Don Ward
silverlake / los feliz / atwater stake holder.
-----
Subject:  130930 0827-1
From: George Pillage [crappola@hotmail.com]
Sent: Friday, September 27, 2013 1:57 AM
To: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org; Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Subject: HYPERION / GLENDALE VIADUCT.
Dear Dinosaurs.
The dream of a city based on oil powered / manufactured transit machines is OVER.
These days people ride bikes - though neither cal trans OR LADOT would know because neither of you actually count bicycles in your traffic counts - and people walk, and people take transit. Some people will always drive, but it’s time to stop catering to them exclusively as you dinosaurs have been doing now for decades.
That being said...
STOP TRYING TO CREEP IN A FREEWAY into my neighborhood please. THANK YOU.
As someone who bikes or walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:
Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge
There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.
Sincerely,
George
-----
Subject: 130930 0827-2
From: Noah Mercer [noah_ten@yahoo.com]
Sent: Friday, September 27, 2013 2:24 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
    mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: Hyperion bridge changes
I routinely bike over the Hyperion bridge into Atwater (and back) and it's
a terrible experience: I need to crank out as much speed as possible to
minimize the difference between me and the fast-moving traffic while
simultaneously avoiding potholes and debris and trying to stay out of the
way of said traffic. At the end of the bridge it gets worse: Suddenly I
have more fast-moving traffic coming up on me from my right rear, wanting
to cross my lane and two others to get to the first u-turn light, and they
can't see me in advance because I'm descending from above them. And of
course there's still the speeding traffic to my left, leaving me sandwiched
like a smear of mustard between pieces of steel.
Coming back home is even worse: I have to cross two lanes of fast-moving
traffic to enter the bridge, but this time I'm moving uphill, making me a
slow-moving obstacle for drivers in a hurry.
But even while juggling all of this I still find time to wonder at the kids
I see walking over the bridge on their way to and from Marshall High: How
do they possibly enter and exit the bridge alive each morning and afternoon
when they have to walk across those same lanes of fast-moving traffic?
There's a lot that could be done to improve this situation for cyclists,
pedestrians and schoolchildren:
Add bike lanes
Add traffic-slowing measures such as narrower lanes
Add a crosswalk with a signal at each end of the bridge
These sorts of changes would help make this important thoroughfare linking
Silver Lake and Atwater consistent with the bike plan and the Caltrans
complete street plan and should be included in the redesign.
Sincerely,
Noah Mercer
Los Feliz
-----
Subject: 130930 0827-3
From: Will Bassett [bookbike13@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, September 27, 2013 2:39 AM
To: Podesta, Tami @DOT

Subject: Hyperion Avenue is a street. It needs to carry some of the ever growing bike traffic in this area. Move forward and accept the bike as a real alternative form of transportation, Plan for it now and in the future. More bikes lead to few autos on the roa...

-----
Subject: 130930 0828-1
From: Jayme Filippini [jaymefilippini@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Friday, September 27, 2013 3:21 AM
To: Podesta, Tami @DOT
Cc: councilmember.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: Fix Hyperion bridge - Bike lanes and safe cross walks and sidewalks

I have often run from Atwater to Silverlake reservoir to exercise and have
experienced firsthand how fast cars travel on the Hyperion bridge that
connects these two communities. It is truly terrifying - this has to be
100x worse on a bike!

I've heard the plans to improve this thoroughfare do NOT include safe paths
for bikes and adequate crosswalks for cyclists and pedestrians crossing the
bridge and accessing the river...Given the new law that requires cars give
3ft space for cyclists - how can this be done if you include a new median
and no bike lanes? Not only that, bike lanes seem so important now that so
many people are taking alternate (non-automotive) transportation to get
around LA. I've tried to take my kids on bike rides and the travel on major
streets without bike lanes is harrowing! I'll have to wait til they get
older, which is unfortunate as I need the exercise now!!!

Please consider all the public comment supporting a revised plan to include
bike paths and adequate cross walks on the Atwater side to access the river
bike path - it can only help to alleviate car traffic in the area and keep
people safe and healthy.

Thank you,
Jayme Filippini
460 Mt Washington Drive
Los Angeles, CA 90065
323-276-9480

-----
Subject: 130930 0828-2
From: John Kayon [johnkayon@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, September 27, 2013 3:36 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT; tom.labonge@lacity.org; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org;
info@la-bike.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All
I ride and vision LA as taking the lead on Carbon free transport.
Also as someone who bikes or walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for
people like me. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for
appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like
the project to include:
Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians
and discourage speeding
No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access
the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an
alternative through the dangerous merge
There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan
and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest
barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This
project can change that and make all travelers benefit.
Sincerely,
John L Kayon
Los Angeles CA.
Concerned Cyclist
-----
Subject: 130930 0828-3
From: Richard Risemberg [rickrise@earthlink.net]
Sent: Friday, September 27, 2013 1:13 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: Glendale/Hyperion Bridge
To Ms. Podesta of the DOT, Mayor Garcetti, and Council Members LaBonge and O'Farrell:
The plans for the Glendale/Hyperion bridge revealed at the recent community meeting represent nothing less than a clumsy tumble back into the past of endless reflexive pandering to the car.
For decades we have built wider and faster roads, only to discover that they induce more traffic and congestion, degrade public health, and crush healthy commercial activity along their corridors.
While city after city in the US, following the lead of healthy and prosperous Northern European communities, has been emphasizing walkability and bicycling, with brilliant results, we in Los Angeles are repeatedly subjected to constant retrograde efforts to boost car speeds through our neighborhoods, replacing a salubrious street life with speed, noise, fumes, crashes, and empty sidewalks.
Silver Lake and Atwater are little success stories in the drab blandscape that old-school traffic engineering has made of Los Angeles. Now, plans to rebuild the Glendale/Hyperion bridge--a bridge I traverse frequently by bicycle, and whose form and setting I know well--seem intended to result in a chopped-off snippet of superhighway, with wide lanes and banked turns that are guaranteed to induce dangerous and aggressive speeding. The drivers swooping over the bridge will not be willing to slow down when they approach Rowena or Glenhurst, nor will they have much regard for cyclists or walkers trying to make their way to neighborhood shops--let alone cyclists on the bridge itself.
Everywhere else in the civilized world--from other West Coast cities such as Seattle and San Francisco, to the powerhouse towns of Chicago and New York, to planetary capitals including Washington DC, Paris, and London, forward-thinking engineers have chosen to slow down and de-emphasize the car, and to support walking, cycling, and transit, which cannot co-exist with shrieking motor traffic.
It is well-known and thoroughly proven now that nurturing the cyclist and the walker results in more cohesive communities, less crime, healthier populations, and increasingly profitable businesses.
Messieurs Labonge and O'Farrell, ladies and gentlemen of CalTrans and the DOT, if you let this unconsidered project move forward as presented, you will be remembered as the last, lost befuddled champions of an obsolete obsession with speed over people, with chrome-plated arrogance over prosperous communities, with the ignorant and presumptive past over the prosperous future the rest of the world is bounding into without us.
Richard Risemberg
648 1/2 S. Burnside Ave. (CD4)
Los Angeles, CA 90036
323-428-4669
--
Richard Risemberg
http://www.bicyclefixation.com
http://www.SustainableCityNews.com
http://gridlogisticsinc.com
http://www.rickrise.com
-----
Subject: 130930 0828-4
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From: Byron Head [byronhead@airmail.net]
Sent: Friday, September 27, 2013 4:12 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org

Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All

.................You Cheap Lying Bastards - Again
As someone who bikes between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:

- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster

A complete crosswalk or bike friendly flyover on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge. There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

I’m 63 and own 4 different bikes any one of which I ride daily. And I bought an electric assist bike at the Alt Car Expo in Santa Monica last weekend where they tend to give a crap about bike riders.

Most Sincerely,
Byron Head
4804 Laurel Canyon
Los Angeles

-----
Subject: 130930 0829-1 (Referenced as 131107 1307-1 in the Letter Comments Database)
From: james bledsoe [jamesbleds0e@yahoo.com]
Sent: Thursday, September 26, 2013 11:43 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT

Subject: Glendale Boulevard-Hyperion Avenue Complex of Bridges Improvement

Why widen the bridge at all. The primary reason i hear while volunteering at the Bicycle Kitchen for not riding bicycles is "I am afraid of cars". If we calm traffic and build a safe cycling infrastructure we will solve many transportation problems. At the same time being able to use bicycle for the bulk of our daily trips to the store, work and recreation destinations will reduce the over all need to earn money there by giving us all more time to do useful things with our families and friends. i understand this notion of earning less is contrary to the conventional measures of wealth and prosperity. Let me simply respond in advance, money does not grow on trees but apples do and if you have apples you don't need money. Also i understand this topic is focused on the DOT's work but the real underlying issue is our collective quality of life. It is very important to consider the far ranging and complex results of any infrastructural design decisions. The cost of widening the bridge will prevent the reworking of some other infrastructural issues, like restoring the LA River or building more subway and light rail facilities. Simply repainting a lot of our existing roads and adding inexpensive lane divers will allay the fears of many potential cyclist and we will all live better.

-----
Subject: 130930 0829-2
From: Eyal Amiran [eyalamiran@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, September 27, 2013 5:25 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org
Subject: Hyperion
Dear Tami Podesta,
I oppose the expansion of Hyperion. We need to preserve those qualities that make Silver Lake so attractive--take them away, and the value of the place will diminish, and with it property taxes and future development. We need a careful balance, not a bigger road, noise, and pollution. How does such an expansion improve the livability of Silver Lake? does it help pedestrians and bicycle riders? does it encourage small shop traffic and character in this part of town?
Sincerely,
Eyal Amiran
2013 Micheltorena Street
Silver Lake
-----
Subject: 130930 0831-1
From: Michael Blanchard [mlblanchard@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, September 27, 2013 5:55 AM
To: Podesta, Tami @DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: Hyperion Freeway? No, thank you. Make LA safe for pedestrians and cyclists
As someone who bikes, walks and runs between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community.
Specifically, I would like the project to include:
  - Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
  - Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
  - Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
  - No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge
There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.
Sincerely,
Michael Blanchard
5124 Vincent Ave
Los Angeles, CA 90041
-----
Subject: 130930 0831-2  
From: Erial [etu.edu@gmail.com]  
Sent: Thursday, September 26, 2013 9:43 PM  
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT  
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; 
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org  
Subject: Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All  
I was going to copy and paste but I just wanted to share. Every time I have 
to bike over Hyperion I feel like -- well this could be it today someone 
hits me with their car and drives off. It’s happened to a few of my cycling 
friends.  
As a commuting cyclist and driver -- I believe we need to encourage safety 
all around. Biking not only reduces traffic, it makes citizens healthier 
and builds a better community. Not to mention, if we make LA the capital of 
bikes and pedestrians, imagine tourist renting bikes and exploring 
businesses beyond Hollywood boulevard; everyone wins. Angelinos are 
starting to use bikes as a method of transportation more and more and it's 
awesome. However, if we do not meet this demand with providing safe passage 
it will not be a lasting boom of an alternative method of transportation. 
We need to invest in our future Los Angeles! We can't let those Portland or 
Long Beach go-getters out pace us - with their nice bicycle lanes and 
fancy trains. We have almost 365 days of sunshine and you want people to be 
bound to their cars to go 10 minutes away? I say be the elected leaders 
that we all know you are step up to the plate and hit a home run -- or 
knock some points off that ERA (if your a pitcher) -- let's make LA safe 
for cyclist! Also, I urge you to walk or bike the section of Hyperion in 
question -- it is indeed terrifying.  
Respectfully,  
Erial Tompkins  
-----
Subject: 130930 0833-1
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From: Rita Valencia [valencia.rita@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, September 27, 2013 6:49 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
    mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: Hyperion Avenue Plan
Dear Tami Podesta,
As a cyclist, pedestrian and homeowner in the community of Silver Lake for
over 20 years, I am concerned about the plans for the Hyperion Bridge over
the 5 freeway having a design speed of 55 miles per hour. It is absolutely
critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone's
needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through
an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:
   Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
   Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
   Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and
    pedestrians and discourage speeding
   No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even
   faster
   A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people
access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists
an alternative through the dangerous merge
There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan
and Caltrans complete streets policy. Crossing the Hyperion viaduct from
Atwater to Silver Lake is currently very unsafe and needs to be adapted for
cyclists, autos and pedestrians to coexist. This project can make all
travelers benefit.
Sincerely,
Rita Valencia
valencia.rita@gmail.com<mailto:valencia.rita@gmail.com>
-----
Subject: 130930 0833-2
From: Josef Taylor [josef.taylor@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, September 27, 2013 7:15 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Subject: Glendale-Hyperion Crossing

Hi, I’m writing to express concerns over the new plans for the Glendale-Hyperion Crossing. There are currently no bridges in this area with any bike infrastructure, and it is a heavily used corridor for anyone who lives nearby. Please consider the exploding number of people who have chosen to use bicycles for their daily transportation recently. It’s not a fad, it’s not a sport. It’s LA catching up to the rest of the world. Our elected officials get this, which is why the 2010 bicycle master plan specified bike lanes on the bridge. To do anything short of exceeding the expectations in that plan is to deliberately sabotage our future, and the safety of countless angelenos. Please work to reduce the speed of traffic on this crossing and make it safe, not just for motorists, not just for spandex-clad sports cyclists, but for bicyclists and pedestrians, humans, from 8 years old to 80.

Josef Taylor

-----
Subject: 130930 0834
From: Rik Williams [rjw297@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, September 27, 2013 2:48 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
    mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: Please make Hyperion bike-friendly
To whom it may concern,
As someone who frequently cycles throughout northeast LA (including Atwater
and Silver Lake), I was deeply disappointed to learn that the planned
Hyperion Avenue Viaduct rehabilitation includes essentially no facilities
for bicycles and pedestrians. This stretch of road connects two busy
commercial/residential districts that are almost always teeming with bike
and foot traffic, and connecting them with a 55mph thoroughfare will only
continue to endanger cyclists who need to cross between these areas.
On the other hand, a design that enhances bike and pedestrian safety will
provide a unique, contiguous bikeable and walkable community, while still
providing ample capacity for automobile traffic. In the Hyperion Viaduct
redesign I strongly encourage you to include such enhancements, including
bicycle lanes, well-marked crosswalks, and slower traffic speeds, for the
safety of this vibrant urban neighborhood.
Sincerely,
Rik Williams
318 N Avenue 52
Highland Park, Los Angeles, 90042
-----
Subject: 130930 0835
From: Niall Huffman [nhuffman28@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, September 27, 2013 7:41 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: Tom LaBonge; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: Don’t turn Glendale and Hyperion into freeways -- make them safe for everyone

Dear Ms. Podesta:
I am writing to express my concerns regarding the DEIR for the Glendale/Hyperion bridge complex improvement project. Specifically, I find deeply troubling the inadequate safety measures for bicycle and pedestrian users and the seeming prioritization of automobile speed over all other design considerations. I urge Caltrans and the City of Los Angeles to rethink the need for high design speeds on the renovated bridge complex and to provide safe, dedicated access for nonmotorized users. In addition, I request that the various agencies involved in the project hold a formal public hearing to allow members of the community to openly voice their concerns.

The Glendale/Hyperion bridge is particularly well-used by people riding bicycles in spite of the fact that it is not very bike-friendly, as it is one of only a few crossings of the Los Angeles River between Silver Lake and Atwater Village. The City of Los Angeles is well aware of this fact -- so well aware that it included bike lanes on Hyperion Avenue as part of the 2010 Bicycle Plan.

Despite this recognition of the bridge as an important connecting route for nonmotorized users, the proposed renovations of the bridge, as described in the EIR, fail to adequately accommodate safe bicycling and walking. Caltrans and the City’s Bureau of Engineering (BOE) are designing Hyperion to freeway standards with a design speed of 55 miles per hour. Based on that design speed, they are pursuing a median crash barrier, banked turns, and excessively wide car lanes. Those decisions leave no room for bike lanes and just a narrow sidewalk on only one side of the street.

This is particularly perplexing when we consider that the speed limit on the street segments that lie at each end of the bridge is 35 mph. I cannot fathom what benefit is gained from encouraging drivers to accelerate to freeway speeds for the length of the bridge and become acclimated to those speeds just as they reemerge into an urbanized area where people live, work, shop and ride bikes. Simply designing the bridge to normal city street standards would leave enough room for everyone and would avoid turning Hyperion into a de facto expressway.

As someone who regularly bikes between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion be made safe for people like me. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:

- Bike lanes on Hyperion Avenue
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Boulevard
Finally, I ask that a formal public hearing be held to allow all potential users of the bridge the opportunity to voice their concerns and know that their comments will be incorporated into the record. It is crucial that the needs of non-automobile bridge users be taken into account.
There is no reason for this project to be inconsistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can help to overcome that barrier and provide safe and comfortable alternatives to the automobile for many thousands of Angelenos. I urge the reconsideration of the dangerous design proposed for this project.

--
Niall Huffman
945 South Sycamore Avenue, Los Angeles
nhuffman28@gmail.com
714.323.1878

-----
Subject: 130930 0836-1
From: otbhans@gmail.com [mailto:otbhans@gmail.com] On Behalf Of Hans Keifer
Sent: Friday, September 27, 2013 7:54 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: Make Hyperion Ave. Viaduct Safe for Biking and Walking

Dear Tami,

As someone who bikes or walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:

- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
- A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,

Hans Keifer
11716 Babbitt Ave
Granada Hills, CA

-----
Subject: 130930 0836-2
From: underconsume@gmail.com [underconsume@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, September 27, 2013 5:43 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Subject: Hyperion safety
As someone who bikes or walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone's needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:
Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave. Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge
There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Best,
Ron McGill
310~701~0510
-----
Subject: Proposed Hyperion-Glendale Bridge Changes

Ms. Podesta,

I’m writing to express my strong concern about the proposed changes and upgrades to the Hyperion-Glendale bridge. I’m not an avid cyclist or die-hard pedestrian, but I do recognize the importance of accommodating a variety of means of transportation, wherever possible, and particularly when there are limited access points across a barrier like the LA River and 5 Freeway. This is especially true given that this bridge links two bike-friendly and pedestrian-friendly communities that lack real connections between them for people not driving.

It is really upsetting to me to learn that the proposed changes to the bridge include design modifications intended to accommodate 55 MPH traffic, which requires widened lanes and takes away what little space could have been in place for bikes and pedestrians while making it that much more dangerous for bicyclists and pedestrians to cross this bridge. Supposedly, the speed limit is 35 MPH, but the design just assumes people will drive 20 MPH over the speed limit and attempts to accommodate that.

What an absolute shame. LADOT should be ashamed for having come up with this design proposal, particularly as recent data shows that nearly 90% of LA’s new residents in the past year have low- to no-vehicle households. These are folks who are walking, bicycling, taking transit, etc., and we’re designing a long-overdue upgrade to a bridge that is almost singularly-focused on cars? So utterly disappointing.

I understand that the proposal includes a widened sidewalk on the north side of the bridge, which comes at the expense of any sidewalk on the south side and which is only accessible by crossing what is essentially an on-ramp to the 5 Freeway (by the way, have you ever tried to walk across a freeway on- or off-ramp without a traffic signal to aid you? It’s one of the scariest experiences you can have as a pedestrian).

I’m so disappointed at the lack of vision and creativity in LADOT’s proposal for the Hyperion-Glendale bridge “upgrades” and wanted to voice that opinion while I hope there’s still time to revisit this proposal and hopefully recognize just how important a linkage it is between two of LA’s most walkable and bikeable neighborhoods.

Thank you for reading this and for your willingness to hear what I have to say.

-Luke Klipp

email: lukehklipp@gmail.com

phone: (415) 203-3102

Work like you don’t need the money,
Love like you’ve never been hurt, and
Dance like nobody’s watching.

-----
Subject: 130930 0836-4
From: Natalie Cardenas [msohno213@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, September 27, 2013 6:53 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway – Build a Safe Viaduct for All
As someone who bikes or walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:

- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster

A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.
Sincerely,
Natalie Cardenas
1427 McCollum Street
Los Angeles CA 90026
-----
Subject: 130930 0836-5
From: Stambler@aol.com [Stambler@aol.com]
Sent: Friday, September 27, 2013 6:59 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: Hyperion-Glendale Bridge Redesign
At the community meeting the other evening regarding the bridge, the engineers and officials indicated that the three reasons for the redesign were seismic retrofitting, traffic capacity, and historic preservation. I fail to see how renovating the bridge to accommodate traffic traveling at 55 miles per hour is in keeping with any of those reasons. It would seem to make much more sense to apply the traffic-calming principles that have proven so effective in other neighborhood streets. The viaduct is a primary passageway for pedestrians and bikes as well as cars and trucks. It’s hard to imagine that the city and state can’t come up with a more sensible approach -- one that takes into consideration the needs of all travelers -- than the design that is currently on the table.
Mark Stambler
3001 Maxwell Street
Los Angeles 90027
-----
Subject: 130930 0837-1
From: Kalee Thompson [mailto:kalee.thompson@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, September 27, 2013 8:31 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: Hyperion Bridge

Hello,
It has come to my attention that city plans to renovate the Hyperion bridge
that connects Los Feliz to Atwater Village are not bike and pedestrian
friendly. I feel strongly that we need to slow traffic in these areas and
create a safer and more welcoming environment for those who choose or have
no choice but to bike or walk.
In my opinion, any renovation to bridges crossing the LA River should
include bike lanes. There is already a shortage of safe ways to get across
the river in these neighborhoods.
Please prioritize the safety and support of cyclists and pedestrians. It
will make our city a happier, friendlier, and safer place.
Thank you,
Kalee Thompson
Biker, Walker, Mother, Resident of NELA

Kalee Thompson
718.930.9891
Twitter: Kaleewrites
Read My Book!
WWW.DEADLIESTSEA.COM

-----
Subject: 130930 0837-2
From: Darren Conly [djconly@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, September 27, 2013 7:54 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Subject: Please better accommodate bicycles in the Hyperion-Glendale bridge redesign!

As a cyclist and 3-year resident of Los Angeles, I am only too aware of the challenges brought about by the fact that this bridge does not feature any sort of bicycle infrastructure. If I, or any of the many cyclists inhabiting Silver Lake, Echo Park, Atwater Village, or Glendale wish to travel between these areas, it is unnecessarily difficult under current conditions.

In particular, getting from Atwater Village to Silver Lake via bicycle is difficult as it requires either braving the Hyperion bridge with vehicles traveling over 55mph, or it requires taking a more circuitous, hilly route via Glendale Boulevard.

Normally, we would just have to accept these conditions as-is since building new infrastructure is very expensive. But the fact that the Hyperion bridge is being rebuilt is a perfect opportunity to feasibly and efficiently make a vital connection in the growing network of bicycle infrastructure in Los Angeles. Doing so would also further the LADOT's goal of promoting more sustainable transportation options.

In short, please make the most of the opportunity presented by this project. Don't use it to promote the outdated status quo of facilitating vehicular traffic in an area with so much potential for alternative forms of transportation. Take advantage to provide a safe and convenient connection for all road users between these two vibrant neighborhoods.

Sincerely,
Darren Conly
MURP, UCLA Class of 2012

-----
Subject: 130930 0837-3
From: ds [d.so@fly@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, September 27, 2013 7:33 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
     mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway – Build a Safe Viaduct for All!
As someone who bikes or walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it
is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me.
Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate
speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project
to include:
   Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
   Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
   Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and
pedestrians and discourage speeding
   No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even
closer
   A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people
access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists
an alternative through the dangerous merge.

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan
and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest
barrier to safe walk/bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River.
This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.
Sincerely,
Diana Estrada
4210 Los Feliz, Los Angeles, CA 90027
-----
Subject: 130930 0838-1 (Referenced as 131108 0847-2 in the E-mail Database)

From: Kathryn Savage [kmsavage@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, September 27, 2013 8:03 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org

Subject: Make Hyperion Avenue Safe for Everyone

I am a young woman who frequently rides my bike between Atwater Village and Silverlake, and I demand that Hyperion Avenue be made safe for bicyclists and pedestrians. We need to provide infrastructure that makes walking, biking and driving feasible and safe, not infrastructure that solely permits cars to speed recklessly and endanger our communities.

Hyperion Avenue should have:
- bike lanes, as designated by the City's 2010 bicycle master plan
- a sidewalk on each side of the street
- well-marked crosswalks
- narrower traffic lanes to give space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding

Hyperion Avenue should NOT have:
- a dangerously high speed limit of 55 miles per hour through our communities
- a median crash barrier and banked turns, encouraging reckless driving
- extra-large car lanes, leaving room for only a narrow sidewalk on one side of the street

In 2010, the City of L.A. set a goal for itself to install bike lanes on Hyperion Ave. There is no reason for this project not to fulfill that goal. Moreover, Hyperion Avenue needs bike lanes precisely because it connects two communities, both of which have a huge, fast-growing number of bicyclists and pedestrians. Our city streets are not freeways! They are avenues for safely moving traffic, pedestrians and bicyclists throughout our communities.

Sincerely,
Kathryn Savage
12354 Sarah Street
Studio City, CA 91604
-----
Subject: 130930 0838-2
From: Will Clark [clarkws@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, September 27, 2013 8:33 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
     mayor.garcetti@lacity.org

Subject: No Hyperion Freeway!
I must say, I’m very disappointed with the design for Hyperion Ave, one of
the EXTREMELY few routes crossing the 5 and the LA River between Silverlake
and Atwater Village, and an area that already very strongly privileges car
traffic to the detriment of all other modes of transit. This is the kind of
retrograde thinking that Los Angeles has been trying to change in its
infrastructure and planning, and this design sends the wrong message to
pedestrians, cyclists and others who wish to experience their city in a
safe, humane way.
As someone who travels frequently in this area as a cyclist and as a
pedestrian, I find these proposals disappointing, and against the ethos of
comprehensive transit advocated by our newly elected mayor, who should lead
this issue by endorsing a redesign for Hyperion Ave that comprehensively
and safely encourages the multiple forms of transportation other than
automobiles. Such a project would include:

   Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
   Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
   Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and
   pedestrians and discourage speeding
   No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even
   faster
   A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people
   access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists
   an alternative through the dangerous merge
There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan
and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest
barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This
project can change that and make all travelers benefit.
You have an opportunity to do this right.
Sincerely,
Will
--
310.924.7318
-----
Subject: 130930 0838-3
From: John Cork [johncork@mac.com]
Sent: Friday, September 27, 2013 8:28 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: mayor.garcetti@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
tom.labonge@lacity.org
Subject: Hyperion: Let’s do it right!
A great deal of time, effort and passion was put into the LA 2010 Master Bike Plan, and part of that was recognition that Hyperion was an important street that needed improvement for pedestrians and cyclists.
I know. I use it all the time.
Silver Lake and Atwater Village are burgeoning neighborhoods, filled with folks who want to walk to cafes, shops, clubs and neighbors. They have grown to be so popular because they have developed a street life independent of the car traffic that flows through them. The LA River and the 5 freeway have worked as social and economic barriers between these two great neighborhoods. How CalTrans deals with Hyperion changes will help unify or hamper this wonderful community.
This is an area filled with schools - public and private. This is an area filled with cyclists who want and need many safe access points to the LA River Path - a crown jewel of the area. Any changes in Hyperion need to take into consideration the requirements of students who want to walk or bike to school and the practical needs of those who use the LA River Path on a regular basis. I know folks who do not use the path but live less than two-tenths of a mile from it. Why? They feel they can’t get to an entrance safely on their bicycles.
The other morning, I was compelled to drive from Glendale into Silver Lake via Hyperion. It was a slow-moving train of cars. Many drivers were talking on their phones. Some were texting. No cyclists used Hyperion while I was in that traffic jam.
Now, I want you to imagine another scenario. Same traffic jam, but in the bike lanes are dozens of cyclists huffing past every couple of minutes. On the sidewalks are a steady stream of walkers. The cyclists move faster than the traffic. LAPD has responsibly cracked down on the distracted drivers, who now look at the scene rather than their cell phone screens. And each day, a few more of those drivers do the calculus - the cyclists are moving; the drivers are not. The cyclists look like they are having fun; the drivers are not. And each day, another kid going to Franklin or Ivanhoe or Lyceé thinks they might want to ride a bike to school rather than ride in a car.
And each week, there is one less car in the Hyperion traffic jam.
You can make that happen. You can make these neighborhoods stronger. You can raise the safety and quality of life quotients for those in all the neighborhoods that access the LA River Path by making Hyperion safe for cyclists and walkers. You can strengthen the businesses of the neighborhoods by giving those who ride and walk the path better access to the wonderful cafes and shops of Atwater and Silver Lake.
Do the right thing. Make the work on Hyperion reflect the values of those who live there. Los Angeles may be “life in the fast lane,” but more and more are choosing “life in the bike lane.” Honor that choice.
Best,
John Cork
2516 Kenilworth Ave.
Los Angeles, CA 90039
323 273-1375
-----
Subject: 130930 0839-1
From: David Matsu [davidmatsu@earthlink.net]
Sent: Friday, September 27, 2013 8:38 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: Hyperion-Glendale bridge complex redesign
Ms. Podesta, Mr. Mayor, and Distinguished Councilmen,
I am writing to express my severe concern about the proposed redesign of
the Hyperion-Glendale bridge complex. This structure links a variety of
mid-sized and small local roadways with commercial and residential
neighborhoods. My first concern is that the bridges are being designed to
accommodate highway level traffic speeds of up to 55 mph. These bridge
spans are short and end on all sides in dense areas with lots of local
traffic, pedestrians, shops, and homes. There is simply no reason to design
this structure to encourage drivers to reach freeway speeds. It is unsafe
and provides no benefit to traffic flow as these high speeds will only
produce back ups at either end as well as leading to increased collisions.
Perhaps more importantly, the roadway design that would allow these high
speeds requires that there would be little to no remaining space on the
bridges to accommodate cyclists or pedestrians in any reasonable manner.
Not only is this extremely short-sighted, it directly violates Los Angeles’
Complete Streets policy that requires the access of all users to be a
primary consideration in road design. This area is a key linkage point
across the Los Angeles River with no nearby alternatives serving these
important neighborhoods. It should provide access for all people.
Whatever is constructed, we will be living with it for literally
generations. I strongly encourage you to follow common sense and the law
and move forward with a design that will accommodate safe movement by all
people while encouraging safe driving and smooth traffic flow.
Thank you for your attention.
David Matsu
Los Angeles, CA
-----
Subject: 130930 0839-2
From: Ray Simmons [rayinla@aol.com]
Sent: Friday, September 27, 2013 9:04 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org

Subject: Hyperion-Glendale Bridge Design

I am writing to express my dismay that the Department of Transportation and Bureau of Engineering has proposed redesigning the Hyperion-Glendale Bridge to accommodate 55 mph speeds.

The fact that currently drivers recklessly speed over this iconic bridge is not a reason to increase the allowed/engineered speed. Rather DOT/BOE should pursue TRAFFIC CALMING measures. This bridge is not part of a freeway and increased speeds on our streets lead to more accidents and more importantly FATALITIES.

Our roads should not be viewed as automobile sewers to "throughput" as many vehicles as possible. They should be designed to accommodate all users SAFELY.

Ray Simmons
821 S Mansfield Ave Apt 1
Los Angeles CA 90036

"The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no Warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by Oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized." - Amendment IV, The Constitution of the United States of America.

"All, too, will bear in mind this sacred principle, that though the will of the majority is in all cases to prevail, that will, to be rightful, must be reasonable; that the minority possess their equal rights, which equal laws must protect, and to violate would be oppression." - Thomas Jefferson

-----
Subject: 130930 0839-3
From: Emily Morishita [more.emily@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, September 27, 2013 9:11 PM
To: Podesta, Tami @DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; mayorgarcetti@lacity.org
Subject: Looming disaster of Hyperion/Glendale bridge redesign

Hello,

I am a resident in Council District 13 and was a supporter of both O'Farrell and Garcetti in this past year's elections.

As a person growing more and more concerned about pedestrian safety, I am outraged and saddened to hear that the Hyperion/Glendale bridge is planned to be redesigned to accommodate speeding cars over safety. I've read that the new design will accommodate speeds up to 55 miles per hour, since that is currently the average speed on this bridge. So the lesson learned seems to be that if you are ignoring the speed limit and driving 55mph we will reward you by changing the road to accommodate you. This is ludicrous.

What I love about the Glendale Blvd area there in Atwater Village is the small town, main street feel that has developed by a good mix of businesses. But now we are encouraging speeding cars to dump into this business area (and residential area).

Our engineers and politicians should be more proactive in preventing this type of roadway and bridge from being developed.

Sincerely,
Emily Morishita

-----
Subject: Bicycle and Pedestrian accommodations needed on Hyperion-Glendale Bridge

Hi Tami,

I am thoroughly disgusted by the proposed re-design of the Hyperion-Glendale Bridge. Bridges are supposed to connect communities, not serve as a barrier between them - a barrier that can only be crossed if one wishes to contribute to our region's terrible air quality by driving one's car to travel a relatively short distance. Comfortable bicycle and pedestrian accommodations are needed on the new bridge. We are no longer living in 1955, energy prices will continue to rise and trips that can be made without climbing into the car will become the norm. High speeds should not be accommodated - they should be slowed to a reasonable speed that reflects the reality on both ends of the bridge - pedestrians on Glendale Ave and homes and a CHURCH on Hyperion.

Please reconsider your proposed BARRIER and design a BRIDGE for the community.

Regards,
Josh Handel
Subject: 130930 0840
From: John E. Kerr [johnkerr87@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, September 27, 2013 10:08 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: mayor.garcetti@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org
Subject: Hyperion/Glendale bridge

Hello,

I am a resident of Los Angeles’ Silver Lake neighborhood. I routinely travel to Atwater Village to see friends, shop, and eat, and I routinely take the Hyperion Bridge to connect between the two neighborhoods. As such, it is with much interest I have been following the proposed redesign of the bridge.

Unfortunately, the current plan is way out of line with the character of the neighborhood. As it stands now, drivers speed over the bridge at speeds in excess of 55mph, and it seems that the bridge is going to be designed to freeway standards. This is simple unacceptable. As someone who commutes via bicycle, the bridge complex, especially the Hyperion segments, should be redesigned to encourage slower speed and include bicycle and pedestrian upgrades. There should be wide sidewalks on either side of the historic structure, providing views of the L.A. River below.

Hyperion is the most convenient way for cyclists and pedestrians in Silver Lake to get to Atwater, as it avoids having to descend down the hill to the river ad then back up the opposite banks. It is wide enough, I believe to accommodate a cycle track, or psychically separated bike lane.

As it stands now, this bridge project is a disgrace and will encourage dangerously high speeds on both sides of the bridge. Please reconsider the plans for this bridge and adopt a plan that respects low speed limits, bicycle riders, and pedestrians.

Sincerely,

John E. Kerr
Silver Lake resident

-----
Subject: 130930 0841-1  
From: Brian Retchless  
[mailto:brian.rechless@gmail.com<brian.rechless@gmail.com>]  
Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2013 6:43 PM  
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT  
Subject: Hyperion/Glendale Bridge  

Hello,  

I recently learned of the plan to widen the Hyperion & Glendale bridges, more specifically that bike lanes are being left out.  

While I understand that the Hyperion section of the bridge is only so wide and that removing an auto traffic lane is politically untenable, I'm surprised that either a bike lane or cycletrack has not been proposed for the Glendale Blvd sections. Considering the bridge is already being widened, adding provisions for bicycles seems like a no-brainer.  

I hope you'll consider some form of real bike connectivity for the bridge widening.  

best,  
Brian Retchless  
-----
Subject: 130930 0841-2
From: Kristen Cruise [mailto:kcruise@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, September 25, 2013 7:05 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Subject: Hyperion/Glendale bridge

Dear Ms. Podesta,
I recently moved from Santa Monica to Los Feliz. I used to commute to work on my bike in Santa Monica. I would love to do the same in Los Feliz. However, I do not feel safe on the Hyperion/Glendale bridge, and I know I am not the only person who feels this way. I ask for your support of the addition of bike lanes to the upcoming renovation and improvement plan for this corridor. This would also strengthen the economic and cultural exchange between Los Feliz/Silverlake and Atwater.
Thank you for your making our neighborhood safe, more environmentally responsible and more welcoming.
Kindly,
Kristen Cruise
e| kcruise@gmail.com
c| 310.846.7151
-----
Subject: 130930 0841-3
From: nathan carballo [nathan.carballo@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, September 27, 2013 10:52 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: Hyperion/Glendale Bridge

Tami,

Unfortunately I was not able to make it to a community discussion concerning the changes planned on the Hyperion/Glendale viaduct that links Silver Lake and Atwater Village. After hearing what said plans are, I am afraid as a cyclist.

By adding an entrance to the LA river bike path, it is clear that the concerns of cyclists in the community are somewhat important to you. This is why I feel it needs to be said that the redesign of what seems to be towards that more of a highway, with cement medians and banked turns, only encourages already high speeds dangerous to cyclists. Why is the city encouraging drivers who are driving over the posted speed limits by catering a new design towards them?

When voting in the recent election, my decisions were HEAVILY based on each candidate’s support of the city’s cyclists and pedestrians. During campaigning, Mayor Garcetti praised the growing cycling, pedestrian, and public transit community in this city. Why does it seem this project is putting us on the back burner then?

I hope this message is heard and is taken into the consideration of the candidates whom I voted for, because I believed they had my back. Thank you so much for your time.

Nathan Carballo
nathan.carballo@gmail.com
805-512-3166

--

Nathan Carballo
I.A.T.S.E. Local 728
805-512-3166
nathan.carballo@gmail.com
Subject: 130930 0841-4
From: lakersalex [lakersalex@yahoo.com]
Sent: Saturday, September 28, 2013 12:58 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: Opposition to Hyperion-Glendale Complex of Bridges Rehabilitation
Project
While the current proposal is a lose-lose, there’s still time to halt the
project and turn things around. This project needs to go back to the
drawing board, with a new set of criteria.
The streets of our cities and towns are an important part of the livability
of our communities. They ought to be for everyone, whether young or old,
motorist or bicyclist, walker or wheelchair user, bus rider or shopkeeper.
But too many of our streets are designed only for speeding cars, or worse,
creeping traffic jams.
The current plan serves 1 priority: maximizing the theoretical throughput
of vehicles at the greatest velocity possible.
Please redesign this project with the idea that a 9 year old girl riding on
a bicycle can safely make her way across this bridge.
-----
Subject: 130930 0841-5
From: Vyki Englert [vyki.englert@gmail.com]
Sent: Saturday, September 28, 2013 3:52 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: Please consider bikes as a vehicle, esp in regards to Hyperion Bridge

Over, and over it has been proven with studies in cities big and small that cycling is not only a viable transportation alternative, but one that is necessary to build strong healthy neighborhoods. LA deserves to be a strong and healthy community.

As an experienced road cyclist that bikes often up to 18 miles each way to my workplace on the west side, I am used to navigating the roads in LA. Recently I have been riding across the existing construction and have been nervous as I navigate a narrow < 9ft wide road painted with sharrows and cars moving at speeds greater than 40mph.

Due to flat terrain, and beautiful weather, the potential here for a viable cycling culture is unparalleled in this country. Take this chance to show LA you are willing and ready to become the next bike city and improve the quality of life for everyone on the roads.

As someone who bikes or walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:

- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster

A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge. There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,
Vyki Englert
120 S Vignes Street Apt 403, Los Angeles, CA 90012
Subject: 130930 0842-1
From: Mike Stein [mike.j.stein@gmail.com]
Sent: Saturday, September 28, 2013 5:32 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Subject: Hyperion Bridge Redesign
Please rethink the proposed Hyperion bridge redesign, so it is pedestrian and bike friendly.
Building a bridge to facilitate 55 MPH traffic, is building a bridge that is incredibly dangerous for anybody that isn’t in a car.
The Hyperion bridge connects communities in East LA, and spans what could become a beautiful LA river. People should be encouraged to walk and bike across it.
Hyperion isn’t a freeway. Instead of designing a bridge because people have been speeding on it, let’s design a bridge that encourages driving safely, and leaves a safe place for people on foot and bike to enjoy Los Angeles.
-----
Subject: 130930 0842-2
From: Jenni Armstrong [geekchick@geekchick.biz]
Sent: Friday, September 27, 2013 5:21 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT; tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: Hyperion Blvd is a 35mph street
Dear Tami
I am formally requesting that a PUBLIC HEARING be held regarding the Hyperion Glendale Ave Viaduct Improvement Project.
What steps do I need to take to make this happen?
Thank you
--

Jenni Armstrong | 106 1/2 Judge John Aiso St. #249, Los Angeles, CA 90012 | geekchick.biz<http://geekchick.biz/> | serving west Los Angeles since 2005 | phone: 310-42-JENNI (310-425-3664) | exclusive technical, internet, network and workstation advice for professionals, proprietors and leaders | geekchick@geekchick.biz<mailto:geekchick@geekchick.biz>
Subject: 130930 0842-3
From: Jenny Morataya [mailto:jenny8morataya@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, September 26, 2013 12:04 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All

As someone who bikes or walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:
Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge
There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.
Sincerely,
Jenny Morataya
2611 Canada Blvd
Glendale, Ca 91208
Subject: 130930 0843 (Referenced as 131108 0847-2 in the E-mail Database)
From: Kathryn Savage [kmsavage@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, September 30, 2013 4:11 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT; tom.labonge@lacity.org;
councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: Public Hearing - Hyperion Bridge Design
Dear Tami Podesta,
I would like to formally request that a public hearing be held regarding
the Hyperion Glendale Ave Viaduct Improvement Project.
Please let me know how we can make this happen
Most Sincerely,
Kathryn Savage
-----
Subject: 130930 0932-1
From: danger [mailto:danger3d@gmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, September 29, 2013 10:51 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
    mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: Subject: No Hyperion Freeway – Build a Safe Viaduct for All

As someone who bikes or walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:

- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
- A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,
David H. Aretsky
5654 oakdale ave.
woodland hills, ca
91367
-----

To Whom it May Concern,

My name is Severin Martinez, I am a resident of Northeast LA and I frequently spend time in the areas affected by the proposed Hyperion Freeway Project, formally known as the Glendale-Hyperion Viaduct Improvement Project.

After reviewing the informational website about this project (http://www.glendalehyperion.com), and viewing the youtube video with commentary from Mayor Garcetti, and Councilmembers LaBonge, and O'Farrell, I have a number of concerns with the current proposal design specifics.

Firstly, I am surprised that if this bridge is to be a permanent replacement that it provides absolutely no bicycle infrastructure along Hyperion Avenue. As you may know, the 2010 LA Bike Plan (approved by the city council when LaBonge and Garcetti both sat on the council) calls for bike lanes on Hyperion Avenue yet bike lanes are absent from the bridge retrofit. If this project is built without bike lanes we will simply have to go back and add bike lanes at a later date, an unnecessary and costly measure considering that bike lanes could be directly incorporated into the new bridge design. Yes, this project includes a separate bicycle-pedestrian bridge connecting to the LA River, however this does not preclude the need for bike lanes on Hyperion Avenue. If Hyperion will be designed for 55mph, it will be critical to have fully-separated bike lanes (also known as cycle tracks) across Hyperion Avenue. Sharrows will do absolutely nothing to improve safety or comfort of cycling on Hyperion Avenue and besides the approved LA Bike Plan calls for bike lanes, not sharrows.

Secondly, I am concerned about the part of this proposal that calls for eliminating the sidewalk on the eastbound side and widening the sidewalk on the westbound side of Hyperion. Of course, by eliminating pedestrian access on one side, any trip made by foot across the bridge suddenly becomes less convenient because if they approach the bridge on the eastbound side, they are forced to cross to get onto the westbound side then potentially needing to cross back to the eastbound side if that is where their destination is. Maintaining pedestrian access on both sides of the bridge will also offer pedestrians the opportunity to have more fantastic views of the LA River from the bridge. I understand that Garcetti, LaBonge, and O'Farrell are all champions of the LA River restoration– there is no reason why we should lose pedestrian access on the eastbound side of Hyperion Avenue as this will eliminate a unique vantage point of the LA River and surrounding urban landscape that is so uniquely
Thirdly, 12ft and 14ft wide motor vehicle lanes are grossly excessive. It is a well-known fact that wider lanes encourage and tolerate higher speeds. What is the compelling reason to make lanes so wide when it will only allow for higher speeds? I assume the response will be because Caltrans standards call for minimum 12ft wide lanes. But what has this standard given us? Streets are no safer when lanes are this wide. Throughout Los Angeles many of the heaviest traveled streets have traffic lanes no wider than 11ft. When the LA Department of Transportation wants to make streets safer, they will narrow excessively wide lanes and create bike lanes. This proposal goes against the city's own practice of narrowing lanes to reduce speeding and improve safety. The basis of the wide travel lane standard assumes that bicyclists are non-existant and that the societal goal is to have traffic moving at high speeds. This may have been our societal goal in the 1970's but we have realized that higher speeds and wider lanes lead to more collisions in an urban context.

I am also opposed to any crash barriers. Crash barriers are a response to excessive, dangerous, and illegal speeding by drivers. However, if this bridge is to re-designed, it can be engineered to discourage speeding, namely through the implementation of narrower travel lanes. Crash barriers anticipate high speed collisions, this is why we have crash barriers dividing traffic on freeways. However, this bridge, and our neighborhood streets are no freeways nor should they be treated as such. The presence of sidewalks and bicycle infrastructure on both sides of the bridge should take precedence over a crash barrier for motorists. Ask yourself– what kind of a proposal is this if it offers crash barriers for motorists but offers no physical protection or consideration for cyclists?

I would also suggest a complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge.

What is being proposed is a dangerous situation that neglects to take into the comfort and safety of people walking and cycling. It should also be noted that high speeds across this bridge will degrade the experience along the LA River as it will only add to the noise and stress one deals with accessing the LA River on foot.

In reflecting on this project, I have some questions:

Does California not have a complete streets law– why is it being ignored on this bridge proposal?

Does the LA Bike Plan not call for bike lanes on Hyperion Avenue– why is this approved plan being ignored on this bridge proposal?

Will 12ft and 14ft wide lanes tolerate or encourage drivers to go faster than having 10ft or 11ft wide lanes? If so, how does this make the bridge...
safer if higher speeds are more likely to cause vehicular carnage?

Does the current bridge proposal make it safe or pleasant for parents to cycle with their children across Hyperion? If not, why are we not designing the bridge so that families can safely and comfortably cycle?

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Thank you for your time,

Severin Martinez
4658 Loleta Ave, 90041
-----
Subject: 130930 0936

From: Jeff Cannon [mailto:cannon.jeffrey@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, September 30, 2013 9:15 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All

As someone who bikes or walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Hyperion is the only direct route connecting these two neighborhoods. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community.

Even as it stands, avid cyclists like myself go well out of their way to avoid the Hyperion viaduct due to the lack of bicycle lanes and the predominance of high-speed motorists. The current plan will certainly make Los Angeles even less safe for cyclists and pedestrians alike.

Specifically, I would like the project to include:

- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turned that will make people drive even faster

- A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project not to be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,

Jeff Cannon
Silver Lake resident and daily cyclist
3342 Hamilton Way
Los Angeles, CA 90026
-----
Subject: 130930 0951-1
From: Debra Beck [prubx@comcast.net]
Sent: Saturday, September 28, 2013 6:03 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Subject: Hyperion Ave Plans in L.A.
My daughter and her spouse live on Hyperion Ave. and ride their bikes to work. I am fearful for them already; the removal of bike lanes will be truly hazardous for them. Please work with Los Angeles to change the new, drastic roadwork plans.
Thank you,
Debra E. Beck
-----
Subject:  130930 0951-2
From: KEVIN HOPPS [kevinhopps@me.com]
Sent: Sunday, September 29, 2013 6:26 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: We don't need a Hyperion Freeway - Please build a safe Viaduct for everyone.

Dear Ms. Podesta,

If we are going to make an honest effort to help Los Angeles combat climate change and become an alternative transportation friendly county, we need to take into consideration the needs of cyclists and pedestrians. Freeway speeds have no place on city streets. Our streets need to be safe for those who bike and for those who walk. Therefore, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Avenue be made safe for cyclists and pedestrians. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:

- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs.
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding.

No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster. A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge.

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,
Kevin Hopps
12015 Kling Street
Valley Village, CA 91604
Subject: 130930 1101-1 (Referenced as 131001 1509 in the E-mail Database)
From: Esther M. [mailto:esther90026@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, September 30, 2013 9:56 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
    mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All

As someone who bikes or walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:

- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
- A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,
Esther Mazmanyan
1454 Glendale Blvd
Los Angeles, CA 90026
-----
Subject: 130930 1101-2 (Referenced as 131001 1506-2 in the E-mail Database)
From: Stephen Roullier [mailto:stephen.roullier@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Monday, September 30, 2013 10:01 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Subject: Hyperion Bridge

I was disappointed to learn that the plan recently unveiled for the Hyperion Bridge contains insufficient provisions for improving pedestrian and bicycle access and safety on the bridge. I believe that such a plan is ill conceived and disregards the needs and wishes of the residents of the surrounding neighborhoods.

I am a resident of Echo Park and I travel to Silver Lake and Atwater three or four times a week via bicycle. I patronize businesses in those neighborhoods and I ride the Los Angeles River bike path for exercise and recreation. At some point or another, all bicycle routes from my neighborhood to Atwater and back are difficult, dangerous and often both. The Hyperion Bridge is the most direct route between Silver Lake and Atwater, yet current conditions on the bridge make bicycle travel hazardous, and pedestrian use highly unpleasant.

I believe that as Los Angeles becomes inevitably denser, the only way for it to continue to function effectively is by encouraging modes of transportation besides the use of the personal automobile. The Hyperion Bridge is a classic design and an iconic feature of the neighborhood. We now have an opportunity to update the functionality of that design with an eye to the future of our city. I strongly urge you to change the current plan - which turns the Hyperion Bridge into a dangerous mini-freeway with no regard for the safe passage of pedestrians and cyclists - and instead put your efforts into devising and supporting a plan that serves our entire community.

Sincerely,

Stephen Roullier
1701 Clinton St. 90026

-----
Subject: 131001 1501-1
From: Roscoe Gordo [mailto:roscoe.gordo@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, September 30, 2013 11:57 PM
To: Podesta, Tami @DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All

As someone who bikes or walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:

- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
- A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,
Roscoe Aquilo-Gordo
-----
Subject: 131001 1501-2
From: colintb@earthlink.net [mailto:colintb@earthlink.net]
Sent: Monday, September 30, 2013 6:26 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org
Cc: mayor.garcetti@lacity.org; tom.labonge@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All
Dear Ms. Podesta and Council Member O’Farrell,

As someone who bikes between Silver Lake/Los Feliz and Atwater Village/Glendale, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. There are currently three main routes across the Los Angeles River and 5 Freeway in the area near the Hyperion Bridge (Los Feliz, Hyperion, Fletcher) and NONE of them have bicycle facilities for east/west travelers. The total lack of east/west bicycle infrastructure at these three locations is the greatest obstacle for people on bikes who might want to travel across the River and the I-5. Among the three routes, Hyperion is the worst and the one most in need of improvement. Everyone’s needs can be met if the Hyperion project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. I’m very disappointed that the current proposal falls short of serving the needs of people on bikes or on foot. Specifically, I would like the Hyperion project to include:

1. Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
2. Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs.
3. Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding.
4. No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster.
5. A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the City of LA Bike Plan and Caltrans’ complete streets policy. The Hyperion viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,

Colin Bogart
1340 N. Edgemont St.
Los Angeles, CA 90027

-----
Subject: 131001 1501-3
From: jwhall@dslextreme.com [mailto:jwhall@dslextreme.com]
Sent: Monday, September 30, 2013 6:07 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All

I neither bike nor walk between Silver Lake and Atwater Village on a
regular basis, however the proposed changes to Hyperion Ave are of grave
care to me. It's alarming that a new design would totally ignore the
burgeoning "Complete Streets" concept this far into the 21st century.

The abandonment of the 2010 Bicycle Plan lanes fits perfectly into the
apparent mindset at work in developing this "improvement". The greatest
concern though is that it is just one in a myriad of future projects. With
that said, does it become the precedent for the future abandonment of
non-motorized transportation accommodations?

Think about it. Think about those affected by it. Maybe someone you know.

Sincerely,

John Hall
24812 Hoeseshoe LN
Newhall CA, 91321
-----
Subject: 131001 1502-1
From: Thomas, Greg (NBCUniversal) [mailto:Gregory.Thomas@nbcuni.com]
Sent: Monday, September 30, 2013 6:04 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: Hyperion Bridge Project

As someone who lives at the Atwater base of the bridge, and bikes, walks, and drives between Silver Lake and Atwater Village EVERY DAY, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Traffic at this junction needs to be slowed down not sped up. I hear horrendous crashes all the time and I fear they will only get worse with higher speeds. Specifically, I would like the project to include:

- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster

And especially this:
- A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,
Greg Thomas
2974 Glendale Blvd.
Atwater Village, CA 90039
-----
Subject: 131001 1502-2
From: cstegallucla@gmail.com [mailto:cstegallucla@gmail.com] On Behalf Of Chris Stegall
Sent: Monday, September 30, 2013 5:26 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: Hyperion Freeway? - Let's Make it Safe For Everyone!

Hey there,
As someone who bikes and walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me (and the rest of us voters). Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:
· Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
· Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with way-finding signs
· Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and to discourage speeding
· No crash barrier and no banked turns that will only make people drive even faster
· A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge.

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,
Chris Stegall
11168 Acama St.
Studio City, CA 91602
-----
Subject: 131001 1502-3
From: eric potter [mailto:echoparkguitar@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, September 30, 2013 5:11 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org; Marcel Porras
Subject: Request for Public Hearing - Hyperion bridge project
hello - this is from eric potter, most of us have met through my work with
the Bicycle Kitchen, though i’m writing you on a personal level.
this Hyperion Bridge plan sounds terrible. i commute by bicycle on that
bridge everyday to my studio. it is a little dangerous right now, but it
appears this new plan will make it even MORE DANGEROUS.

i’m REQUESTING A PUBLIC HEARING for this project. it is completely out
of scale for the neighborhood that it should serve.
sincerely,
eric potter
-----
Subject: 1310001 1503-2
From: Daniel Martinez [mailto:danielmartinez323@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, September 30, 2013 4:02 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway! - Build a Safe Viaduct for ALL

As someone who bikes and walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it
is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me.
Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate
speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project
to include:

- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians
  and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
  (which is bad enough as it is)
- A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access
  the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an
  alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan
and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest
barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This
project can change that and make all travelers benefit. I pray that
you listen to my concerns which are consistent throughout the city. With
more LA citizens considering commuting via bicycles, it is imperative that
they are not discouraged by plans to making our streets into highway type
streets. It is dangerous enough having drivers zoom past us at 35 mph, if
this street turns into a 55 mph street with no bike lanes, it will be a far
more dangerous pathway that many use to head towards Silverlake, Koreatown,
Hollywood and beyond! So let’s be more compassionate for each other
and let’s start making moves towards a safer and bike friendly LA!

Sincerely, Daniel Martinez

-----
Subject: 131001 1504-1
From: Lance Kanawi [mailto:lanceka@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, September 30, 2013 3:27 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: Hyperion Bridge rehab

I am a car-free resident of Los Angeles who finds myself making use of the Hyperion bridge on a regular basis, both on foot and on a bike. I was very disturbed when I heard about the plans to change the roadway on the bridge. The proposed freeway-like redesign strikes me as a plan from a bygone era, when the city was only concerned with flushing cars through the streets as fast as possible. LA has clearly entered a new era of multi-modal transportation, and those responsible for designing large infrastructure projects like this need to catch up. Specifically, there needs to be bike lanes on Hyperion Ave, as well as ADA-compliant sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks. The traffic lanes should be of standard urban-arterial width, to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding. The addition of a crash barrier and banked turns will make people drive even faster, and is probably the worst idea in the plan. Finally, we need a complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge, since proper lane striping for cyclists in situations like that seem to be beyond our traffic engineers at the moment.

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the city's bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Thank you for your time,

-Lance Kanawi
-----
Subject: 131001 1504-2
From: Bronwyn Beck [mailto:bronwyn@jokeisup.com]
Sent: Monday, September 30, 2013 1:43 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
    mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All

As someone who bikes and walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it
is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me.
Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate
speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project
to include:
  - Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
  - Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
  - Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and
    pedestrians and discourage speeding
  - No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even
    faster
  - A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people
    access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists
    an alternative through the dangerous merge

I live on Hyperion Ave. just off the bridge and frequently walk and bike
into Atwater Village. Every day I see motorists speeding off the bridge in
front of my house at extremely unsafe speeds, and I oppose any plan that
would encourage even higher speeds along this corridor. I often feel unsafe
as a pedestrian and cyclist on the bridge as it is; any rehabilitation plan
would need to make the bridge safer and more accessible for people like me
who are simply trying to walk through their neighborhood, not more
dangerous.

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan
and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest
barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This
project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,
Bronwyn Beck
3005 Hyperion Ave.
Los Angeles, CA 90027
-----
Hello,

Like many other people, I was appalled to hear that the bike plan for the Hyperion Blvd. bridge was being ignored and a new, freeway-like design was being proposed in its place. I truly do not understand the logic of this. Is the problem with this bridge that people are not able to go fast enough? Certainly not. The problem is that people already do go far too fast. Providing safety measures to allow for these speeds to continue rather than mitigating the speeding itself would ultimately be counterproductive. It would certainly be less safe for cyclists and pedestrians but also will continue to be unsafe for drivers. If they can safely go 40mph, they will go 55; if you increase it to 55, they will go 65 or 70. That's the way driving works.

Inconveniencing -- and endangering -- cyclists and pedestrians so cars can go a little faster for such a short distance is not only ridiculous, it is shameful. If the current design is not safe for people to drive at the speed they do (and it's not), then just add some speed bumps or something. It's a bridge, not a freeway.

--
Sean Deyoe
439 S. Hobart Blvd. LA, CA 90020
-----
Subject: 131001 1504-4
From: Joe Bayes [mailto:jbayes@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, September 30, 2013 1:12 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: Please include pedestrian and bike access in the Hyperion Bridge redesign
Ms. Podesta,
I was disturbed to learn that Caltrans and the BOE are proposing redesigning the Hyperion bridge to freeway standards to accommodate 55mph motorized traffic, to the detriment of pedestrian and bicycle users of that bridge. The redesign has one substandard-width sidewalk and no bicycle lane, contrary to LA’s 2010 Bike Plan.
This bridge is in the middle of an urban area and connects two walkable residential areas, and any redesign should reflect that.
Please design the bridge to calm traffic to a speed that’s safe for residential and pedestrian areas, and include bike lanes and ample sidewalks on both sides of the bridge.
Thank you.
--
Joe Bayes -- jbayes@gmail.com
-----
Subject: 131001 1505-1
From: Mario Ramírez [mailto:unesceptico@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, September 30, 2013 12:18 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Subject: Hyperion Ave I-5 bridge in Los Angeles

Dear Ms. Podesta,
I am writing to register my objection to the Hyperion Ave bridge project as currently designed, specifically the plan to build the lanes to freeway standards with a 55 MPH speed limit. This is a dangerous and anti-neighborhood plan that is completely out of place in a dense city with plenty of residents and pedestrians using the bridge and adjacent roads. Please allow bike lanes and traffic calming to happen, Los Angeles deserves better than this car centric plan.
Mario Ramírez
-----
Subject: 131001 1505-2
From: Ryan Gratzer [mailto:gratzer@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, September 30, 2013 11:26 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: Please make the Hyperion-Glendale bridges more bike/ped friendly

I read that the Hyperion-Glendale bridges are slated for a redesign, and
that they may be made even less bike/ped friendly than they are now.
I should note that I don't even bicycle (in LA - too dangerous for me).
But I drive over this bridge every day. I go with the flow of traffic,
which is usually 35-40mph. I don't understand the logic behind redesigning
a half mile long bridge that connects two business districts with 55mph
designs. These bridges aren't bottlenecks, and speeding drivers up just to
slow down again once they traverse the bridge doesn't do anything to
alleviate traffic. If anything, it will just encourage people to go faster
through Atwater and Silver Lake.
I think it's important to support connections between routes for all modes
of transportation. In Atwater on Glendale Blvd, there are bike lanes.
Those lanes disappear on the bridge, and don't reappear in Silver Lake.
Less people will use the lanes in Atwater if they can't make safe
connections from them to other destinations.
I hope you guys end up making design decisions that work for the long-term
future of all residents, regardless of their chosen mode of transportation.

Thanks,
Ryan Gratzer
-----
Subject: 131001 1506-1
From: Dion Johnson [mailto:johnson.dion.b@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, September 27, 2013 8:38 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
    mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All

Dear Tami Podesta,

I work and live near Silver Lake and Atwater Village. Believe me that is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:

- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
- A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,
Dion Johnson

--
Dion Johnson  |  Studio
2640 North San Fernando Road
Los Angeles, California  90065
www.dionjohnsonstudio.com
213.321.6521
-----
Subject: 131001 1506-2
From: Stephen Roullier [mailto:stephen.roullier@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Monday, September 30, 2013 10:01 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Subject: Hyperion Bridge

I was disappointed to learn that the plan recently unveiled for the
Hyperion Bridge contains insufficient provisions for improving pedestrian
and bicycle access and safety on the bridge. I believe that such a plan is
ill conceived and disregards the needs and wishes of the residents of the
surrounding neighborhoods.

I am a resident of Echo Park and I travel to Silver Lake and Atwater three
or four times a week via bicycle. I patronize businesses in those
neighborhoods and I ride the Los Angeles River bike path for exercise and
recreation. At some point or another, all bicycle routes from my
neighborhood to Atwater and back are difficult, dangerous and often both.
The Hyperion Bridge is the most direct route between Silver Lake and
Atwater, yet current conditions on the bridge make bicycle travel
hazardous, and pedestrian use highly unpleasant.

I believe that as Los Angeles becomes inevitably denser, the only way for
it to continue to function effectively is by encouraging modes of
transportation besides the use of the personal automobile. The Hyperion
Bridge is a classic design and an iconic feature of the neighborhood. We
now have an opportunity to update the functionality of that design with an
eye to the future of our city. I strongly urge you to change the current
plan - which turns the Hyperion Bridge into a dangerous mini-freeway with
no regard for the safe passage of pedestrians and cyclists - and instead
put your efforts into devising and supporting a plan that serves our entire
community.

Sincerely,

Stephen Roullier
1701 Clinton St. 90026
-----
Subject: 131001 1509
From: Esther M. [mailto:esther90026@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, September 30, 2013 9:56 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All

As someone who bikes or walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:

- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
- A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,
Esther Mazmanyan
1454 Glendale Blvd
Los Angeles, CA 90026
-----
Subject: 131001 1515
From: C R [mailto:chrismredwine@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, October 01, 2013 11:37 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All

Hello!
As someone who bikes between Silver Lake and Atwater Village (actually, I cycle ALL OVER Los Angeles county, all day, every day! There is hardly a street in LA that I don’t use to transport myself around, via bicycle), it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me.

PLEASE! Let’s make Los Angeles a safe and secure city, featuring environmentally-friendly and health-conscious modes of transportation, more readily available for the public. The only way to cut down on traffic congestion, is to support Metro, Cycling and Walking! PLEASE, do not let this important passageway become another extremely Un-safe zone, for people who choose not to support a lifestyle with polluting, dangerous vehicles. Thank you for listening and making the right choice!!!

Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:
Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge
There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,

Chris Redwine
Currently residing in North Hills, 91402
Los Angeles resident since 2005
-----
Subject: 131001 1516
From: Ben Cuevas [mailto:bencuevas@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, October 01, 2013 12:35 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org; board@silverlakenc.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All

As someone who bikes or walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:

Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,

Ben Cuevas
1307 Maltman Ave. Apt. 1
Los Angeles, CA 90026
bencuevas.com
bencuevas@gmail.com
323-698-4000

-----
Subject: 131001 1517-2
From: Kari Cassellius [mailto:smellslikechanel@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, October 01, 2013 12:54 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; ofarrell@lacity.org; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org;
board@silverlakenc.org
Subject: Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All

As someone who bikes between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:

Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Plus, if you don't put I bike lanes I'm just going to ride my bike over that bridge all the time anyhow and slow down traffic.

Sincerely,

Kari Cassellius
1710 Camino Palmero st #14
Los Angeles, CA 90046
-----
Subject: 131001 1518-1
From: Jason Jenn [mailto:jasonrebegin@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, October 01, 2013 1:05 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org; board@silverlakenc.org
Subject: Build a safe viaduct on Hyperion Ave

I am someone who bikes or walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village from time to time. I feel it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone's needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:

- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
- A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,

Jason Jenn 4364 1/2 Melrose Ave  Los Angeles, CA 90029
-----
Subject: Hyperion freeway?

As someone who bikes or walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, I feel it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:

- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
- A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,

William Schindler
2114 Hyperion Ave
Los Angeles

-----
Subject: 131002 0724
From: Danila Oder [mailto:doder@usc.edu]
Sent: Tuesday, October 01, 2013 3:36 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
    mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All
Dear Ms. Podesta:
As someone who bikes between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, I would like
to see the viaduct be 'calmed' to accommodate bikes and pedestrians as well
as cars. These two neighborhoods are characteristically low-rise and
pedestrian-scaled. A freeway-speed viaduct sets up expectations in drivers
that are soon to be disappointed, and makes for an incongruous transition
from freeway to neighborhood and vice versa.
Specifically, I would like the project to include:
Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs Narrower
traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and
discourage speeding No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people
drive even faster A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to
let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give
bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge
There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan
and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest
barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This
project can change that and make all travelers benefit.
Sincerely,
Danila Oder
530 S. Kingsley Dr. #402
Los Angeles, CA 90033
-----
Subject: 131002 0727
From: the one [mailto:larunner1@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Tuesday, October 01, 2013 3:39 PM
To: ‘William Schindler’; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org; Podesta, Tami L@DOT; ‘Sam Gennawey - Katherine Padilla & Associates’
Subject: RE: Hyperion freeway?

Mr. Schindler,

Perhaps you attended the informational meeting on the 25th at Friendship Hall. It has also been presented at the Silver Lake NC governing board meeting and at the SLNC Transportation and Public Works Committee meeting a couple months ago. I have copied the representative San Gennawey on this so he can hear your concerns. I do know that Council Member LaBonge brought this project to the attention of the community on several occasions a few years ago. I urge you to contact Mr. Gennawey and see where you can make further comments on the project. He has been very open to listening to the concerns and has been going out of his way to present the project.

Rusty Millar
SLNC

From: William Schindler [mailto:brotherwm@att.net <brotherwm@att.net>]
Sent: Tuesday, October 01, 2013 2:16 PM
To: councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org;
Tami.Podesta@dot.ca.gov; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org; board@silverlakenc.org
Subject: Hyperion freeway?

As someone who bikes or walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, I feel it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone's needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:
- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
- A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,
Subject: 131002 0728
From: Scott Epstein [scottevanepstein@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, October 01, 2013 11:34 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: Glendale/Hyperion viaduct
Dear Tami Podesta:
I write to you concerning the renovation of the Glendale/Hyperion viaduct complex of bridges. A huge renovation such as this project offers the perfect opportunity to accommodate all users, and I was very concerned to learn that the current plans do not include bike lanes on Hyperion that are in the 2010 bike plan, and is designed for fast traffic which would endanger bicyclists and pedestrians. Making this bridge bicycle and pedestrian friendly would also align to the city’s commendable efforts to revitalize the LA river.
Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:
- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge
There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.
Thank you very much for your consideration.
Sincerely,
Scott Epstein
608 N. Hayworth Avenue, Apt. 10
Los Angeles, CA 90048
-----
Subject: 131002 1000
From: Thiago Winterstein [mailto:ticoinla@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, October 02, 2013 9:47 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All

As someone who regularly bikes between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. I have often felt unsafe riding on the Hyperion bridge and have often thought that the city could do a lot to improve it. Many riders I know and ride with have commented on how unsafe that bridge is and I’ve heard several stories of cyclists being injured when struck by cars on that bridge, despite the cyclist riding safely and obeying the rules of the road.

Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:
- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
- A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,
Thiago Winterstein
Subject: 131002 1310
From: Leni Fleming [mailto:lenifleming@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, October 02, 2013 10:20 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT; tom.labonge@lacity.org; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: Hyperion Bridge

Dear Ms. Podesta, Councilman LaBonge and Mayor Garcetti:

I'm a longtime resident of Silver Lake and am writing to express my great concern about the current plan for the Hyperion Bridge.

Los Angeles must move forward, not backward. Focusing solely on convenience for automobile drivers (i.e. SPEED) is shortsighted. We need to be encouraging alternative means of getting around town. Two of the most basic are walking and biking.

The current plan for Hyperion virtually ignores both of these. Cyclists are relegated to the shoulder, at the same time that cars are going at least 55mph right beside them. Pedestrians will have a single sidewalk on this high-speed stretch of road. If, on the other hand, traffic lanes are narrower and there are dedicated bike lanes as well as sidewalks on both sides, everyone -- cyclists, walkers and drivers -- will get where they're going with greatly increased safety. It is true that the drive might then take a minute and a half rather than a minute -- but weigh that against a safer, more pleasant crossing for all 3 groups!

This bridge has the potential to be a significant symbol of progressive design for Los Angeles, with serious attention paid to cyclists and walkers -- as attention is paid in other major cities.

We ALL benefit by encouraging biking and walking. Planning this bridge with the sole goal of getting cars from point A to point B as fast as possible harks back to city planning in the 1950s, and does not reflect well on Los Angeles. We are more forward-thinking than that!

I appreciate your attention to my concerns.

Sincerely, Leni Fleming
2130 Apex Avenue
-----
Subject: 131003 0805
From: Ben Nero [mailto:ben.nero@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, October 02, 2013 2:07 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Subject: Glendale Hyperion bridge.

Mrs. Podesta,
Please add some sort of bike infrastructure to the Glendale-Hyperion project. I think that access is a major problem with the pedestrian bridge for cyclists. The options for using a bike to get from Silver Lake the Atwater Village will be go on some ridiculous, long, out of the way route, or ride on the freeway like bridge.
Thanks,
Ben Nero
-----
Subject: 131003 0808
From: Sally Schnitger [mailto:s.schnitger@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, October 02, 2013 3:38 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All

As someone who bikes or walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it
is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me.
Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate
speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project
to include:
- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and
pedestrians and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even
faster
- A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people
access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists
an alternative through the dangerous merge
There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike
plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the
greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA
River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,

Sarah Schnitger
1549 Winchester Avenue
Glendale, CA 91201

-----
Subject: 131003 0855
From: Susanna Schick [susanna@sustainablefashionla.com]
Sent: Thursday, October 03, 2013 2:12 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
    mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All
Dear Public Servants,
I voted for Eric Garcetti thinking he would expand upon the revolutionary
work Villaraigosa did before him, in implementing the 2010 bike plan. I
feel so foolish for having trusted Garcetti.
A city of almost 4 million and growing does not have room for 4 million
cars. We need more than 1% of us to ride bikes. Not just at CicLAvia, but
everywhere, every day. I used to be one of those 1% until I had my pelvis
shattered by a car. Unfortunately it was an LAPD car, so there was no way
to prove this happened. I know perfectly well the fractures I experienced
are impossible falling off a bicycle at 18mph. But that’s in the past, and
I want to move forward.
The PTSD has made it hard for me to feel safe enough to ride around LA like
I used to, so I rarely ride my bicycle now. But the LA river is the only
place where I do feel safe. However, the only roads that offer access from
the LA river to local restaurants are all terrifying. I would love to be
able to just pedal up to Silverlake for lunch, shopping, etc.
The city needs to become a safe place for cyclists. By making it safer,
more people will ride instead of drive, reducing traffic congestion,
freeing people’s disposable income to be spent on local businesses instead
of gas, and making LA a more awesome place for everyone. Why wouldn’t you
want that?
Even Ford has recognized that people don’t want to sit in cars all the
time, and now offers a Ford-branded Pedago, as reported here:
My article summarizing the research Ford did on the future of
transportation, the full book is something I’d be happy to share with any
of you. Practically every trend they identify shows people moving away from
cars into walkable, bikeable communities:
http://gas2.org/2013/07/01/forget-the-prius-effect-here-comes-the-matrix-effect/Please
do the right thing to make LA great. Portland only spent $60 million
over the past 18 years to become the most bike-friendly city in America.
We’re spending over $1billion just to widen the 405!
As someone who bikes between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is
absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me.
Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate
speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project
to include:
- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and
  pedestrians and discourage speeding
No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge
There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Many Thanks,
Susanna Schick, MBA
Sustainable Fashion LA<http://www.sustainablefashionla.com/>
919.265.9608

-----
Subject: 131003 0858
From: John Samarjian [samarjohn@aol.com]
Sent: Thursday, October 03, 2013 2:48 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Subject: hyperion Bridge re construct
I live on Glendale
blvd facing Redcar park..the bridge is definately apart of my every day experience. The speed of cars now traveling on this bridge is already way to fast..to have a 55 mi zzone over it into glendale is madness and extremely dangerous. The traffic congestion happens in the am for about 2 hours and just about the same in the evenings. It is not unbearable. The reorganization plans sound just like everything the city does OVERBLOWN. Someone really needs to return to the drawing table and come up with a plan that takes into account the villages the road traverses. John W Samarjian
2982 Glendale Blvd. LA90039
-----
Subject: 131003 0859-1
From: Leonardo Chalupowicz [sustainsl@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, October 03, 2013 10:54 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: LaBonge Tom; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org; Board SLNC
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All

As someone who bikes or walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:

- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
- A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Warm regards,
Leonardo Chalupowicz
Silver Lake Stakeholder
-----
Subject: 131003 0859-2  
From: Teresa Sitz [teresa_stewart_sitz@yahoo.com]  
Sent: Thursday, October 03, 2013 1:14 PM  
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT  
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org  
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All  

Dear Tami Podesta:

I am writing in regard to the Hyperion Avenue Bridge. This is the year 2013 and we need to plan for our future. The future must include pedestrians, bicyclists, mothers with children in strollers and those in wheelchairs and on mobility scooters. The automobile cannot continue to be our privileged form of transportation.

Please consider the following points.

There is no reason for the Hyperion Avenue Bridge to accommodate speeds of 50 miles per hour and higher. This is not a long bridge and ends rather abruptly at a stop light at Glen Feliz.

The bridge could be built to be traveled at normal speeds – 35 miles per hour.

Without accommodations for pedestrians, bicyclists, strollers and those in wheelchairs and on mobility scooters large portions of our population will either be denied access between Silver Lake and Atwater Village or will be required to take their own lives, and the lives of others, into their hands on crossing. Making the bridge inaccessible to these people is the same as exiling them in their own neighborhoods. This must stop. People with disabilities MUST be accommodated and NOT be treated as an afterthought or discriminated against.

People are not impaired – people with disabilities, mothers with small children, the poor who do not have cars, those who have chosen to live without supporting planet-destroying gasoline power – these people are not impaired. The ENVIRONMENT is impaired. It seems you are choosing to build this bridge with the intent of not serving, or excluding, the above-mentioned people. Requiring people to travel an additional mile and a half is not a viable alternative and is discrimination. This is unacceptable in 2013.

Please redo the bridge design to include:

1. Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
2. Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
3. Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
4. No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
5. A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit. This project could be a major win for the City in terms of accommodating ALL people and
especially those with disabilities.  
I strongly recommend that you hold public hearings on this issue.  
Thank you for your consideration. I hope you will do the right thing.  
Sincerely,  
Teresa Sitz  
PS Notification of receipt of this email by all parties is greatly appreciated.  
-----
Subject: Please consider bike facilities on new Hyperion Ave. Bridge

Good morning,

I have reviewed the EIR for the redesigned Glendale-Hyperion Crossing Bridges, and I am very concerned about the lack of dedicated bicycle facilities in the plan, especially on Hyperion Avenue. This is a topographically natural route for bicyclists, including myself, but the traffic speeds on the bridge are very intimidating and dangerous. This should be a great opportunity to include bicycle facilities on a new bridge, which would encourage more bicycle travel between the communities on either side of the LA River. And it would make it much safer for those who do choose to travel by non-motorized means.

Thank you for considering a revision to the design of the bridges.

--

Ryan Johnson
1118 Mohawk St, Los Angeles, 90026

-----
Dear Tami and decision-makers,

As a local resident who walks, bikes and drives in this area, I am very familiar with the current dangerous conditions for bicyclists and pedestrians who use this bridge. This project has the potential to dramatically improve safety and access for all road users, if it includes safe bicycle infrastructure and ample space for pedestrians. Hyperion is the flattest route across the LA River north of downtown. It is therefore an ideal corridor for cyclists, and was therefore singled out by the L.A. Bicycle Plan for bike lanes.

I urge you to amend the project to include these Class II Bike Lanes, or even better, Class I protected bike lanes!

Thank you,

--
Wesley Reutimann
626-529-4615
-----
Subject: 131004 0855-3
From: K Fanslow [mailto:kfanslow@msn.com <kfanslow@msn.com>]
Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2013 4:05 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Subject: support bike lanes on Hyperion/Glendale bridge

I urge you in the strongest possible terms to support bike lanes as the Hyperion/Glendale bridge is widened. That the bridge is being WIDENED and the city sees no need to install bike lanes that were approved the in the city's 2010 Master Bike Plan is truly appalling.
Traffic travels very fast on this street. Installing the bike lanes will not only provide a critical connector as the city expands its bike lane network, it will also make the street safer for all users including car drivers.
Far from being a "cyclist only" issue, installing bike lanes on the Hyperion/Glendale bridge is first and foremost a public safety issue. Furthermore, as our fire department and police forces are stretched more thinly, as a city lets take a preemptive strike against the car crashes that plague this city and consume far too much of the fire department & LAPD’s resources and manpower.
Support bike lanes on the Hyperion/Glendale bridge now.
Sincerely,
K Fanslow

-----
Ms. Podesta,

While the improvements to the Glendale Bridges are encouraging, the lack of a bicycle lane promised on the Hyperion Avenue Bridge means that instead of a smooth flow between the communities of Glendale, Hollywood, Silver Lake and Atwater, the city will have a hodge-podge of half measures that don’t get cyclists where they need to go in a safe and reasonable manner.

Please include bike lanes on the Hyperion Ave. Bridge!

Sincerely,
Robert deFerrante
Board Member, Pasadena Athletic Association
Pasadena, CA

--
"Be yourself. Everyone else is taken."
--Oscar Wilde
-----
Subject: 131004 0858
From: Jonathan Edewards [mailto:jedewards@gmail.com <jedewards@gmail.com>]
Sent: Wednesday, September 25, 2013 12:26 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Subject: Bike Lanes must be added to Glendale-Hyperion Viaduct complex

Dear Tami,

I am writing to register my protest at the lack of bicycle lanes for the Glendale-Hyperion Viaduct complex.

If we are going to replace these bridges, we need to ensure conformity to the Bicycle Master Plan.

The Bicycle Master Plan calls for a dedicated (preferably protected, Class I) bike lane on the Hyperion Avenue Bridge.

Therefore, the EIR is not in accordance with the Bicycle Master Plan.

Please add protected bike lanes to all the bridges and roads that comprise the Glendale-Hyperion Viaduct complex.

The bridges must be re-built according to the best Complete Streets policies.

Jonathan Edewards  | DOWNTOWN PASADENA NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION
507 S Madison Ave, Apt #5 | Pasadena, California | cell (626) 676-3466 | home (626) 529-3089
www.downtownpasadena.org <https://downtownpasadena.wordpress.com/>!

"Like" us on Facebook <http://www.facebook.com/DowntownPasadena>!

-----
Subject: Bike lanes are not appropriate for the Hyperion Bridge

Dear Ms. Podesta,

To address the concern of a bikeable link between communities east and west of the L.A. River and of a bike lane on the Hyperion Bridge in Atwater Village, Glendale Boulevard has had a Master Plan in place for over a decade, which did NOT include a bike lane, primarily for safety reasons. A few months ago, Atwater Village came to discover that the plan had been ignored through a 2010 vote by the Los Angeles City Council in favor of the a citywide bike friendly plan. This resulted in the unsafe bike lanes we now have on Glendale Boulevard: parked vehicles can and do open their doors into bikers in the bike lane, as the lane runs adjacent to the parallel parking on the northbound side of Glendale Boulevard.

Bike lanes are inappropriate on Glendale Boulevard, not only for this safety hazard but also because this route is designated for use by 18-wheel trucks making deliveries to grocery stores. Large trucks and bikes do not mix.

Glendale Boulevard now has bike lanes, but the bike coalition would have these lanes continue up and down the Hyperion Bridge. This is a recipe for disaster. The better southbound solution would be to continue the bike lanes on Glendale Boulevard, past Riverside Drive (UNDER the Hyperion Bridge) and up the hill to Rowena Avenue. This route just makes more safety sense. The northbound solution would take bikes on Glendale Boulevard from Rowena to Riverside Drive, across the freeway and L.A. River, and onward toward the city of Glendale.

Thank you for taking the time to read this letter.

Sincerely,

Lisa Waldner
Atwater Village Resident
Treasurer/Acting Secretary, Atwater Village Residents Association
Formation Committee, Atwater Village Neighborhood Council

-----
Subject: 131004 0903-1
From: Husseini, Salah
[mailto:Salah.Husseini@disney.com<Salah.Husseini@disney.com>]
Sent: Wednesday, September 25, 2013 2:59 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Subject: Hyperion/Glendale bridge

Dear Ms. Podesta,

I am a resident of Los Feliz and utilize the Hyperion/Glendale bridge every day during my commute by bicycle to work. I am writing to strongly encourage you to support the addition of bike lanes to the upcoming renovation and improvement plan for this corridor. The bridge is quite treacherous for bicyclists, particularly in the evenings, and the addition of bike lanes would make a tremendous difference for my commute and that of hundreds of other cyclists and pedestrians. Not only would this change help bikers like myself, I also believe it would help connect the neighborhoods of Atwater and Silverlake/Los Feliz by creating a more walkable and bikeable area that families would be more willing to utilize.

Thank you for your consideration.

Best,

Salah Husseini
Senior Analyst
International Labor Standards
The Walt Disney Company
500 S Buena Vista St, Burbank, CA 91521-6706
Phone: 818-627-4576 | Tie Line: 8655-4576 | Fax: 818-627-4602
salah.husseini@disney.com

Please consider the environment before printing this e-mail.

This e-mail message is confidential, intended only for the named recipient(s) above and may contain information that is confidential, privileged, attorney work product or exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If you have received this message in error, or are not the named recipient(s), please immediately notify the sender at 1-818-627-4576 and delete this e-mail from your computer. Thank you. -----
Subject: 131004 0903-2
From: Alexander Moffat
[mailto:alexander.moffat@lacity.org<alexander.moffat@lacity.org>]
Sent: Wednesday, September 25, 2013 3:26 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Subject: Glendale Hyperion Bridges

Please, Please, Please put in BIKE LANES if you build any bridges anywhere - especially here. You have no idea how scary it is on a straight stretch of road (ie a bridge) with cars flying past and no bike lane.

- - Alexander Moffat
-----
To: Tami.Podesta@dot.ca.gov
cc: info@la-bike.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All

Dear Ms. Podesta:

I am a pediatrician and cyclist who drives this route frequently to visit my patients at Childrens Hospital. While I have an interest in better traffic flow, I also believe that making more streets safer for cyclists will help this traffic flow, as more people feel safe to commute or travel by bicycle. I have friends that I cycle to meet in Silver Lake, but I dare not take this route. To be safe, I have to travel from Glendale across to the Equestrian Center, cross at Victory and take the bike path to Fletcher and up from there. I am a strong cyclist, but what about those that can’t go many miles out of their way to cross the LA River?

Neither the Atwater/Glendale side of the bridge, nor the Silver Lake side are built to handle fast moving traffic. The traffic lights at either end make this untenable. It certainly might be a good idea to engineer the bridge structure for future considerations, at this time, with our current energy and environmental concerns, shouldn’t LA be trying to encourage more bicycling? Therefore, the bridge should be built with the following considerations:

- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
- A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,

Richard H. Feuille, Jr., MD
Glendale, CA

-----
Subject: 131004 1351
From: Tom McMahon [mailto:tmcmahon@origprod.com]
Sent: Friday, October 04, 2013 8:05 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT; tom.labonge@lacity.org;
councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: Hyperion Bridge

Subject: No Hyperion Freeway – Build a Safe Viaduct for All
As someone who bikes or walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is
absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone’s
needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:
- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
- A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.
Sincerely,

Tom McMahon
2101 Hollyvista Avenue
L.A., CA 90027

-----
Subject: 131004 1407
From: Allen MD, Warren [mailto:Warren.Allen@stjohns.org]
Sent: Friday, October 04, 2013 9:56 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
    mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: Hyperion Ave Viaduct

As the LA Times recently opined, Is LA ready to admit that non-motorists such as pedestrians and bicyclists have a legitimate right to safe transportation? I am worried that the recent preliminary plans for Hyperion are so car-centric that any other use for this critical thoroughfare would be impossible.

Now is the time to insure that Hyperion Ave be made safe for non-motorists. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:
- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
- A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,

Warren M Allen, MD
1011 Pine St
Santa Monica, CA 90405-3923

-----
Subject: 131004 1408-1
From: Katelin Mitchell [mailto:katelincherie@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, October 04, 2013 10:16 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All

As someone who bikes or walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:

- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
- A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,
Katelin Mitchell

-----
Subject: 131004 1408-2
From: Vahe G [mailto:vahe.gulyan@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, October 04, 2013 10:55 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All

As someone who bikes or walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:

· Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
· Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
· Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
· No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
· A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,
Vahe G
505 A N. Normandie ave, los angeles, 90004
-----
Hi Tami,

I shared these comments with Councilmember O'Farrell’s staff, and they suggested I pass them along to you for inclusion in the official record.

Can you confirm that you’ve received and processed these, and if there has been any consideration to the suggestions below, I’d love to hear it.

Thanks,

Alex

I run with my dog along the river quite often, and this morning I had an epiphany about an easy couple improvements that could be done as part of this project. They wouldn’t cost much, and would really improve the pedestrian flow along the river.

I usually run along the east side of the River - the side closest to my house with no bikes! - starting from Fletcher and heading north. Once I get to the Red Car Park, there is no path to get under/over Glendale Blvd, so I tiptoe under the bridge on the uneven cobblestones OR I play human frogger to get across Glendale Blvd so I can go down the I-5 ramp towards Sunnynook Park.

There is also no pedestrian access from the river path to Glendale Blvd from the North. The east side of the River trail just dead ends into the side of the base of the bridge.

I think there are a couple improvements that would really encourage River access:
1. Add a path/boardwalk under the bridge that connects the east side river trail into a contiguous path. This could be a raised wood deck that leaves 7" of clearance under the bridge, maybe a couple lights, and a railing. Or you could pour some concrete to make a solid, flat area under the bridge.
2. On the north side of the Glendale Blvd bridge, along the east side of the River, they could add a simple stairway (7 or 8 steps and a railing) to let pedestrians get directly from the River path to Glendale Blvd.

Alex

-----

-----
Subject: 131004 1417-2
From: Ben Grangereau [bengranger@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, October 04, 2013 12:19 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: Hyperion Bridge

As someone who bikes, jogs, and walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:

- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
- A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge
- There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.
- A car-centric LA is an ideal of the past. Please make a Los Angeles safer, more community-oriented city, not a place where cars fly through neighborhoods at 55 mph. New construction project lend themselves to making positive changes in our city, please don’t pass up this opportunity!!

Sincerely,
Ben Grangereau
1811 Lucretia Ave. LA, CA 90026

-----
Subject: 131004 1417-3
From: ustrajem@gmail.com [ustrajem@gmail.com] on behalf of Christopher Lovejoy [lovejoy.chris@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, October 04, 2013 12:09 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All
As someone who bikes between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:
- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
- A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge
There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.
Sincerely,
Christopher Lovejoy
2521 W. 5th St., Los Angeles, CA 90057
- Christopher
-----
Subject: 131004 1418
From: Trenton Strong [mailto:trenton.strong@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, October 03, 2013 3:48 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
    mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All

As someone who bikes or walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it
is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me.
Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate
speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project
to include:
· Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
· Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding
  signs
· Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists
  and pedestrians and discourage speeding
· No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive
even faster
· A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let
  people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give
  bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan
and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest
barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This
project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,
Trenton Strong
832 E. Edgeware Rd.
Los Angeles, CA 90026
--
t.s.
-----
Subject: 131004 1419-1
From: Juan Felipe Valencia [mailto:jfvalencia@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, October 03, 2013 3:03 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: Please, No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All

Mrs. Podesta,

Please pardon my liberty to email you directly concerning the new plans that are being studied to rehabilitate the Hyperion-Glendale complex of bridges over the 5 Freeway and LA River connecting Silver Lake to Atwater Village.
As someone who bikes and walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. I bike everyday from my house to the LA River Bike Path through Fletcher because I’m afraid of being hit while crossing the Hyperion bridge.

Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community.

It would be ideal for the project to include:
1. Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave. This would require narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists (and pedestrians) and discourage speeding
2. Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with way-finding signs
3. No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
4. A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Thank you for your time.
Sincerely,
Juan Felipe Valencia
2449 Hyperion Ave.
Los Angeles, CA 90027
-----
Subject: 131004 1419-2
From: Benjamin Hyun [mailto:benjaminmhyun@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, October 03, 2013 2:46 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All

As someone who bikes or walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:

- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
- A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,
Benjamin Hyun
4237 Longridge Ave, Unit 404
Studio City, CA 91604
-----
Subject: 131004 1420-1
From: neilbridge.uk [mailto:neilbridge.uk@googlemail.com]
Sent: Thursday, October 03, 2013 2:45 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All

As someone who regularly bikes and walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:

- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
- A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,
Neil Bridge, 2215 Baxter Street Los Angeles CA 90039

Subject: 131004 1420-2
From: Owen Gerst [mailto:gogerst@yahoo.com]
Sent: Thursday, October 03, 2013 12:40 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: Hyperion to Highway standards

Hello,
Are you aware that Los Angeles, at one point in it’s history, had the largest mass transit system in the entire world? As the story goes, the car and tire manufactures conspired to shut this system down so that they could sell more cars and tires, and this is why LA today is a Car-centric city. I am writing you in regards to your current plan to design Hyperion Ave to highway standards, and my thesis is that you are not being intelligent or thoughtful in your design criteria; you are just maintaining the corrupt status quo that benefits corporations and not the actual people who live in the city.
Recently the city redeveloped a path along the river that is both picturesque and functional; I both like it, and use it. In many ways this path is becoming it’s own “bicycle highway” because it is a safe way to travel long distances without the risk of getting hit by cars. I am an architect and artist, living in Lincoln Heights and I do not have a car. I use this path to get to many places, one of which is atwater village. For atwater village Hyperion is the logical exit ramp for bikes, yet your plan make this passage way inhospitable for bikes.
What is gained by designing it to car highway standards? A few people getting to their destinations by car a little sooner, but at the expense of making it more dangerous for bikers. Why? It seems to be a plan born out of thoughtlessness and lack of consideration for anything other than cars. As I said, I don’t have a car. I get around using the combination of my bike and the metro. I moved here from NYC where I developed this life-style and intend on keeping this life style. Part of why I choose to bike instead of drive has to do with an understanding of the larger world in which we live. The world dependent upon fossil fuels is in decline. The reason we have all these wars and problems with terrorism is because we depend upon fuel from the middle east. I don’t wish to be part of the reason for being in these countries and killing innocent people and destroying cultures. Beyond that, this way of living is simply unsustainable. The costs associated with driving are rising, making other transportation means more attractive to everyone. The architect in me understands that if LA wishes to be a vibrant city in the future it should stop being such a car centric-dinosaur, and get with the program. Cities should have a diversified portfolio of transportation options.
I’m happy with the metro and bike lane development that is going on, but by designing Hyperion to highway standards you are missing out on an opportunity to continue this development, and for the city to evolve naturally and change with the times. You are missing out on an opportunity to make LA a vibrant and diverse city of bikers, cars, and mass transit. You are a dinosaur if you do this.'
Sincerely,
Owen Gerst
-----
Subject: 131004 1421-1
From: Ezra Horne [mailto:ezrahorne@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, October 03, 2013 12:25 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: Tom LaBonge; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion "Freeway" - Build a Safe Viaduct for All Road Users

As someone who bikes or walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:
- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
- A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,
Ezra Horne
3944 1/2 Marathon Street,
Los Angeles, CA 90029
-----
Subject: 131004 1421-2
From: Hallstead, Jeff (KMNOW) [mailto:Jeff.Hallstead@kantarmedia.com]
Sent: Thursday, October 03, 2013 12:14 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.gov; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway--Wider Sidewalks and Bikelanes
As someone who bikes or walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:
Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
Wide sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge
This project should be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.
Jeff Hallstead
3159 Gracia St
Los Angeles CA  90039  (Atwater Village)
-----
Subject: 131004 1422
From: Hadley [mailto:oldhadley@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, October 03, 2013 9:40 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
    mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: Hyperion Freeway

Wake up, please. Bikes are here to stay. Your job may not be.
As someone who bikes AND walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it
is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me.

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan
and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest
barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This
project can change that and make all travelers benefit.
Sincerely,
Jason Hadley
90039
-----
Subject: 131004 1423-1
From: Jason Brown [mailto:jasontbrown99@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, October 03, 2013 12:13 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
    mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: The Hyperion Viaduct … Please read.

To all,

As a cyclist, I am concerned about the Hyperion Viaduct crossing. Increasing this city’s cycling infrastructure has the ability to relieve congestion, improve health among its citizens, and build stronger communities.

A common response I receive from people if I say I road from point A to point B is, "Wow, you’re brave." or "I would have never have thought to cycle there. Its dangerous." If more space were allocated for cyclists on our roads more people would be less intimidated of riding. We need bike lanes that connect with one another. My girlfriend and I love the Atwater farmer’s market. We ride from Echo Park to Atwater fairly often but what we dread is the crossing to get from Silver Lake into Atwater and vice versa. We also have friends that live in Atwater and while we’d love to cycle over there for dinner parties and whatnot, the Hyperion crossing is just too dangerous at night. So we always drive if we know we are going to be there after sunset. The argument can be made that not a lot of cyclists take that crossing, so why adjust it for more cyclists? However, I truly believe that if the crossing were safer, there would be a significant change in the number of cyclists using the bridge. "If you build it, they will come." The change would result in more people cycling and fewer people driving.

http://www.youtube.com/watch?feature=player_embedded&v=pX8zZdLw7cs
Mikael Coville-Anderson on Infrastructure - He is an urban mobility expert with Copenhagenize Consulting

I have found that LA is a city where people work hard and for long hours. Many people don’t have time to go to the gym. Many people are aspiring to work in the film industry and essentially work two jobs just to get by. Or they may be taking care of their families once they get home from work. Studies have found that by engaging in moderate exercise on can reduce the risk of heart disease, stroke, diabetes, and cancer by up to 50%. Since our government is currently shut down because of looming issue of the cost of health care and who should pay for it, wouldn’t it be more cost effective to encourage more exercise? The side affects of exercise also give people more energy and can boost self-esteem. We could have more productive, happy people working and living in L.A.!

An article from the BBC from Ocober 1, 2013 on a recent study regarding the benefits of exercise and being healthy:
http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/health-24335710
The Hyperion Bridge was constructed in the late 1920’s. Without a doubt the crossing needs restructuring. However, with today's population, congestion, and growing concern over our community's health I plead with you to include bike lanes and sidewalks for pedestrians in the new plan. I agree with the LACBC's request for the following:

- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
- A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

Sincerely,

Jason Brown
1708 Clinton St.
L.A., CA 90026

-----
Subject: 131004 1423-2
From: Kyle Woodward [mailto:klelandw@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, October 03, 2013 10:47 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: Build a safe viaduct for all!

To LADOT, Caltrans, et al. ---
As an Angeleno who bikes, walks, runs, takes mass transit, and --- yes! --- even drives on Hyperion Avenue between Silverlake and Atwater Village, I am concerned by the current plans to reduce non-automobile safety on the Hyperion Viaduct. With limited river crossings, it is essential that the available connectors take proper account of the fact that all transit from one side of the river to the other must cross somewhere; as vibrant sister districts, ensuring that the corridor from Silverlake to Atwater is safe, controlled, and available to all transit modes is of the utmost priority.

The viaduct renovation should and must include:

Bike lanes!
Widened sidewalks (the sidewalk under the bridge at the top of the viaduct is a particular danger) and protected crossings (I challenge you to try using the north sidewalk)
Speed-mitigation measures: there is no need to encourage reckless driving with ridiculously large travel lanes

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,
Kyle Woodward (cyclist, commuter, jogger, and Costco/Trader Joe’s shopper)

4109 Normal, 90029

The mass transit options I am aware of avoid the viaduct, but the Glendale Boulevard split at the base is unbelievably treacherous for pedestrians and cyclists alike.
-----
Subject: 131107 0928
From: Paul Romero [paul_romero818@yahoo.com]
Sent: Saturday, October 05, 2013 1:27 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT

Subject:
Dear Caltrans and BOE
I am writing you today about the Hyperion bridge you guys are planning to
do work on in Atwater Village. I read an article saying you want to post a
55mph zone and I must say that is ABSOLUTELY DANGEROUS! I went to John
Marshall High School and walking on that narrow sidewalk with cars flying
by just inches away then having to cross the street at the bottom of the
bridge, wait for it's safe to cross. I think it's a accident waiting to
happen and I would hate to see young students having to go thru that.
Then there is the case of bikes going thru their. It's would be unsafe and
unreasonable for cars to be going that fast when there are bicyclist going
thru their. Just think about what would happen. There is a guy riding his
bike, car is already at 55mph and all of a sudden he has to slow down/slam
on the breaks. The driver might hit the guy then by that time since he's
going so fast he would just go into the freeway and get away or he might
stop causing the car behind him to hit him.
I just see so many bad things that could happen if you put the speed at
55mph and I hope you guys come to the sense that this idea is not the best for
this street.

Sincerely,
Paul Joshua Romero

-----
Subject: 131107 0932
From: nancy wedeen [nanpsycle@icloud.com]
Sent: Friday, October 04, 2013 10:20 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org
Subject: Bicycle roads & streets
Hello ...
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All
We bike all over the LA area. We need safe streets.
As someone who bikes or walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me.
Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:
   Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
   Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
   Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
   No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
   A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge
There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.
Please consider carefully. Bicycle routes and/or lanes improve communities!
Sincerely,
nancy & richard
we noho wedeens
??
Cycle & Recycle
Mini Ipad
-----
Subject: 131107 0933-1
From: Shannon ORourke [shannonorourke@me.com]
Sent: Friday, October 04, 2013 10:30 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; tom.labonge@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway – Build a Safe Viaduct for All
As someone who bikes or walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it
is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me.
Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate
speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project
to include:
   Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
   Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
   Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and
   pedestrians and discourage speeding
   No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even
   faster
   A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people
   access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists
   an alternative through the dangerous merge
There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan
and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest
barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This
project can change that and make all travelers benefit.
Sincerely,
Shannon O’Rourke
2101 Hollyvista Avenue
Los Angeles, CA  90027
-----
Subject: 131107 0933-2
From: David P. Dapper [dpdapper@me.com]
Sent: Saturday, October 05, 2013 10:32 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; tom.labonge@lacity.org;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All
Dear Ms. Podesta,
As someone who bikes or walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it
is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me.
Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate
speeds through an urban community. Specifically, the project should include:

   Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
   Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
   Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and
   pedestrians and discourage speeding
   No crash barrier and banked turns that will only encourage people to
drive even faster
   A full-width crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let
people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give
bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge
There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan
and Caltrans’ complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the
greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA
River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,
David P. Dapper
1155 South Grand Avenue
#1411
Los Angeles, CA 90015
-----
Subject: 131007 0934
From: Tomer Gurantz [tgurantz@yahoo.com]
Sent: Saturday, October 05, 2013 1:40 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT

Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All
As someone who bikes or walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it
is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me.
Everyone's needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate
speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project
to include:

- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and
  pedestrians and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even
  faster

A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people
access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists
an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan
and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest
barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This
project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,
Tomer Gurantz
2009 Sierra place
Glendale, CA 91208

From: Eric Bruins [mailto:eric@la-bike.org]
Sent: Friday, October 04, 2013 9:26 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Subject: Glendale-Hyperion Project IS/EA comments

Tami,
Please find attached LACBC's comments on the Initial Study/Environmental
Assessment for the Glendale Boulevard-Hyperion Avenue Complex of Bridges
Improvement Project.
Should you have any questions, please do not hesitate to call.
Regards,
-Eric
--
Eric Bruins
Planning & Policy Director
Los Angeles County Bicycle Coalition
t: 213.629.2142, x127 / f: 213.629.2259
www.la-bike.org
Help build a better, bike-able L.A. County:
Become an LACBC member <http://la-bike.org/membership> today!
-----
Subject: 131007 1316-1
From: Keith Pluymers [mailto:kdpluymers@gmail.com]
Sent: Saturday, October 05, 2013 11:59 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All

As someone who bikes between Los Feliz, Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it
is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me.
Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate
speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project
to include:
- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and
  pedestrians and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even
  faster
- A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people
  access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists
  an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan
and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest
barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This
project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,
Keith Pluymers
4408 Russell Ave APT 1
Los Angeles, CA 90027
-----
Subject: 131007 1316-2
To: Tami.Podesta@dot.ca.gov
cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org, councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org,
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
bcc: info@la-bike.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All
Dear, Tami Podesta

As someone who bikes or walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:
Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge
There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.
Sincerely,
Jances Certeza
4445 1/2 Prospect Ave.
Los Angeles, CA 90027
-----
Subject:  131007 1317
From: Joel Lozada [mailto:wisperjoel@gmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, October 06, 2013 7:44 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All

Good morning to all who are reading this email. I hope your day is going well.

I am someone who bikes between Silver Lake and Atwater Village. I am writing to you today to show my agreement and to share my belief that it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me, and others who walk and shop in that area. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:

· Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
· Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
· Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
· No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
· A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,
Joel A Lozada
1838 Winmar Drive
Los Angeles, CA 90065
-----
Subject: 131007 1318-1
From: todd wexman [mailto:twexman@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 07, 2013 6:53 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT; Tom LaBonge
Cc: councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; Tom LaBonge; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: Glendale/Hyperion bridge: Safe bridge for pedestrians and bikes too!!!

As someone who bikes or walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:

· Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
· Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
· Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
· No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
· A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,

Todd Wexman

Todd Wexman
926 Tularosa Drive
Los Angeles, CA 90026
310/770-6211
twexman@gmail.com

-----
Subject: 131007 1318-2
From: Amy Chatfield [mailto:achatfie@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 07, 2013 9:11 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: Make Hyperion safe for bikers!

I bike between Silver Lake and Atwater Village about once a week (I live in Franklin Hills). I would do this more often if there were a safe way to get between the two communities. Currently I take my chances on Hyperion Avenue; I was delighted to hear recently that this would be re-designed to meet LA’s future transit needs. However, I was entirely dismayed to learn that the new plan does not include bike lanes, makes the sidewalk even smaller, and does not include crosswalks. It is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for bikers like me and for pedestrians. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:
- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
- A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans’ complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,
Amy Chatfield
-----
Subject: 131007 1319
From: Mary Belton [mailto:mbelton@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 07, 2013 11:17 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All
As someone who bikes or walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it
is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me.
Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate
speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project
to include:
- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and
pedestrians and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even
faster
- A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people
access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists
an alternative through the dangerous merge
There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan
and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest
barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This
project can change that and make all travelers benefit.
Sincerely,
Mary Belton
3454 Waverly Drive #5
LA, CA 90027
-----
Subject: 131007 1320-1
From: Michael Nicholls [mailto:mrmikenicholls@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 07, 2013 11:23 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All

Dear Ms Podesta-

As someone who bikes and walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave be safe for people like me. Everyone's needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through this urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:
- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
- A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,
Mike Nicholls

Ivanhoe School Parent
Silver Lake resident
Local business owner

-----
Subject: 131007 1320-2
From: Miles [mailto:wanuki@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 07, 2013 10:14 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All

As someone who bikes or walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it
is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me.
Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate
speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project
to include:
- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and
  pedestrians and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even
  faster
- A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people
  access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists
  an alternative through the dangerous merge
There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike
plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the
greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA
River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,
Miles Hindman
1518 Talmadge St.
Los Angeles, CA 90027

-----
Subject: 131007 1343
From: Alex Moore [mailto:alex.charlotte@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 07, 2013 1:01 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org;
tom.labonge@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All

As someone who frequently bikes between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:

• Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
• Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks
• Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
• No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
• A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

Mayor Garcetti campaigned on a bike friendly platform and events such as CicLAvia highlight the desire for a more bike friendly Los Angeles. Simple changes such as a safe biking route between Silverlake and Atwater would increase the number of bikes on the road—leading to increased quality of life for all Angelinos.

Thank you,
Alex Moore,
841 Lucile Ave
Los Angeles 90026
--
alexcmoore.com
www.fantastic-heliotherapy.com/
-----
Subject: 131007 1618
From: J. Nordberg [mailto:look@t.hin.gs]
Sent: Monday, October 07, 2013 2:44 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All
As someone who bikes and walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:
• Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
• Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
• Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
• No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
• A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge
There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.
Sincerely,
J. Nordberg
Los Angeles, CA 90026
-----
Subject: 131008 0730
From: Kelly Marie Martin [kellym43@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, October 08, 2013 12:43 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All

Good Afternoon

As someone who bikes or walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:

- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster

A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,

Kelly Martin
229 N. Union Ave.,
Los Angeles, CA 90026

-----
As someone who bikes or walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:

- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
- A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,
Matt Roberson
4210 Los Feliz Blvd, LA, CA 90027
-----
Subject: 131009 0814
From: Siobhan Dolan [mailto:siobhan.dolan@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, October 08, 2013 10:28 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; tom.labonge@lacity.org;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All

As someone who bikes out of Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. In Atwater, where I have lived for over 6 years as a homeowner, I only have two ways to get out of my neighborhood on my bike (Fletcher or Glendale). I have a RIGHT to use my bicycle as my transportation therefore I have a RIGHT to be SAFE on my roads.

Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:
- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
- A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,
Siobhan Dolan
3112 Madera Ave
Atwater Village, CA 90039
-----
Subject: 131009 0817
From: erich bollmann [mailto:erich.bollmann@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, October 08, 2013 1:16 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Subject: RE: Glendale Hyperion Bridge Proposal

Dear Tami Podesta,
I hope this finds you well.
Today I’m writing to express my profound disapproval and disappointment in the Glendale/Hyperion Bridge redesign proposal. Turning an already dangerous roadway - where cars speed and pedestrians must be intensely vigilant in light of reckless motorists (reckless in that many have no regard for crosswalks) - into a mini highway where cars are free to speed at an outrageous 55mph is a recipe for disaster. Not only a disaster in terms of lost lives, but also a disaster of missed opportunities - namely the opportunity to move Los Angeles forward with a unique design that embraces ALL ANGELENOS, not merely motorists.
As a patron of the Atwater Village area, I’d like to point out the high levels of foot traffic up and down Glendale Boulevard. Shops, cafes, and even the farmers market on certain days benefit from the sense of community and civic space our sidewalks and outdoor seating creates. Unfortunately, the bridge is monstrous obstacle that stops pedestrians right where they could be making a leisurely uphill trek into nearby Silver Lake. Why not create a bridge redesign that actively seeks a BETTER connection between these two neighborhoods? Instead of further dividing them with a mini highway.
While I understand we must make changes in order to protect our infrastructure from seismic damage, I sincerely hope you won’t sacrifice the future of Los Angeles in order to do it. Individuals in our fair city are increasingly giving up their automotive dependence, in pursuit of healthy and sustainable freedom on bikes or on foot. Please don't look to the past for already failed "solutions." I strongly urge the Division of Environmental Planning to return to the drawing board and come up with a design that accommodates ALL ANGELENOS.
Thank you for your time,
Erich Bollmann
-----
Subject: 131009 0821-1
From: Kelly Thompson [mailto:kthompson1346@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, October 08, 2013 1:28 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All
Please keep our City moving forward!! Keep it safe, green and progressive.
Not the old Car Centric mindset. As someone who bikes or walks between
Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion
Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone’s needs can be met if the
project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community.
Specifically, I would like the project to include:
Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians
and discourage speeding
No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access
the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an
alternative through the dangerous merge
There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan
and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest
barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This
project can change that and make all travelers benefit.
Sincerely Kelly Thompson 3916 West Point Place, LA, CA 90065
--
Kelly Thompson
Website - untitled54web.com/ <http://www.untitled54web.com/>
Blog - untitled54.blogspot.com/
-----
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All

Dear Ms. Podesta,

As someone who bikes or walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:

- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
- A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,

Emily Camastra
3138 Glenmanor Place
Los Angeles CA 90039

-----
Subject: 131009 0822-2
From: Aaron Lawrence [mailto:aaron.lawrence@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, October 08, 2013 2:33 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All

Greetings,

I am submitting my public comment in opposition to the current proposed configuration of the Hyperion Viaduct, as part of the Glendale Boulevard-Hyperion Avenue Complex of Bridges Improvement.

I own a home several blocks from the base of the viaduct in Atwater Village, and I drive or cycle the viaduct daily as part of my commute and when shopping/dining/socializing between Atwater Village and Silver Lake. This viaduct is a critical connection between these neighborhoods--one of only three really connections that cross both the river and the 5 freeway (Fletcher and Los Feliz Blvd. being the others). As both a driver and cyclist, I’ve been looking forward to a project that would finally fix design issues and rampant speeding that make the complex dangerous and difficult to navigate for all road users. But the existing proposal would, in many ways, make matters even worse.

By implementing a design speed of 55 mph, along with freeway design features like mega-sized lanes, banked curves, and a freeway crash barrier, the proposal would encourage even more dangerous speeding while ignoring a decade of community input demanding that the City do something to reduce the dangerous speeds on this bridge. These freeway-like elements have no business being forced onto a critical connection between two sleepy neighborhoods. The proposed design will dump freeway-speed traffic (going 55mph and higher) out into pedestrian-oriented streets made up of single family residences, restaurants, and boutiques. This proposal is totally inconsistent with the designation of Silver Lake and Atwater Village as Pedestrian-Oriented Districts. Rather than engineering the road to conform with the dangerous speeds driven by some drivers, the road should be engineered to calm traffic and slow dangerous drivers down.

By focusing only on how to move cars across the viaduct at the highest possible speed, the proposed design completely neglects and endangers others who want and need to use the bridge. Instead of including a bicycle lane and robust pedestrian accommodations in this major project, the proposal is to include a single sidewalk on only one side of the street, but with no safe way to access that sidewalk for those living on the other side of Glendale/Hyperion Blvd. Pedestrians will have no choice but to walk blocks out of their way or rush across many lanes of high-speed traffic to reach the single sidewalk. As for cyclists, the project documents claim that the proposal is "consistent" with the 2010 bike plan (which calls for a full bike lane on this route) because cyclists can ride on the shoulder.
I invite the planners of this project to try riding a bike on the shoulder up a steep incline next to 55mph traffic with no bike lane or separation and see if they still feel this way. Because this is one of only three routes connecting the neighborhoods, cyclists are left with no other options (other than some ridiculously circuitous routes--e.g.: http://goo.gl/30DyMv). This will ensure that only the most hardcore committed cyclists (or those without the means to drive) will walk or cycle between these neighboring vibrant pedestrian-oriented areas. Rather than design the bridge for everyone, in accordance with the complete streets requirements and the 2010 bicycle plan, the proposal prioritizes only the automobile (and the reckless speeding automobile instead of responsible drivers content with going the speed limit, at that). This is ridiculous.

It is clear that--if the emphasis is taken off of accommodating the highest speed traffic and instead placed on meeting the needs of all road users--there are many better options for a bridge redesign. Implementing lane widths consistent with a typical city street rather than a freeway and foregoing a freeway crash barrier leaves plenty of room for a wide sidewalk and bike lanes (even buffered/separated bike lanes), while discouraging dangerous driving instead of encouraging more speeding. I implore the City and Caltrans to consider the lane configuration proposed by the LA County Bicycle Coalition, which takes into account the character of the neighborhoods, the 2010 bicycle plan, and the complete streets policy, which makes the bridge accessible to all, which discourages reckless driving, and which does nothing to reduce car capacity. Additionally, I request that any redesign include the following:

- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
- A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

I should add that I do appreciate the inclusion of the proposed red car pylon footbridge, which will provide those south of Glendale Blvd. in Atwater with convenient recreational access to the LA River Bike Path (though without a complete crosswalk at the base of the bridge, this does not help those north of Glendale Blvd.). And I appreciate the inclusion of the partial crosswalk allowing access to the sidewalk for those north of Glendale Blvd. in Atwater with safer access to the sidewalk (though without a complete crosswalk at the base of the bridge, this does not help those south of Glendale Blvd.). Both of these address real needs, but neither confronts the greater problem that the Hyperion viaduct is the critical connection between Atwater and Silver Lake, and it needs to provide a safe
means of transportation between these neighborhoods for everyone, not just move cars back and forth at the highest possible speeds.

Thank you for the consideration.
Sincerely,
Aaron Lawrence
3138 Glenmanor Pl., Los Angeles, CA 90039
-----
Subject: 131009 0823
From: Danny Cohen [mailto:dco1@dco1.com]
Sent: Tuesday, October 08, 2013 3:13 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; mayorgarcetti@lacity.org
Subject: Hyperion-Glendale Bridge
Hello,
I am a frequent driver of the Hyperion Glendale bridge, and would be
delighted to use a renovated bridge that reflects the realities of how
motorists are using it.
However, I am also a frequent cyclist of the Hyperion Glendale bridge who
would be even more delighted to use a bridge safe for humans, not just
cars. Perhaps a bridge with shade, sidewalks and bike lanes so I don’t feel
like I might be struck when I am struggling to get up that incline (I’m
getting better) or switch lanes so I don’t end up going into the freeway.
We need a bridge that reflects the realities that we want for the future,
not a bridge for cars today. I don’t want some mini-freeway shuttling cars
between two islands of communities, but a multi-modal connection allowing
for real humans to move around Los Angeles on a human scale.
Please reconsider the proposed plans for the Hyperion Glendale bridge
because, as citizens, we should be catering to each other as humans, not
cars. Thank you for your time.
Danny Cohen
Los Feliz Resident
-----
As someone who lives in Pasadena and works in Los Feliz, and who bikes to work occasionally, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community.

Specifically, I would like the project to include:

- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
- A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,
Blair Miller
Subject: 131009 0826-2
From: Haruna Madono [hmadono@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, October 08, 2013 11:15 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
    mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All
I live across the bridge from Atwater Village, and I am scared to death
every time I access Hyperion on my bicycle. Not only are the sidewalks
barely usable, but there is no viable crosswalk to give me access from both
sides of Glendale Avenue. As it stands, the cars race across like it's a
highway, and I am surprised that no one has been killed by now. Please make
the changes necessary so all of us can use it safely.
Best,
Haruna Madono
3120 Rowena Ave
Apt 2
Los Angeles CA 90027
-----
Subject: 131009 0838
From: matthew.mooney.53 [matthew.mooney.53@my.csun.edu]
Sent: Wednesday, October 09, 2013 1:08 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT

Subject: Hyperion bridge viaduct
I am someone who would love to use the Hyperion bridge but I do not for
fear of being hit by automobiles that drive way too fast. Please in your
proposal include bike lanes on either side of the bridge, wide pedestrian
sidewalks on either side of the bridge, a place for bicycles to merge
safely with traffic when coming in to Atwater and a complete crosswalk from
the south side of Atwater to the bridge. I constructed a motion that passed
just last evening to oppose the current proposal for this bridge. I
desperately want Los Angeles to build more complete streets and move into
the 21st century and remain a global competitive City. I respect your work
so please take into consideration my suggestions.
Sincerely,
Matthew Mooney

-----
Subject: 131017 0815
From: Megan Wade [mailto:megan@skylightbooks.com]
Sent: Wednesday, October 09, 2013 12:15 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
    mayor.garcetti@lacity.org; assemblymember.gatto@assembly.ca.gov
Subject: Hyperion Bridge Without Bike Lanes: Both Dangerous and Bad for
    Economic Development

To those with influence over the decision regarding the redesign of the
Hyperion Bridge:

For the past year I have commuted by bike from Montrose to Los Feliz
through Glendale. I chose not to use Los Feliz Blvd. for that commute
because of the number of large trucks; nor do I use any of the currently
marked bike/pedestrian infrastructure because of its complete inconvenience
and the amount of time it adds on to my commute. Instead, I have used the
Hyperion Avenue bridge, with the belief that one day there would be bike
lanes and improved infrastructure and this commute would be much safer.

Now I have learned that new plans call for the bridge to be designed to
allow for cars traveling at 55+ miles per hour. You can imagine my shock.

Personally, I am already in the process of moving out of the LA area
because it has been so frustrating, in my years here, to try and navigate
the city via bike and public transit. Yes, there are changes, but when I
hear about 'improvements' like this, I can only feel vindicated in my
decision to leave.

Still: I have friends and colleagues who will still be here, and that's why
I'm writing. Because I encouraged them to give biking a try and recommended
this route, and I would hope that in giving that recommendation I would not
be putting them in danger. For their sake, as well as the sake of all the
cyclists who in navigating those paths for the first time will think it
natural to jump from the sharrows on Rowena to the bike lanes on Glendale
in Atwater, do not let the project proceed without new, safer
infrastructure for cyclists.

Furthermore, I strongly believe that improved cycling and pedestrian
infrastructure on the bridge will be a boon for local business in both
Silverlake and Atwater Village. There are currently amenities in both
neighborhoods that are inaccessible by foot because of the unsafe
conditions on that bridge, that would be within walking distance for
residents on one side or the other. I believe that businesses in Atwater
would see an increase in the number of visits from Silverlake residents,
and those Atwater residents going to Trader Joe's or Gelsons would suddenly
be able to do so by bike or foot, lessening the incredible congestion that
exists in that area. In this way, I don't think that decisions about the
design plan for the Hyperion Bridge should take into consideration only
environmental or safety factors; an excellent design could greatly impact
the economic development of these areas long into the future.

As a resident of Montrose, I have seen first hand the positive impacts of a pedestrian-focused design for Honolulu Ave. on our downtown business district. It’s part of what makes Montrose such an amazing place to live, and what allows us to have so many wonderful small businesses. And as an employee of an independent business myself (Skylight Books, in Los Feliz) I certainly hope that you will take the health of such businesses into account when making decisions like this. So much of our business depends on foot traffic; so I truly think it’s a shame, anywhere, when high-speed car traffic destroys the opportunity for independent businesses to succeed.

I believe the LA County Bicycle Coalition and many other groups have put forward alternative designs for the bridge that are not only feasible but will protect the safety of all commuters and truly benefit both of these neighborhoods. I greatly encourage you to consider these designs over the current dangerous and ill-conceived car-focused proposal.

Sincerely,

Megan Wade
3921 1/2 Ocean View Blvd.
Montrose, CA 91020
-----
Subject:  131017 0819
From: Sanchez, Lawrence (CDPH-DDWEM) [mailto:Lawrence.Sanchez@cdph.ca.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, October 09, 2013 2:58 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Subject: Build a Safe Viaduct for All - No Hyperion Freeway - Glendale
Hyperion Complex of Bridge Improvement Project

Dear Tami Podesta, Branch Chief
Division of Environmental Planning
California DOT

As someone who bikes, walks, drives and rides between Silver Lake and
Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that the Glendale Hyperion
Complex of Bridge Improvement Project be made safe for people like me.
Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate
speeds through an urban community. I attended project workshop on 9/25/2013
and was happy to discuss the project with all in attendance. Specifically,
I would like the project to include:

1. Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave in accordance with the 2010 Los
   Angeles Bike Plan
2. Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with way finding
   signs
3. Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists
   and pedestrians and discourage speeding
4. No crash barrier and banked turns maximize bridge real estate
   for automobiles so people drive faster than necessary for the posted speed
   limits surrounding streets
5. A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let
   people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give
   bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge
6. Crosswalk ramp on both sides that facilitate bicycle traffic
   entering or exiting sidewalk
7. A crosswalk on the Rowena Ave, Silver Lake end of the viaduct
   to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd.,
   preventing jaywalking and improve pedestrian way finding
8. Minimize grating on the bridge which collects debris and
   creates a hazard for cyclists

There is enough room on the bridge to accommodate pedestrian & bike traffic
better, & slow car traffic down to make it safer & more pleasant for
everyone. There’s no point in allowing or encouraging drivers to speed up
to freeway speeds to cover the short distance that these bridges span.

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan
and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest
barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This
project can change that and benefit all travelers.

Sincerely,
Lawrence Sanchez
2053 N. Vermont Ave. Apt 6
Los Angeles, CA 90027
-----
Subject: 131017 0821
From: Herb Agner [mailto:herbagner@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, October 08, 2013 10:11 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: Hyperion Bridge project
Ms Podesta,
I understand from LA County Bicycle Coalition that no bike lane is planned
in plans for the rehabbing of this ancient bridge, and that we need to
lobby you, city govt, etc for a public hearing to discuss. Safe and easily
accessible bike lanes along this corridor are essential, given the rapidly
growing car traffic in Silver Lake and Atwater Village. If we need a public
hearing to convince the powers-that-be of this, then consider this my
"lobbying" for that hearing. Thanks
Herb Agner
-----
Subject: 131017 0919-1
From: Susannah Lowber [mailto:susannahlowber@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, October 09, 2013 8:23 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
  mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: NO Hyperion Freeway- Build a safe viaduct for all

As someone who bikes or walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. I travel this bridge two to five times a week and it is already scary as a cyclist with the current speed. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community.

Specifically, I would like the project to include:
· Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
· Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
· Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
· No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
· A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,
Susannah Lowber
1326 Douglas St.
LA, CA 90026

-----
Subject: 131017 0919-2
From: ~rajni~ [mailto:rajnianne@yahoo.com]
Sent: Thursday, October 10, 2013 9:09 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
    mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All

As someone who bikes or walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it
is absolutely critical that Hyperion Avenue be made safe for people like
me. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate
speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project
to include:
Bike lanes on Hyperion Avenue
Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians
and to discourage speeding
No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access
the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an
alternative through the dangerous merge
There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan
and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the
greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA
River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

-----
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All

As someone who bikes or walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Rendering Hyperion inaccessible to cyclists forces me and many others to ride on Los Feliz Blvd, which is far more dangerous than even the current Hyperion crossing. I also frequent businesses on both sides of the bridge and know that when traffic flows off the bridge at high speeds it makes for dangerous crosswalks for several blocks in either direction. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community.

Specifically, I would like the project to include: Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave. Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs. Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding. No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster. A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge.

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit. I also request a public hearing on this matter.

Sincerely,
Rebecca Joyce
1724 N Edgemont Street #416
Los Angeles, CA 90027

-----
Subject: 131017 0920-2
From: Gabriela Nuñez [mailto:nunez.gabriela@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, October 10, 2013 1:42 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Subject: tom.labonge@lacity.org, councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org,
      mayor.garcetti@lacity.org

As someone who bikes or walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it
is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me.
Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate
speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project
to include:

- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with
  wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for
  bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people
  drive even faster
- A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to
  let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give
  bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan
and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest
barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This
project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,
Gabriela Nunez
1130 Rossmoyne Ave. Glendale, CA 91207

-----
Subject: 131017 0920-3
From: Ben Guzman [mailto:ben.guzman23@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, October 10, 2013 5:01 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All

As someone who bikes or walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:

- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
- A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,

Ben Guzman
Historic Filipino Town
Subject: 131017 0925
From: EsterNLenny@aol.com [mailto:EsterNLenny@aol.com]
Sent: Thursday, October 10, 2013 3:40 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Subject: Please, NO bicycle lanes on the Hyperion Bridge

To Whom It May Concern,

We have lived in the area close to the Hyperion Bridge since 1960 and have used the Hyperion Bridge for most of those years. As such, I am greatly concerned about the safety of everyone using the bridge, including the youth that use it going to and from John Marshall High School.

The discussion about the bicycle lanes on the Hyperion Bridge is important but the demand is demeaning. How can it ever be feasible to narrow the lanes on the bridge for car drivers, who count in the thousands as daily users, to give room to make a bicycle lane for maybe 100 users?

Has thought ever been give to car drivers as well as cyclists? And the flow of traffic? It has been noticed how car drivers slow down for bicyclists in the designated lanes, and this causes the flow of traffic to slow down and even to stop. But often cars have to slow down because so many bicyclists do not adhere to traffic lights nor to stop signs. In other words, what would make cyclists more dependable or safety-minded on the Hyperion Bridge than what has been observed on general roads in Glendale and Atwater Village? There is much to consider when making sure that safety is the first concern.

In addition, I don't understand how safe bicycle access on to and off of the bridge can be achieved. Two lanes need to be crossed to get on and off the bridge, which would make it VERY unsafe for both bicyclists and motorists.

This sounds like the tail wagging the dog, with the cyclists demanding change from the decision-makers and forcing their will on the neighboring communities. And this should not happen.

Thank you,

Evy and Jim Todd
-----
-----
-----
Subject: 131017 0934-2
From: longlegged.guy@gmail.com [mailto:longlegged.guy@gmail.com] On Behalf Of Aaron Sosnick
Sent: Thursday, October 10, 2013 5:31 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All

As someone who frequently bikes between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, I call on you to ensure that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for all.

Bike lanes were called for in the 2010 LA Bicycle Plan. It's outrageous that rehabilitation plans for this complex totally ignore this plan.

Everyone's needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:
- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
- A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,
Aaron Sosnick
2243 East Live Oak Drive
-----
Subject: 131017 0939
From: Alex Rixey [mailto:alexrixey@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, October 10, 2013 5:46 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: Hyperion Avenue - Build a Safe Viaduct for All

As someone who travels between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Avenue be made safe for people like me. I regularly use the bridge both as a pedestrian and motorist, and would like to be able to bike across as well.

When training for the L.A. Marathon, I regularly cross the Hyperion bridge on foot en route from my home in Franklin Hills to the L.A. River Bike Path and Griffith Park beyond. In the bridge's current auto-oriented configuration, the sidewalk ends abruptly on the Atwater Village side in the middle of four lanes of fast-moving traffic, and requires me to cross at an unmarked location, creating an unsafe condition both for me and for motorists on Glendale and Hyperion. As a marathoner-in-training, I am able to make the sprint to the other side; it would be impossible for someone moving at comfortable or reduced walking speed or in a wheelchair to cross.

I also regularly patronize restaurants and businesses on Glendale Boulevard in Atwater Village, and regularly travel to my gym just across the border in Glendale. I am an avid cyclist and would like to visit these businesses by bike: the short two miles from my home to Atwater Village should be a quick and pleasant bike ride. I regularly commute to Downtown on city streets and ride recreationally on PCH and Mulholland drive, but I do not feel safe on Hyperion Avenue. The unsafe biking environment leaves me no choice but to drive or risk serious injury or death. This results in my making additional vehicle trips that create congestion and pollution in my neighborhood.

I understand the need for motorists to cross the bridge. Even with better walking and biking facilities, I would continue to make some trips to Atwater Village and Glendale by car. However, safe walking and biking facilities would make it possible to walk, jog, and bike to Atwater Village, saving me money and improving my health while improving safety, reducing traffic congestion and reducing emissions for everyone in the community. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:

- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge. There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and benefit all travelers.

Sincerely,

Alex Rixey
1426 Talmadge Street
Los Angeles, CA 90027
Council District 4
-----
Subject: 131017 1029
Attachments: comment cards sept 25 mtg.pdf; _Certification_.htm
From: michael macdonald [mailto:michael.s.macdonald@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, October 10, 2013 5:53 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe River Crossing for All Users

Ms. Podesta,
I write as a resident with great concern for the current plans to reconfigure the Hyperion/Glendale viaduct crossing between Silverlake and Atwater Village. The plans as presented appear to be out of sync with the community character and intended use of this connection, as well as with the City’s Bicycle Master Plan and modern urban roadway design standards.

Specifically, I would like the project to include:
- Protected bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier or banked turns that will encourage vehicles to drive even faster
- A complete crosswalk on the Atwater Village end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

The incorporation of a river crossing from the L.A. River Bike Path is not sufficient to accommodate bicycle or pedestrians to commute between Silverlake and Atwater Village. There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan, Caltrans complete streets policy, and Federal Highway Administration routine accommodation regulations. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and to the benefit of all road users.

Sincerely,

Michael MacDonald
Subject: 131017 1049
From: michael culhane [mailto:michael_culhane@mac.com]
Sent: Thursday, October 10, 2013 7:31 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
    mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: Hyperion-Glendale complex of bridges over the 5 Freeway and LA River connecting Silver Lake to Atwater Village
Dear Ms. Tami Podesta, Mr. LaBong, Councilmember Farell, and Mayor Garcetti,
I am concerned about the plans for the Hyperion-Glendale complex of bridges over the 5 Freeway and LA River connecting Silver Lake to Atwater Village.
They are a death trap for any Bike trying to use them. PLEASE make sure that a bike lane becomes part of the plan for each of them. Bike are the future of LA and bike deaths will slow that progress.
Sincerely,
Michael Culhane
-----
Subject: 131017 1055-1
From: Bill Clare [mailto:bill_clare@hotmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, October 10, 2013 9:07 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: Hyperion Bridge-bike lanes and sidewalks

Dear all,

I recently heard about the proposed changes to the Hyperion Bridge and was shocked by the plan. I lived in Atwater Village for a time and used to walk up the bridge to get to Trader Joe’s. I was amazed at how unsafe it was for pedestrians. I also bike along it to get into Hollywood as there are not many alternate routes to get over there. Every time I ride over that bridge I fear for my life. I figured with a renovation on the way, the city would take the opportunity to make the bridge a way to bring the communities of Silver Lake, Edendale and Atwater together as well as connecting existing and planned bike paths. Instead you’ve planned to build the smallest freeway ever. Now is the time to bring the Hyperion Bridge back to its former glory and let it help bring communities back together as well as add to the LA River beautification project.

Here is what the project should include:

- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
- A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,

Bill Clare
-----
Hello,

As a pedestrian who routinely crosses the Glendale-Hyperion Bridge on foot, I am very concerned with the proposal to retrofit the span. When I first heard the news there was a plan to upgrade the bridge, I was excited by the idea that maybe the bridge would become a safer, more pleasant span to cross on foot or bike. Then I saw the details of the plan. The plan expands the roadway to freeway standards (accommodating motorists who routinely drive over the speed limit at 55 mph) instead of calming the traffic along the road, and enforcing current speed limits (which would make the crossing safer for pedestrians and cyclists). This is a grave mistake and one I urge you to change. We have an opportunity to correct 50 years of auto oriented planning principles in Los Angeles and this plan, although well intentioned, only continues these mistakes and furthers our traffic problems. Removing a pedestrian sidewalk on the eastside and making no room for bikes in exchange for road expansion, higher speeds and freeway style road barriers is not the way to improve life for our community. I urge you to rethink the elements of the plan that take away from pedestrians to facilitate speedy motorists. 35 mph for this road is appropriate and by this sound clip, many of my neighbors think so too. https://soundcloud.com/hyperionpubliccomment/what-is-the-design-speed-of

Thank you for your time,

Matt Diaz

-----
Subject: 131017 1055-3
From: Olivia Offutt [mailto:ooffutt@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, October 10, 2013 9:47 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
    mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All

As someone who bikes or walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:
· Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
· Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
· Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
· No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
· A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,

Olivia Offutt
3400 Poly Vista
Pomona, CA 91768
-----
Subject: 131017 1056
From: Lawrence Rogow [mailto:lrogow@loop.com]
Sent: Thursday, October 10, 2013 11:09 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
    mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All

As someone who bikes or walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:

- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
- A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,

Lawrence Rogow
Chairman

5670 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 1300
Los Angeles, CA 90036

(323) 904.4090 direct line / (323) 965.5411 fax
rogow@loop.com
Subject: 131017 1057
From: SkiDaily@aol.com [mailto:SkiDaily@aol.com]
Sent: Friday, October 11, 2013 7:45 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway

Tell me it is NOT true that you are designing "improvements" to the Hyperion Bridge over the L.A. River/I-5 Freeway without considering and accommodating ALL users (cars, bicycles and walkers).

Tell me it is NOT true that you are designing "improvements" to the Hyperion Bridge and ignoring the 2010 L.A. City Bicycle Plan which designates the Hyperion Bridge for BIKE LANES.

What exactly was the purpose of having spent all the time and money to develop a BIKE PLAN, if it is not going to be followed?

SHAME on you all for allowing this proposal to even be considered ... let alone get this far.

Andy Miliotis, 10 year CCC Participant - since 2004 - and more until we find a cure ...
600 S. Curson Avenue
#325
Los Angeles, CA 90036
(818) 384-5290 cell

Please join me in supporting the Arthritis Foundation in its efforts to find a cure for "arthritis" and related diseases. Each year since 2004, I have bicycled from San Francisco to L. A. as a way to honor my 100 year old Mother who passed away on August 13th and had been suffering with arthritis since age 28 and to raise money to help find a cure for the 40,000,000 Americans and 300,000 children (yes, this is not only an "old person's" disease) with some form of Arthritis.

Visit www.californiacostclassic.org for more info. Be sure to view the "Camp Esperanza video". I have set a personal goal of raising $20,000. Please help me reach this goal by DONATING on line at our secure web site at http://afcabikeclassic.kintera.org/andy or send a check to me payable to the "Arthritis Foundation". Thank you so much for your generosity and support. Working together, I know we can make a difference. Next ride takes place 9/28 - 10/5/13.

-----
Subject: 131017 1058
From: Rachel Bennett [mailto:rachelacbennett@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, October 11, 2013 9:04 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Consider public health, equity, and safety
for all!

As a public health professional, urban planner, and someone who bikes or
walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical
that Hyperion Ave. be made safe ALL people. Everyone's needs can be met if
the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban
community. PLEASE CONSIDER PUBLIC HEALTH AND EQUITY IN THIS IMPORTANT
PROJECT! Specifically, I would like the project to include:
- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and
pedestrians and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even
faster
- A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people
access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists
an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike
plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the
greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA
River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit. Thank
you very much for your attention.

Sincerely,

Rachel Bennett
3360 Hamilton Way, Los Angeles, CA 90026
-----
Subject: 131017 1106-2
From: Melody Brocious [mailto:melodybrocious@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, October 11, 2013 10:13 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Subject: Build a Safe Viaduct for All - No Hyperion Freeway - Glendale
Hyperion Complex of Bridge Improvement Project

Dear Tami Podesta, Branch Chief
Division of Environmental Planning
California DOT7

As someone who bikes, walks, drives and rides between Silver Lake and
Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that the Glendale Hyperion
Complex of Bridge Improvement Project be made safe for people like me. Everyone's needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate
speeds through an urban community. I attended project workshop on 9/25/2013 and was happy to discuss the project with all in attendance. Specifically, I would like the project to include:

1. Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave in accordance with the 2010 Los Angeles Bike Plan
2. Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with way finding signs
3. Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
4. No crash barrier and banked turns maximize bridge real estate for automobiles so people drive faster than necessary for the posted speed limits surrounding streets
5. A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge
6. Crosswalk ramp on both sides that facilitate bicycle traffic entering or exiting sidewalk
7. A crosswalk on the Rowena Ave, Silver Lake end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd., preventing jaywalking and improve pedestrian way finding
8. Minimize grating on the bridge which collects debris and creates a hazard for cyclists

There is enough room on the bridge to accommodate pedestrian & bike traffic better, & slow car traffic down to make it safer & more pleasant for everyone. There's no point in allowing or encouraging drivers to speed up to freeway speeds to cover the short distance that these bridges span. There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and benefit all travelers.

Sincerely,

Melody Brocious 900 east 1st street LA CA 90012
-----
Subject: 131017 1106-3
From: Tricia Robbins [mailto:tricia.d.robbins@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, October 11, 2013 10:17 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All

As someone who bikes and walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me.

Hyperion / Glendale is wide enough that it can be designed to accommodate pedestrians, bicyclists', and motorists needs at speeds appropriate for an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:
- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks on both sides of Hyperion / Glendale and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and to discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
- A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the Los Angeles bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,
Tricia Robbins Kasson
1952 Rodney Dr.
Los Angeles, CA 90027
tricia.d.robbins@gmail.com
(323) 552-3231

-----
I am writing to express my concern over the proposed retrofit of the Glendale Hyperion Bridge. I do not support the proposal. This bridge is a vital connection between Silverlake and Atwater Village, currently is a dangerous bridge to walk, bike or drive across & the proposed retrofit will make it even less safe for all users.

I dont support the median in the center or eliminating the sidewalk on one side - this is not historically compatible with the original bridge and it is a downgrade in terms of safety and quality of place.

I am appalled that there will be no bike lanes on the bridge - bike lanes were promised on this bridge as part of the bike plan, it is essential per Caltrans Complete Streets Policy (DD-64-R1) to provide for the mobility needs of bicyclists and pedestrians.

The proposed new ped/bike bridge on the river path does replace the function of bike lanes or sidewalks on the bridge itself. This new proposed ped/bike bridge does not connect directly to Glendale or Hyperion, in order to access this new bridge a user would have to take a dangerous circuitous path illustrated in the attached map sketch. Also there already is the Sunnynook Ped/Bike bridge just 1000 to the north so there is no real added function with this new bridge.

I urge the Department of Transportation to require this proposed bridge modernization project to be re-designed to accomodate all users. Bike and Ped access must be maintained and modernized.

Thank you.

daveed kapoor  323 252 8510  california architect C32812
Subject: 131017 1107
From: easwaran@gmail.com [mailto:easwaran@gmail.com] On Behalf Of Kenny Easwaran
Sent: Friday, October 11, 2013 10:33 AM
To: councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org; Podesta, Tami L@DOT; tom.labonge@lacity.org
Subject: Hyperion Ave

I'm sure you're getting plenty of messages about the importance of the Hyperion Ave viaduct for cyclists and pedestrians wanting to cross the LA river, and the 5 freeway. But you should also note that no matter how many bridges you build across the river and freeway, it's still quite difficult to get from the neighborhoods of Silver Lake and Los Feliz down to Riverside Dr. The ridge line of the hills is just as much a barrier as the freeway and the river. Glendale Blvd is not yet usable by cyclists and pedestrians, and Los Feliz Blvd is nearly as bad. Hyperion is the best chance for a straight route, connecting to the bike lanes on Griffith Park Ave, and the neighborhood bike route on St. George St.

There is plenty of space on the bridge for 8 feet width of protected cycletracks next to the protected sidewalk, if the traffic lanes are 11 feet wide instead of 12 and 14. If the worry is that cars are going too fast for 11 feet to be adequate safety, then we need design features that psychologically encourage drivers to proceed at a safe speed, rather than design features that encourage them to speed up even more.

From my house just off Fountain Ave, at the foot of Hyperion Ave, I am much more likely to bike the three miles into Hollywood, or the five miles into Downtown, than the two miles into Atwater, because the bridge is scary, and no better alternatives exist to crossing the three barriers of the ridgeline, the freeway, and the river.

Please make this bridge safe and usable for all!

Kenny Easwaran
-----
Subject: 131017 1109-1
From: bergstressers@sbcglobal.net [mailto:bergstressers@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Friday, October 11, 2013 12:10 PM
To: councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org;
    Podesta, Tami L@DOT; tom.labonge@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway!

Councilmembers O-Farrell, LaBonge, Mayor Garcetti and Ms. Podesta -

As someone who bikes and walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me.

Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community.

Specifically, I would like the project to include:
- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
- A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy! The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,

Judy Bergstresser
1945 Meridian Ave.
South Pasadena, CA 91030
-----
Subject: Glendale Blvd. - Hyperion Ave. Complex of Bridges Improvement Project

Dear Ms. Podesta,

When I heard of this project many years ago, I was very apprehensive as to what would become of the historical bridge. I know it needed earthquake retrofitting, but at what cost?

I see all of the fine work the engineers through diligence and community input have accomplished with their plans, very impressive.

To see now at the eleventh hour, how a group of purported outsiders seem to be throwing a wrench in the project is disgusting. All of this work to be put in jeopardy for the addition of a bike path? This doesn’t sit well with me.

Growing up in the area (Elysian Heights) and having lived in Glendale for a number of years before returning to Elysian Heights, I have travelled this bridge complex in one aspect or other since as long as I can remember, often several times in a day. I can tell you from common experience, this is no sane place for a bike path. It is simply too dangerous and to make it somewhat safe, well there goes the whole project in my opinion:

1. Narrowing the lanes would do nothing but make it more dangerous for both motorists and cyclists.
2. Removing the median barriers would make it less safe for drives as well (imagine driving on the I-5 without a divider).
3. The cost is simply not worth reworking or scrapping the time, energy and money already invested in this project.

And finally:

4. How many of these bicyclists have ever or would ever use this?

I see a simple solution in widening the pedestrian crossing over the river using the existing Red Car piers. This would not only be a cheaper solution, but a much safer one at that and a chance to repurpose part of old Los Angeles. If this is not an option financially, cyclists can be instructed to walk their bicycles across the path ensuring the safety of pedestrians. This has been done for many years in Venice Beach as cyclists must walk through the vendor lines section of the boardwalk or take the alternate bike path closer to the water.

I hope you consider the opinion of a local resident.
Regards,

James Todd
Elysian Heights resident
-----
Subject: 131017 1110-1
From: Marianne Vogel Bender [mailto:mariannebender12@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, October 11, 2013 11:13 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: Tom; Mayor; Ofarrell
Subject: IMPORTANT!!!!Hyperion Freeway - Build a SAFE Viaduct for All

As someone who walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:
- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
- A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,
Marianne Bender
3214 Perlita ave la ca 90039

Marianne Vogel Bender
PRODUCER/DIRECTOR
Los Angeles, CA
m 215.262.8892
mavtv@roadrunner.com
Bendercreativegroup.com

-----
Subject: 131017 1111
From: Evy Todd [mailto:evy747@yahoo.com]
Sent: Friday, October 11, 2013 2:21 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Subject: NO Bike Lanes on Hyperion Bridge - SO VERY UNSAFE!

10/10/13

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN;
I was extremely concerned and dismayed to hear of possible alterations to
the renovation plans for the Hyperion Bridge. The Bridge does NOT need bike lanes, forcing it to become narrower and possibly removing the center divider. While I applaud their efforts in most cases, and acknowledge their right to speak of their desires, I don’t appreciate the bike lane advocates not granting me the same courtesy, in their apparent unwillingness to see other points of view in return.

There are certain realities in life. Dealing with the finite, physical dimensions of a historical bridge is one of them. Another reality is safety. Unfortunately, on this topic, I know of which I speak.

I went to John Marshall High School in the ’70s and there were constant stories of accidents on the Bridge including head-on collisions. In the ’80s, I and a friend came upon the site of an accident on the Bridge, late one night. A motorcyclist had been forced onto the side and was down. A semi-truck had stopped to help but his radio wasn’t working. We ran home, called 9-1-1, grabbed aluminum foil (to act as a reflector for cars) and a blanket. We got back and did what we could until help arrived. However, before it did, the motorcyclist literally died in my hands. This is not the kind of thing that one forgets. A center divider on the Bridge is most assuredly needed!

I have heard that the bike lane advocates suggest making lanes smaller and that will slow traffic speeds down. No. No it won’t! Has any one of them driven the Pasadena (Arroyo Seco) freeway lately? It has the narrowest lanes of any stretch of freeway in the greater Los Angeles area, and yet people speed merrily along, breaking the speed limit, every day.

These plans have been developed over YEARS. To come in at the 11th hour and expect to have their desires met is unrealistic and smacks of entitlement.

For the safety of all, please leave the lanes the same width, add a center divider, and do NOT add bike lanes to the bridge. In this case, THE NEEDS OF THE FEW DO NOT OUTWEIGH THE SAFETY NEEDS OF THE MANY!

Thank you for your time!
Evy Todd
-----
Subject: 131017 1115
From: Judy Korin [mailto:judy@seesawstudios.com]
Sent: Friday, October 11, 2013 2:42 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway -- Build a Safe Viaduct for ALL!!

Dear Ms Podesta, Council Members and Mayor Garcetti,
As someone who has had their office at 2959 Glendale Blvd, the last building in Atwater before the Hyperion bridge, and as someone who bikes AND walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, I can attest to the importance of this critical link across the LA River between our neighborhoods. I have observed Marshall High School students walking and crossing perilously at both sides of the bridge, while cars come hurtling down the Boulevard at freeway speeds without regard for pedestrians or cyclists.

It is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me, but especially for our high school students. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:
- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
- A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,
Judy Korin
3828 Valleybrink Rd
Los Angeles, CA 90039
--

Judy Korin
Creative/Director/Founder
Seesaw Studios
tel: 323.646.7747
e: judy@seesawstudios.com
www.seesawstudios.com
balancing content and branding
-----
Subject: 131017 1130
From: Wes High [mailto:weshigh@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, October 11, 2013 2:43 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: VisionHyperion!-No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All

I'm a resident of CD13 and think that the current plans for the retrofit of the Hyperion viaduct are a bad idea and will hurt the livability of all the communities surrounding it. There is no reason that the bridge should be designed for 55mph auto travel.

This bridge needs to have bike lanes, as well as great pedestrian access(wide side walks, cross walks etc.) This bridge connects to very walkable and bike heavy neighborhoods. Its a waste of infrastructure to design this bridge to increase auto traffic speeds for .5 miles, where that high speed traffic will then dump into pedestrian heavy areas. That is just asking for people to get run down and killed. I would like the project to include:

· Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
· Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
· Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
· No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
· A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

CD13 Resident
Wesley High
1425 Lucile Ave
Los Angeles, CA 90026
-----
Subject: 131017 1132-1
From: Allison Amon [mailto:aamon@chelsea.com]
Sent: Friday, October 11, 2013 3:00 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org; Paul Franceschi
Subject: Hyperion in Atwater

Dear Tami,

I am a long time Silverlake resident (20 years) with two children and a husband who all are avid bicyclists and walkers. I am very concerned about the upcoming project that would turn yet another Silverlake street into a high speed freeway.

I am writing to you about the proposed project that would rehabilitate the Hyperion- Glendale bridges over the 5 freeway and the LA River. I am unclear and unhappy that the project does not include the bicycle lanes that were planed for in the 2010 plan. Please consider changing the current plan to include them.

Specifically, I would like the project to include:

- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
- A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,

Allison Amon
2388 Kenilworth Ave
Los Angeles, CA 90039

-----
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All

I've recently moved to Rowena Avenue in Los Feliz after living in Echo Park for 8 years. As someone who now bikes and walks frequently between that area and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. I drive my car across that bridge frequently as well but I know that everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:

- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
- A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

I’m really looking forward to better bike and pedestrian infrastructure in my new neighborhood. Please help this become a reality!

Sincerely,

Alice Rutherford
3358 Rowena Ave #1
Los Angeles, CA 90027

Alice Rutherford
ILLUSTRATION & DESIGN
Los Angeles, CA
alicerutherford.com
Subject: 131017 1133-1
From: stephenmarshallbox@gmail.com [mailto:stephenmarshallbox@gmail.com] On Behalf Of Stephen Box
Sent: Friday, October 11, 2013 11:37 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: Rachel Horst
Subject: Glendale Blvd-Hyperion Ave Bridge Comments

Tami,

I understand that the deadline for comments on the Hyperion-Glendale Bridge is today.

I offer these comments and request the opportunity to contribute additional comments in the future.

1) Those in charge of this project will be exceeding their authority if they restrict access to one mode while allowing access to other modes during the construction project. If motor vehicles are permitted during construction, then pedestrians and cyclists must also be permitted. The State of California has been very clear in the CAMUTCD on the many options available for accommodating all modes during construction, and also very specific on behavior that is prohibited, including engineered conflict and mode restrictions.

2) The bridge, as proposed, is inconsistent with LA’s 2010 Bike Plan, which specifies bike lanes. The Initial Study says that it is consistent but fails to demonstrate that consistency. The Bike Plan calls for Bike Lanes and the Initial Study has no Bike Lanes. They are inconsistent.

3) The Initial Study includes inconsistencies such as referring to a widened sidewalk but being unable to specify if it is 8' or 7'. Both numbers are used.

4) Optimum capacity would be reached with speeds of 30-35 so increasing the speed of traffic with enhancements that favor motor vehicle speeds are not improvements, but actually defects that work against pedestrian safety, cyclist safety, and motorist safety. In addition, it results in a loss of efficiency for all modes.

5) Removing a sidewalk and offering in its place a crosswalk supported with a flashing beacon is no solution at all. Flashing beacons are no match for speeding traffic that requires sufficient distance to safely stop. This is simply engineered conflict.

6) At best, the accommodations during construction and the resulting infrastructure for pedestrians and cyclists appear to be afterthoughts, not a commitment to multi-modal and certainly not an improvement.

Thanks for the opportunity to comment and to point out that to proceed at
this point would be to exceed your authority.

Stephen
Stephen

Stephen Box
Director of Outreach and Communication
Senior Project Coordinator
Department of Neighborhood Empowerment
200 N. Spring Street, Suite 2005
Los Angeles, CA 90012
Downtown Office: (213) 978-1551
Downtown Fax: (213) 978-1751

Website <http://EmpowerLA.org> | Facebook <http://facebook.com/EmpowerLA>
| Twitter <http://twitter.com/EmpowerLA> | YouTube<http://youtube.com/EmpowerLA>
| Newsletter<http://archive.constantcontact.com/fs005/1105232878764/archive/1109985657054.html>

Register now <https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/NCBudgetDay2013> for the October 26 Neighborhood Council Budget Day
Empower Yourself. Empower Your Community. Empower LA.

-----
Subject: 131017 1133-2
From: Caleb [mailto:anago55@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Friday, October 11, 2013 3:35 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.com; mayor.garcetti@lacity.com
Subject: Hyperion Avenue Project

As someone who bikes or walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:

- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
- A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,

Caleb R. Nelson
2929 Waverly Dr. 110
Los Angeles, CA. 90039
-----
Subject: 131017 1134-1
From: casey caplowe [mailto:casey@goodinc.com]
Sent: Friday, October 11, 2013 3:36 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All

Hi,
As someone who bikes and walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:

- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster

A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,
Casey Caplowe
1447 Avon Terrace
LA, CA 90026

-----
Subject: 131017 1134-2
From: Kimberly Greenhut [mailto:kimproduces@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, October 11, 2013 3:22 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All

As someone who bikes between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is
absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave be made safe for people like me.
I also bike regularly from my home in Los Feliz to the LA River.
Currently, I have to use Los Feliz Blvd, which I despise due to the heavy
traffic and very busy intersection at Los Feliz and Riverside. I would
love an alternative.
Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate
speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project
to include:
  - Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
  - Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
  - Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and
    pedestrians and discourage speeding
  - No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even
    faster
  - A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let
    people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give
    bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge
There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan
and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest
barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This
project can change that and make all travelers benefit.
I would also like to add that putting a major thoroughfare in a
neighborhood disrupts the cohesion of the community. Let’s make L.A. a
more community friendly and livable city by building infrastructure that
serves everyone.
Sincerely,
Kimberly Greenhut
4448 Melbourne Ave.
Los Angeles, CA 90027
415-260-6879
-----
Subject: 131017 1243-2
From: Mary Abler [mailto:mary.abler@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, October 11, 2013 3:39 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All!

Hello!
As someone who bikes and walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it
is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me.
I volunteer at a food/art space in Atwater and live in Silver Lake. When I
bike home at 11 PM, after my shift, my coworker insists on following me,
slowly, in his car, convinced that Hyperion is completely unsafe for me to
bike on that late at night. Of course, I have bike lights and I travel at a
safe speed, but he is right!
Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate
speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project
to include:
· Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
· Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with
wayfinding signs
· Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for
bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
· No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people
drive even faster
· A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to
let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give
bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge
There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan
and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest
barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This
project can change that and make all travelers benefit.
Sincerely,
Mary Abler
1720 N Dillon St, 90026
-----
Subject: 131017 1244
From: Bradley Cleveland [mailto:bfcleveland@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, October 11, 2013 3:40 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: Hyperion Viaduct

Ms Podesta,

I'm a frequent biker on the streets of LA, and I'm writing to urge you to design the Hyperion Viaduct so it is safe for people who bike or walk between Silver Lake and Atwater Village. Specifically, I would like the project to include:

- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
- A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge.

Please ensure this project to consistent with the LA bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The changes listed above will transform the viaduct into a safe bike and pedestrian route across the 5 Freeway and the LA River.

Sincerely,
Bradley Cleveland
1907 1/2 Whitley Av, LA 90068

-----
Subject: 131017 1245-1
From: Joe Andrews [mailto:andrews@earthlink.net]
Sent: Friday, October 11, 2013 3:42 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: Rehabilitation of Hyperion Bridge

Ms. Podesta:

This email requests that in any plan to rehabilitate the Hyperion Bridge, that you give consideration to bikes, walkers, and even dog-walkers, and not just to automobiles. The current plan fails to do so, and in doing so, is part of the problem, not the solution, to making Los Angeles an even better place to live. Also, it is not clear that the plan properly factors in Hyperion Avenue’s history of carnage – it was not that long ago that the stop light was placed on Hyperion in front of Trader Joe’s, and only after at least one person had been killed at that intersection.

I live in the Franklin Hills area, and very often use the Hyperion Bridge between Silver Lade and Atwater Village. Many Sunday mornings, walking the dog, I take the stairs from Riverside Drive next to the Hyperion Bridge that end on the Silver Lake side of the bridge. I try to ride my bicycle in the area as well.

Please make Hyperion Avenue safe for all of us – not just cars, but the bikers and walkers as well. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:

- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Speed limits consistent with city driving, not freeway driving;
- Well-marked crosswalks;
- Sufficient space for multi-use, including safe use by bicyclists and walkers (sufficient walk-ways, bike lanes, etc)
- A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the existing bike plan and Caltrans’ complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

I have copied Tom Labonge and others, because Tom is not only a bicycler (leading trips in his district) but also a dedicated walker and hiker. Tom is a strong supporter of his constituents and of their quality of life. Help us on this one, Tom.

Sincerely,

Joe Andrews
3871 Franklin Ave.
Los Angeles, CA 90027
-----
Subject: Build a Safe Viaduct from Silver Lake to Atwater on Hyperion for all users of public roads.

As someone who bikes and walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me and all members of the public. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through this urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:

- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with way-finding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and to discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
- A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

This project should be consistent with the LA’s bike plan and Caltrans’ complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe pedestrian and bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and benefit all travelers if the recommendations outlined above are considered and implemented.

Sincerely,

Joe Hogg
2467 Hidalgo Avenue
Los Angeles, CA 90039

-----
Subject: 131017 1246  
From: William Campbell [mailto:wildbell@gmail.com]  
Sent: Friday, October 11, 2013 4:51 PM  
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT  
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org  
Subject: I'm Hyper Over Hyperion

As both a life-long cyclist in Los Angeles and a 10-year resident of Silver Lake, the Hyperion Viaduct has been a regular connector on bike routes to and from Atwater Village, Elysian Valley Glendale, Burbank, and the San Fernando Valley. It’s certainly not the safest place to ride or walk as it is, but I manage. From what I hear now plans are being proposed to make it even less manageable, and it is inconceivable that any upgrade to such a vital link to so many communities seem designed to make it even less of a safe place to walk and ride. It is completely hypocritical that after the implementation of a “road diet” on a section of nearby Rowena now the bridge is in danger of being turned into what amounts to be an environment that is hostile to pedestrians and cyclists. I encourage you to promptly demand the plans be revisited and revised so that they are inclusive to all modes traveling over and under the viaduct and not exclusive, with consideration being made for the following:
- Bike lanes on Hyperion Avenue
- Wider sidewalks and marked crosswalks with wayfinding signage
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
- A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to be inconsistent with the city’s bike masterplan and Caltrans’ "Complete Streets" policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the Los Angeles River. Making it less safe is not the answer. This project shouldn’t change the bridge to benefit motorists to the detriment of cyclists and pedestrians. It should change the bridge to be of benefit all modes of transportation.

Sincerely,
William Campbell
840 N. Occidental Blvd
Los Angeles, CA 90026
-----
Subject: 131017 1304
From: Gilbert G. Gutierrez Jr. [mailto:gilbergg@usc.edu]
Sent: Friday, October 11, 2013 4:55 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: coram.paribus@gmail.com; tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: Hyperion Bridge

Respectfully:

I am a cyclist. I am also a community member (live in Koreatown, work in University Village, play in DTLA and Hollywood). I am a tax payer, voter and, most importantly, a father, brother, and son. I do not ride to Atwater Village or Eagle Rock or any other Los Angeles neighborhood north of the river due to the poor infrastructure. What do I mean by poor? I mean no separation from auto traffic, no painted bike lanes, little to no signage, really no meaningful consideration whatsoever for anyone other than the motorist. I am writing this brief note to express my dismay with the current plans for the Hyperion Bridge. The bridge could be a key link between Los Feliz, Silver Lake and the aforementioned neighborhoods.

I do not want freeway style median barriers on the bridge. I do not want to be shooed off onto some isolated bike-ped bridge. I do not want cars to be sped up, but rather slowed down. It is sad and frustrating because I should not have to plead for safety nor think of it as a ‘want’. This project needs to be totally rethought or rejected.

Let me just go ahead and reach for the stars: ideally, there would be a physical barrier ie K-rails placed on either side of the bridge between the wide sidewalks and the traffic lanes to cordon off the protected bike lanes crossing the river. This is likely not going to happen. Why not? Because it is perceived to be highly politically risky and would take real leadership. Should politics trump safety? Even Type II painted bike lanes, as many other advocates are calling for, are not part of the plan as presented. Type II bike lanes across the river should be the bare minimum. They should be a no-brainer slam dunk.

Widening travel lanes only encourages speeding by motorists and with the bike-ped bridge being built in such a non-obvious manner to anyone traveling on Hyperion by bike, cyclists will continue riding over the bridge. Only after this project, the bridge will be more dangerous to them.

Please, please, please rethink this project with the needs of cyclists and pedestrians also in mind and do NOT build this project as was presented at the community meeting on September 25, 2013. Thank you.

--
Gilbert G. Gutierrez, Jr.
Senior Library Assistant, Acquisitions
USC Libraries  UVI-A
gilbergg@usc.edu  213-740-7470
-----
Subject: 131017 1305
From: HEALYDESIGN@aol.com [HEALYDESIGN@aol.com]
Sent: Saturday, October 12, 2013 12:12 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Subject: Re: Hyperion Bridge redesign

Hello Ms. Podesta
I have been a resident of this area for 30 years and use the bridge often. Where the bridge ends, east bound, is a signal at Glen Feliz. There has always been a bottle neck there as cars turn either left to enter Atwater Village or make a U turn to go west from the north bound 5 freeway, Glendale Bl exit (one can only turn east from that exit ramp). One left hand turn lane is dedicated for all this traffic and the lane is always backed up into one of the lanes to its right, stopping that lane of traffic as well. Drivers are required to wait through two or even three lights, at times, to make the turn. This is not just a rush hour concern, it happens throughout the day.
One lane dedicated for U turns and another for left turns would help but the way the bridge ends on the east and melds into Glendale Bl. doesn’t leave room to do that now. The eastern portion of the bridge needs to be redesigned to allow for a better flow of traffic.
I sincerely hope this issue will be address by the engineers as the bridge is redesigned.
Thank you for the opportunity to comment about the bridge issues facing the people living in this community.
Susan Healy
-----
Subject: 131017 1307-1
From: Aaron Kuehn [aaron@aarline.info]
Sent: Saturday, October 12, 2013 1:37 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: Glendale-Hyperion Viaduct / Bridge - Misguided Plans
Dear Ms. Podesta,
I was a bicyclist, motorist, and pedestrian in LA for 20 years, and I created landmark bicycle safety campaigns for the City of LA, and worked hard to pass the current bicycle plan so that future changes to the streetscape will result in a more livable city. I traveled back and forth on the Glendale-Hyperion Viaduct / Bridge many times. It is a beautiful historic span connecting two of the most vibrant and walkable communities in the region. The view as you descend the bridge into Atwater is breathtaking and unique, and should be a joyful experience for all users.
Instead, it is currently a horrific gauntlet run for cyclists and pedestrians, and even motorists have a very hard time safely crossing the many lanes of divergent traffic. It is my understanding that several motorists have died on this bridge in the past decade. Business owners on the Atwater side tell stories of frequent high-speed collisions. As a cyclist, I have been subjected to more harassment from motorists on this bridge than anywhere else in LA, and I fear for my life every time I ride up the ramps of this bridge. As a pedestrian, I am perplexed how to even get across.
The LA traffic engineers’ solution to raise the speed of traffic, ignoring the longtime pleas of the community to slow the lethal mess down is insulting and foolish. This flagrant irresponsibility of LA traffic engineers is a principle reason I moved my business and family this summer to a different city.
The city where we live now is building a very similar replacement high-traffic viaduct / bridge. This bridge, however, will feature in each direction, 12’ wide shared-use sidewalks, a bicycle lane, and a single motorized travel lane ( Read more about it here: http://www.sellwoodbridge.org/?p=project-area ).
Forward-thinking design that responds to community input is more difficult, but completely worth it. LA officials need to help create a city that people want to continue living in, and that doesn’t kill them. It is imperative that any changes to this bridge calm/slow the existing reckless traffic, add the bicycle lanes called for in the bicycle plan, add sufficient side walks, and engage the community in a more meaningful and responsive way. This is all completely do-able, and will result in a safer and more effective connection between these stellar communities.
Thank you,
Aaron Kuehn
-----
Subject: 131017 1307-2
From: M. Chambliss [ragweedpress@yahoo.com]
Sent: Saturday, October 12, 2013 1:38 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: Objections to Hyperion Freeway System - Viaduct Must Be Safe For ALL Users
Dear Ms. Podesta,
I have lived in Atwater Village since 1990, and each day, I commute both ways over the bridge from Atwater Village to Silverlake. On the weekends, I sometimes walk into Silverlake to shop and go to the gym. Crossing the street from Glendale Boulevard to the bridge is, at best, a risky procedure for a walker. I would also love to ride my bicycle across the bridge, but frankly, under the current conditions, I am afraid to.
Based on my daily observations of traffic, as a car driver, pedestrian, and bicycle rider, I feel that it is an absolute necessity for public safety and the Atwater Village and Silverlake communities, that both the bridge and Hyperion Avenue/Glendale Boulevard be made safe for me and everyone in my community. I do not see this happening if the current project's design goes forward, without first being modified to respect and accommodate the current makeup and traveling needs of my community.
Here are the items that I feel should be changed/incorporated regarding the current project design:
   Bike lanes going both ways across the bridge to/from Atwater Village, and on Hyperion Avenue
   Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
   Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
   No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
   A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge
In addition, I fully agree with the statement that there is no reason for this project to be inconsistent with the bike plan and Caltrans "complete streets" policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.
With kindest regards,
Marty Chambliss
3862 Valleybrink Road
Los Angeles, CA  90039
(323) 793-0885
-----
Subject: 131017 1308
From: Ray de Mesa [ray@raydemesa.com]
Sent: Saturday, October 12, 2013 6:36 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All
Greetings:
As someone who bikes or walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Avenue be made safe for people like me. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:
   Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
   Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
   Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
   No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
   A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge
There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.
Sincerely,
Ray de Mesa
-----
Subject: 131017 1309-1
From: Kitty Norton [kittynorton01@gmail.com]
Sent: Saturday, October 12, 2013 7:55 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway! A safe viaduct for bikes/pedestrians

As someone who bikes or walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:

- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
- A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,
Kitty Norton
1917 Rodney Drive
Los Angeles, CA 90027
--
Kitty Norton
Video Editor
Website: KittastrophyProne.com<http://www.kittastrophyprone.com/>
-----
Subject: 131017 1309-2
From: Netty Carr [dishy512@icloud.com]
Sent: Saturday, October 12, 2013 3:42 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: mayor.garcetti@lacity.org; Mitch O'farrell; tom.labonge@lacity.org;
Wenn Chyn; ana.guerrero@lacity.org; Mary Rodriguez; Daniel.Halden@lacity.org;
Luis Lopez; Sandra Caravella; Ann Lawson
Subject: Hyperion Bridge Project
To whom it may concern:
Friends of Atwater Village (FAV) would like to express our sincere thanks
to the design team that has been working on the retrofit and restoration of
our local landmark, the Hyperion Bridge HCM #164.
The bridge retrofit & restoration project was first brought to Atwater
Village residents back in 2004. Since then we have seen many changes to the
plan. Mr. Wally Stokes had said it best at one of the early community
meetings, "No one knows their neighborhood better than the people who live
there." No truer words have been spoken.
FAV, had many suggestions for this project, first and foremost was the
protection of all historical elements of the bridge. We also advocated for
pedestrian safety, the realignment of the Interstate 5 freeway off-ramp and
proposed a pedestrian / bike bridge over the Los Angeles River on the old
Red Car pylons. Amazingly all of these things have been incorporated in the
plan.
Over the years we have witnessed firsthand a collaboration between the
government agencies and local stakeholders to improve the historic bridge
and meet the new seismic requirements. Working together we achieved great
results. Thanks for giving the community stakeholders a seat at the table.
Now pedestrians and bicyclists alike will have a safe way to cross Glendale
Blvd and access the Hyperion Bridge stairs to continue their commute to the
Silver Lake and Los Feliz communities. The 5 freeway offramp realignment
will help alleviate the congestion at the Glenfeliz Blvd turnaround which
will in turn keep the traffic from backing up on the bridge.
Lastly, we give our wholehearted thanks to our new Council Member Mitch
O'Farrell for sharing our vision, conveying our safety concerns, working
with the design team to find a solution and helping to secure the funding.
Wenn Chen, Linda Moore and Wally Stokes also deserve special recognition
for taking that extra step to work with the community members. We
appreciate all their due diligence and hard work.
We look forward to seeing a beautifully restored Hyperion Bridge.
Sincerely,
Netty Carr, Sandra Caravella, Ann Lawson & Luis Lopez
Board, Friends of Atwater Village
3371 Glendale Blvd unit #110
Los Angeles, CA 90039
323-913-2999
-----
Subject: 131017 1310
From: Andy Au [andyau8@gmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, October 13, 2013 2:08 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT; tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Cc: Carol Feucht; Cyclists Inciting Change thru LIVE Exchange:: BikeNow.org; Jen Klausner; Erik Alcaraz; JJ Hoffman; info@bikenow.org; Javier Hernandez

Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All - Bicycles, Pedestrians and Motor Vehicles

Good Morning Ms. Podesta, Council Member Labonge, Council Member O'Farrell and Mayor Garcetti,

Thank you for what you have done to work with the entire Northeast Los Angeles Community to establish the bicycle lanes along York Blvd in Highland Park, Colorado Blvd. in Eagle Rock and Spring St. in Downtown Los Angeles. I travel these routes regularly.

As a 49 year old and therefore 49 year member of the Silver Lake Community I am writing to request that you reconsider the current plans for the Hyperion Avenue and its absence of Sidewalks for Pedestrians and Separated Bicycle Lanes for Bicyclists, Kids on Scooters and responsible Skateboarders.

As a kid, especially an older tween and teenager, I rode my bicycle on this road to get from Silver Lake to Atwater Village and on to Eagle Rock. As an adult, I'd like to do the same and continue to bring my children on this route for a leisurely Saturday or Sunday activity. Or a ride during the week to the Farmers Market. Or to Costco for groceries. Or to connect to the Class I LA River Bike and Pedestrian Lane. Or to Tam O'Shanter Inn for Prime Rib, Yorkshire Pudding, Creamed Corn and a light salad after a day of physical activity biking and walking about this great city of ours. I would like to be able to use Zero Pollution, slow and safe, 100% Healthy Physical Activity means to travel throughout Northeast Los Angeles in addition to driving around the city in an automobile.

I commute from one Los Angeles City Community / Neighborhood (Silver Lake) to several other Los Angeles Communities / Neighborhoods (Atwater, Highland Park, Glassell Park, Eagle Rock) and onto adjacent cities as well: South Pasadena, Pasadena, Alhambra, Glendale etc.

I am not merely a bicyclist and pedestrian, I also drive an automobile on a daily basis as part of my employment as a pharmaceutical sales representative. This is a safety initiative that will help calm traffic and reduce accidents which will more consistently improve traffic flow, ease frustration and prevent road rage.

It will lower the stress level and raise the awareness of each of us to the other users of this major thoroughfare. I think of this bridge and roadway with its beautiful vistas of the Glendale Foothills and San Gabriel Mountains much like the view from the 1st St and 4st Bridges that cross over to East LA during the 7 CicLAvia events.

Please rethink and reconsider what kind of Los Angeles we want to live in. One that is a "Freeway" even in residential neighborhoods and thoroughfares? Or one that combines safe and sane vehicular (motorized or not) traffic movement with a pleasant, natural transportation corridor.
One that appreciates the beauty and not mere functionality of this bridge route and allows transportation users to appreciate its historical engineering and architecture. I’m pretty sure it was built during the WPA era of great infrastructure?

As someone who bikes or walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:

- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
- A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Thank you for all you do to make Los Angeles a global 22nd Century City that is the envy of the world with our multi-modal transportation means throughout the city.

Sincerely,

Andy Au

I have lived in Eagle Rock 90041, Silver Lake 90039, attended Micheltorena Elementary School and Thomas Starr King Junior High School before moving to Eagle Rock Junior/Senior High School for graduation in 2982. I then attended and graduated from the University of California at Davis where a bicycle was my primary means of transportation for 4 years. Whereupon I returned to Los Angeles, CA and lived in Eagle Rock.

--

Andy Au

323-344-8795   home / office

---
Subject: 131017 1311
From: Eli Sentman [elis000@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 14, 2013 6:00 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
    mayorgarcetti@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All
Tami,
I live in Atwater Village with my wife and infant daughter. I was recently informed of the Caltrans plan to modify the Hyperion Bridge to accommodate cars traveling at 55 mph. I have lived in Atwater for almost five years and enjoy being able to walk over the Hyperion Bridge to shop at the stores on the other side as well as hike up to Griffith Park and to walk around Silver Lake Reservoir. In essence, this plan cuts off Atwater from the neighborhoods of Silver Lake and Los Feliz. That bridge is the quickest path to the other side. If anything, there needs to be enforcement of the posted 35 mph speed limit. High school students walk to Marshall HS every day over the bridge and bicyclists have to contend with speeding cars. I have seen many accidents on the bridge because of reckless drivers. If you alter the bridge to encourage high speeds like 55 mph, drivers will exceed those speeds. It is just the nature of LA drivers to drive fast, so you’re going to see cars traveling at up to 70 mph. I would suggest maybe putting in a flashing pedestrian warning light and a crosswalk at the base of the bridge in Atwater so people can cross the street from one side of the LA River to the next. The city is trying to encourage people to use the River, so why not make it more pedestrian friendly and all around safer for people who live in the area?
Sincerely,
Eli Sentman
Atwater Village Resident
---
Subject: 131017 1327

From: Karen Barnett [mailto:karen@urbanaid.com]
Sent: Thursday, October 10, 2013 5:39 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: Karen Barnett
Subject: * Re.: Glendale-hyperion Complex of Bridges Comment Card****

date: 10.10.13

Karen Barnett

2971 Sunnynook Drive

Los Angeles CA 90039

- There are no sound readings to the North and South of Glendale Blvd. in Atwater Village. (i.e. perpendicular to bridge or using 5 freeway directions) Homes are located next to the project and along the LA River.
Before the project begins sound readings should be taken. Long term, not 15 minutes, for an average. There's a constant higher than average level of noise in Atwater Village. Currently we have no way to show any increase in volume due the project which will effect our community for a minimum of 3 years.

- Sound mitigation - "sound barrier" fabric should be used within and around construction site(s)

- Stairs at bridge (after 5 N. entrance) better lighting should be considered. Possibly reconfigured with access not hidden from sidewalk.

- Bike/Pedestrian bridge - widen as much as possible to mitigate tensions between walkers and cyclists a known issue along the bike path.****

- Bike/Pedistrian bridge - this should end at path in Atwater Village. It appeared to end beyond it on the image at community meeting ****

- Create path under bridge (Atwater Village side) for walkers and cyclists which mimics bike path along other side. This would allow people to access the other side of Glendale Blvd without running or riding across. Further more it would increase the use and access for the newly created Bike/Pedistrian bridge.****

Thank you,

Karen Barnett
Subject: 131018 1949
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From: Ross Hirsch [Ross.Hirsch@doj.ca.gov]
Sent: Friday, October 18, 2013 8:36 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT; tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org

Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All

Dear Mayor Garcetti, Councilmember LaBonge, Councilmember O'Farrell, and Ms. Podesta,

Please let me apologize in advance for not writing before the October 11th requested date for feedback, but a serious bike collision on that Friday prevented me from emailing on the date requested. It could have ended my life, but I'm glad it didn’t, so I feel compelled to plead for a more bike-friendly plan for Hyperion. Last Friday, a car driving in Glendale at relatively slow speed simply didn’t see me (although I was wearing a neon green jacket, brightly colored helmet and riding safely in the proper lane position). The impact sent me flying through the air, whereupon my helmeted head crashed on the road leaving me unconscious for some ten minutes—before I was taken to the ER, where I had to make that dreaded call to my wife: “Honey, I’m ok, but I was taken to the emergency room because I was hit by a car.” Bad road design makes this scenario all too common. Please let’s not make that the future for Hyperion.

I, and many others I see regularly on the LA River Bike Path and streets adjacent to the Hyperion Bridge, bike to work daily through Glendale, Los Angeles, and particularly just the area where the new Hyperion bridge is planned. Currently, that area is terrifying, unwelcoming, and needlessly dangerous. High car speeds, insufficient signage, bad design. But the area is a major corridor for bike commuters traveling between downtown Los Angeles, Silverlake, Glendale, Atwater Village, Burbank, Elysian Valley, Pasadena, etc. many of whom for which there is no alternative route but to travel to/over/around the bridge. Please take these bikers into consideration. I like arriving to work safely in the morning and again home in the evenings. My choice to bike to work shouldn’t equate to an extreme sport where I feel I’m putting my life at risk each day.

The new bike/ped bridge connecting the LA River path to Hyperion on the old Red Car pylons sounds like a nice bit of infrastructure, as long it can accommodate bike traffic and pedestrians comfortably. If it is too cumbersome or improperly designed for either user group (particularly cyclists whether they be recreational or commuters like myself), it will simply be ignored for alternative routes (even if they pose greater danger and/or cause car traffic to slow down) or cause unnecessary friction between well-meaning neighbors. Nobody wants that as a desired result.

My neighbors also ask to please make this a better area for those of us that live in the two adjacent areas (Silverlake, Atwater Village/Glendale). We would like to enjoy our neighborhoods without feeling that there is a dangerous impenetrable barrier separating the two area. Me and my wife and our two young sons should be able to comfortably bike from the Atwater Farmer's Market over to Silverlake for breakfast without feeling like we are taking our life in our hands just to do that.

For the project to be successful and a positive neighborhood asset, the project must include:

1. A safe connection for cyclists between the Hyperion/Glendale streets (1) over the bridge, and (2) connecting to the LA River Bike Path so they can avoid the heavy car traffic constantly jockeying to enter/exit the 5 freeway.
2. A seamless route for cyclists that does not force cyclists to merge into heavy traffic, alter their routes in any considerable manner, or dismount to avoid obstacles. Just this type of bike infrastructure exists throughout the world. There is no reason a world-class city like Los Angeles should be without this human-centered infrastructure.
3. Buffered/colored bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
4. Aggressive signage to motorists that bikes and pedestrians are present.
5. Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs.
6. Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding.
7. No crash barrier and banked turns that could result in people driving even faster or more dangerously.
8. A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd.

I would like this project to be consistent with the bike plan, Caltrans complete streets policy, and harmonious to the humans that use this street each and every day to walk, bike for recreation, bike to work, bike to run errands, etc. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Thank you,
Ross Hirsch

---
Ross H. Hirsch
Deputy Attorney General
Office of the Attorney General
300 S. Spring Street, Suite 1702
Los Angeles, CA 90013
p: (213) 897-6325
f: (213) 897-2802
ross.hirsch@doj.ca.gov

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This communication with its contents may contain confidential and/or legally privileged information. It is solely for the use of the intended recipient(s). Unauthorized interception, review, use or disclosure is prohibited and may violate applicable laws including the Electronic Communications Privacy Act. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender and destroy all copies of the communication.
Subject: 131021 1012-1
From: Grant Deans [mailto:grantdeans@gmail.com]
Sent: Saturday, October 19, 2013 10:17 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT; tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All
Dear Ms. Podesta, Councilmember LaBonge, Councilmember O’Farrell, and Mayor Garcetti,
As someone who bikes or walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:

- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding

A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge.

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,
David Deans
Los Angeles, CA
-----
Subject: 131021 1012-2
From: Joel Krajewski [mailto:joelkrajewski@gmail.com]
Sent: Saturday, October 19, 2013 10:28 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT; tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All

Dear Ms. Podesta, Councilmember LaBonge, Councilmember O'Farrell, and Mayor Garcetti,
As someone who bikes between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that
Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone's needs can be met if the project is
designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the
project to include:
  Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
  Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
  Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage
speeding
  No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
  A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk
from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge
There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete
streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5
Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.
Sincerely,
Joel Krajewski
829 N. Harper Ave.
Los Angeles, CA 90046
-----
Subject: 131022 0939
From: Tim Barber [mailto:tbarber@timbarberltd.com]
Sent: Tuesday, October 22, 2013 7:11 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT; tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Cc: Krajewski, Joel A (4220)
Subject: Please don't make it worse

Dear Ms. Podesta, Councilmember LaBonge, Councilmember O'Farrell, and Mayor Garcetti,
I bike between Silver Lake and Atwater Village. Traveling across the 5 Freeway and the LA River is already unsafe for me. An expanded "freeway-speed" viaduct would make my passage impossible. But even more important than my bike access is the inevitable ruin of a neighborhood already teetering in the balance. This area could be part of the thriving communities it connects, with small businesses, residences, schools and (someday, god willing) the restored LA river. Or it could degenerate into a hemmed-in barrier to any living thing.
It is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone's needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:
  Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
  Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
  Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
  No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
  A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge
There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access between these communities. Please don't make it worse.
Yours,
Charles T. Barber
829 N. Harper Ave.
Los Angeles, CA 90046
-----
Subject: 131022 1323
From: Josie Lanuza [mailto:fivef0oter@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, October 22, 2013 1:20 PM
To: Podesta, Tami @DOT; tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All
Dear Ms. Podesta, Councilmember LaBonge, Councilmember O’Farrell, and Mayor Garcetti,
As someone who bikes and walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical
that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is
designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the
project to include:
- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage
  speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
- A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from
  both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge
There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete
streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5
Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.
Sincerely,
Josie Lanuza
995 Figueroa Terrace, #109
Los Angeles, CA
90012
-----
Subject: 131023 0853
From: Nina Eliasoph [mailto:eliasoph@usc.edu]
Sent: Tuesday, October 22, 2013 6:54 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT; tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
    mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - stop climate change, obesity, anti-social streets
Dear Ms. Podesta, Councilmember LaBonge, Councilmember O’Farrell, and Mayor Garcetti,
As someone who bikes or walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village (Mr. LaBonge, you have
seen us on our bikes and on foot, with kids, riding around Los Feliz and Silverlake!), it is absolutely
critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone’s needs can be met if the
project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like
the project to include:
   Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
   Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
   Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage
   speeding
   No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
   A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from
   both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge.
There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete
streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5
Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.
Sincerely,
Nina Eliasoph, Leo Eliasoph, Paul Lichterman, and Olivia Lichterman
Nina Eliasoph
Associate Professor and Vice Chair
Department of Sociology
Stanley and Hazel Hall Building
851 Downey Way
University of Southern California
Los Angeles, CA 90089-1059
Fax: (213) 740-3535
Tel.: cell: (323) 333-5899
Home: (323) 667-2430
-----
From: Mason Funk [masonfunk@mac.com]
Sent: Thursday, October 24, 2013 11:07 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT; tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Cc: info@la-bike.org
Subject: Hyperion Bridge rehab

Dear Ms. Podesta, Councilmember LaBonge, Councilmember O’Farrell, and Mayor Garcetti,

I am an avid runner, and one of my favorite routes takes me from Silver Lake, down across the Hyperion Bridge into Atwater Village, and back to the Reservoir via Fletcher & Glendale Blvd.

I have made that run countless times -- and it's a small miracle I am still alive. That bridge is a disaster waiting to happen for pedestrians. The sidewalks are narrow and the traffic speed is extreme. It is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone's needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community.

Specifically, I would like the project to include:

- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster

A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge.

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,

Mason Funk
3022 Windsor Ave.
Los Angeles, CA 90039

-----
Subject: 131024 1820
From: Steven Guerry [steven.guerry@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, October 24, 2013 11:36 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT; tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All
Dear Ms. Podesta, Councilmember LaBonge, Councilmember O’Farrell, and Mayor Garcetti,
As someone who bikes or walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:
- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
- A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge
There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.
Sincerely,
Steven Guerry
1800 N. New Hampshire Ave #135
Los Angeles, CA 90027
-----
Dear Mayor Garcetti, Councilmember LaBonge, Councilmember O'Farrell, and Ms. Podesta,

The Hyperion Ave. connection between Silver Lake and Atwater needs to be made safe for pedestrians and bicyclists. Specifically, I would like the project to include:

- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier nor banked turns, which will make people drive even faster
- A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project not to be consistent with the bike plan and the Caltrans complete streets policy.

Sincerely,
MIKE ALLEN
853 Coronado Dr., Glendale, CA

-----
Subject: 131028 0927
From: Richard Dean [mailto:rdean@mac.com]
Sent: Saturday, October 26, 2013 2:13 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Subject: Hyperion Bridge - Speed Limit

Hello

I cannot make the public hearing on the proposed bridge improvements but I wanted to add my voice to those concerned about the speeds on the bridge. The engineer on the project and others have cited the current average speed on the bridge as 55 mph. The proposed approach effectively abdicates any responsibility the city and engineers have to stop this reckless situation.

The residential and small business stretch of road between San Fernando and Rowena is already treated as a mini highway with people driving on the shoulders, running through right turn only lanes and speeding 20+ mph above the speed limit. It’s unclear why those involved would both further enable this dangerous situation and abdicate any responsibility to address it. I support most of the proposed changes but they MUST be accompanied by an agreement on maintenance of the 35mph speed limit and a promise of aggressive enforcement. I wouldn’t mind speed cameras there if LAPD continues to refuse to enforce the speed limit.

So far those involved in this planning have declined to make any comments in this area. Please help convince people like me by making positive comments about speed control plans.

Thank you

Richard Dean
3426 Madera Ave
Los Angeles (Atwater Village), CA

-----
Subject: Glendale Hyperion Viaduct Improvement Project Comment
please add me to the mailing list

-----
Subject: 131028 0928-2  
From: Molly Ortiz [mailto:molly.ortiz@gmail.com]  
Sent: Sunday, October 27, 2013 4:43 PM  
To: Podesta, Tami [DOT]; tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org  
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All  
Dear Ms. Podesta, Councilmember LaBonge, Councilmember O’Farrell, and Mayor Garcetti,  
As someone who bikes between Silver Lake and Atwater Village on a weekly basis, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:  
Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.  
Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs  
Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding  
No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster  
A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge  
There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.  
Sincerely,  
Molly Ortiz  
877 1/2 N Hoover St. 90029  
-----
Subject: 131028 1425
From: HYERAN LEE [mailto:hyeranlee@ucla.edu]
Sent: Monday, October 28, 2013 1:22 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT; tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: NO Hyperion FREEWAY - DONT KILL ME
Dear Ms. Podesta, Councilmember LaBonge, Councilmember O'Farrell, and Mayor Garcetti,
As someone who bikes or walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:

- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding (ex: recent “complete street” renovation on Colorado Blvd. Eagle Rock)
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
- A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make ALL TRAVELERS, not only drivers, benefit.

Sincerely,
Concerned citizen, cyclist, and pedestrian
Hyeran Lee
2547 W Ave 30
Los Angeles CA 90065
-----
Subject: 131028 1426
From: Tawny Barin [mailto:tawny.barin@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 28, 2013 1:46 PM
To: Podesta, Tami @DOT; tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Cc: info@la-bike.org
Subject: Hyperion Freeway
Dear Ms. Podesta, Councilmember LaBonge, Councilmember O’Farrell, and Mayor Garcetti,
As someone who frequently bikes and runs between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Avenue bridge be made safe for all who traverse the area - whether it be by car, bike or foot. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community.
Specifically, I would like the project to include:
  - Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
  - Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
  - Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
  - No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
  - A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Boulevard and give cyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge
There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.
Best,
Tawny Barin
220 E Broadway #411
Glendale, CA 91205
--
Tawny Barin
http://pages.teamintraining.org/los/leonadiv14/tawny
http://twitter.com/scrawnylion
-----
Subject: 131028 1628
From: JJ Hoffman [mailto:lariverride@la-bike.org]
Sent: Monday, October 28, 2013 4:09 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT; tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: Hyperion
Dear Ms. Podesta, Councilmember LaBonge, Councilmember O'Farrell, and Mayor Garcetti,
As someone who bikes between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that
Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone's needs can be met if the project is
designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the
project to include:
   Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
   Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
   Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage
   speeding
   No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
   A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk
from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge
There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete
streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5
Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.
Sincerely,

--
JJ Hoffman
Events and Development Director
323-839-6414 (cell)
-----
Subject: 131029 0918
From: Marty Bracciotti [mailto:martyjoe@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Monday, October 28, 2013 6:02 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Subject: Hyperion Bridge: Opposition to Bike Lanes

Tami,
As a long time resident of Silverlake and South Glendale (Adams Hill), I want to share my views on plans for the Hyperion bridge.
I am also a bicycle rider and member of the Los Angeles County Bicycle Coalition, but contrary to the vocal bike lobby who are mostly outsiders, I am totally against narrowing the 4 lanes so that 2 bike lanes can be added to the Hyperion Bridge. As a biker, I wouldn't ride them anyway as I would consider them to be unsafe. Instead, I prefer to walk my bike on the sidewalk of the Hyperion Bridge where it is safe and don't understand why bike riders wouldn't do that too.
The Hyperion Bridge is an important means to connect Silverlake, Atwater Village, and Glendale. Los Feliz is the only other connector and that is choked with traffic, lets not shrink the Hyperion Bridge and make traffic even worse. Traffic coming to the Hyperion Bridge from Silverlake is already choked. If Caltrans reduces the lanes or otherwise slows the flow of traffic on the Hyperion Bridge, we all lose.
I am for adding a k rail between opposing traffic lanes on the Hyperion Bridge - this is long overdue, and would also like to see a k rail between cars and the sidewalk on that bridge. Please feel free to add bike lanes either over the Glendale Blvd bridge or better yet, over the pylons of the defunt Red Car rail line - that's the absolute best alternative.
As for the Glendale Blvd bridge, something must be done to make it safer when exiting the north 5 freeway offramp to Glendale Blvd. That is a scary merge, especially since there are 2 lanes that must turn right onto Glendale Blvd from the offramp.
Thank you for your consideration.

Marty Bracciotti
318 Roads End Street
Glendale, CA 91205
(213) 247-2294
martyjoe@sbcglobal.net

-----
Subject: 131029 0919-2
From: Krista Nicole [mailto:passionforwords@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 28, 2013 7:39 PM
To: Podesta, Tami @DOT; tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org

Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct FOR ALL

Dear Ms. Podesta, Councilmember LaBonge, Councilmember O’Farrell, and Mayor Garcetti,

I have crossed the Hyperion Bridge countless times, both by car and by bicycle. I have resided in the communities of Los Feliz, Glendale and Highland Park. I have friends and family spread throughout these neighborhoods and those adjacent. The bridge has been a valuable direct passageway for years, connecting me to my community and granting me critical access to numerous businesses and destinations.

I ask that you take into account the safety and access of Hyperion Bridge. I ask that you consider the needs of all who depend on the connection Hyperion provides between the communities east and west of it.

As someone who bikes or walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:

- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs.
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding.
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster.

A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge.

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and provide a way for all travelers to benefit.

Sincerely,

Krista Carlson
6179 Myosotis St., Highland Park, 90042
(818) 522-4347

-----
Subject: 131029 0919-3
From: Andrew Welker [mailto:welkersemail@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 28, 2013 7:49 PM
To: Podesta, Tami @DOT; tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All

Dear Ms. Podesta, Councilmember LaBonge, Councilmember O’Farrell, and Mayor Garcetti,

As someone who bikes or walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone's needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:

- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
- A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,
Andrew Welker
322 Sonora ave
Glendale, ca 91201
-----
Subject: 131029 0920-1
From: Paul Burke [mailto:pjburke@pacbell.net]
Sent: Monday, October 28, 2013 11:14 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT; tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
    mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: Hyperion Bridge Redesign
Dear Ms. Podesta, Councilmember LaBonge, Councilmember O'Farrell, and Mayor Garcetti,
I live in Glendale but I like to visit Silver Lake, where I used to live. Rarely do I ride my bike across
the Hyperion bridge, because
    there is no bike lane
    you need to cut across traffic (southbound) to reach the bridge
    if you commit to the sidewalk you are stuck because of the curb
    there is hardly enough room for pedestrians on the sidewalk let alone bikes
It is my understanding that the city plans to address these shortcomings by redesigning the bridge
to accommodate speedy motorists. I would like to lend my voice to the many concerned
Angelenos and Glendale neighbors who urge you to reconsider. Please redesign the bridge to
welcome bikers and walkers who do Los Angeles a favor by forgoing their automobiles.
Sincerely,
Paul Burke
817 Palm Dr.
Glendale, CA
-----
Subject: 131029 0920-2
From: jim alejandre [mailto:jalejand@usc.edu]
Sent: Monday, October 28, 2013 11:07 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All
Dear Ms. Podesta, Councilmember LaBonge, Councilmember O’Farrell, and Mayor Garcetti,
As someone who bikes or walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical
that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is
designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the
project to include:
   Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
   Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
   Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage
   speeding
   No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
   A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk
from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge
There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete
streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5
Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.
There is no reason to make this segment a high speed artery.
Sincerely,

Jim Alejandre
1224 South Hudson Ave
Los Angeles California 90019
-----
Subject: 131029 1029 (Referenced as 131029 1029 in Letter Comments Database)  
Attachments: 2013 Oaks letter Hyperion.pdf; _Certification_.txt  
From: Gerry [mailto:gerryhans51@gmail.com]  
Sent: Tuesday, October 29, 2013 10:22 AM  
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT  
Cc: Tom LaBonge; Councilmember.O'Farrell@lacity.gov; Mayor Garcetti; jeanne.min@lacity.org; christine peters; Mary Rodriguez; Carolyn Ramsay; Daniel Halden  
Subject: Comment, Hyperion Ave Bridge redesign  
Attached Oaks letter regarding Glendale-Hyperion bridge complex.  
Thank you,  
Oaks HOA  
-----
Subject: 131029 1259
From: jacqueline Kerr [mailto:jacquekerr@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, October 29, 2013 12:36 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Subject: Fwd: Delivery Status Notification (Failure)
1. In "modernizing" the Bridge for auto speeds of 55 mph capability, all of the proposed safety measures are negated.
2. This is a dangerous stretch of pavement - do whatever possible to slow down traffic.
3. The speeds used by southbound motorists to climb that hill become dangerous at the top - just as a downward slope begins. I use that Bridge all the time - and no matter how careful I try to be, when reaching the top I've become a dangerous motorist.
Many thanks for addressing the problems of this wonderful, old landmark... good to have it around for other generations.
Jacqueline Kerr
-----
Hello Mr. Chyn,
I would like to submit the following letter on behalf of the Alliance of River Communities- We are Los Angeles’s regional alliance of East and Northeast Area Neighborhood Councils. At a regularly scheduled meeting last week, our alliance decided to support a plan that would create multi-modal transportation a priority of this bridge project. I would like to ask that you please include our letter into the public record as part of the comments regarding this project. Thank you. Please confirm that you have received this email.

Thank you Mr. Chyn.
-Hector Huezo
ARC-Los Angeles

Hector L. Huezo
562.485.7329
H.L.Huezo@GMail.com

-----
Subject: 131030 1042
From: doug@zuumsocial.com [mailto:doug@zuumsocial.com] On Behalf Of Doug Schumacher
Sent: Tuesday, October 29, 2013 9:45 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT

Subject: The need for better bicycle accommodations on the glendale-hyperion bridge
I saw this posted on LA Eastsider, and read the linked page with this email for comment submission.
I honestly couldn't believe this bridge would even be considered to be built without, not adequate, but great support for cycling. Anyone who drives around LA knows that our traffic situation is unbearable. Metro is helping, but isn't near enough.
Cycling is one possible, reasonably affordable solution (relative to more freeways and metro lines), but people are hesitant to bike in LA because they don't feel safe. This has to be addressed, and this bridge is exactly the kind of place that we need progressive thinking in support of cycling.
Also, Atwater is a lovely place, but it's currently not a safe place to bike to from echo park. That's sad, as it's only a few miles away.
Thank you
Doug Schumacher
Echo Park
-----
Subject: 131030 1116
From: Juliana Telleria [mailto:pumpkinfay@hotmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, October 30, 2013 11:11 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT; tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All
Dear Ms. Podesta, Councilmember LaBonge, Councilmember O’Farrell, and Mayor Garcetti,
As someone who bikes or walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:

- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
- A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can positively change Hyperion Ave. for bicyclists, pedestrians, and automobile travelers alike.

Juliana Telleria
-----
Subject: 131030 1259
From: Dan Riley [mailto:dprski33@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, October 30, 2013 12:41 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT; tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Cc: info@la-bike.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All
Dear Ms. Podesta, Councilmember LaBonge, Councilmember O’Farrell, and Mayor Garcetti,
As someone who bikes or walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:
- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
- A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,
Dan Riley
645 W 9th St, #200
Los Angeles, CA 90015

--

___________________________
Dictated but not read.
-----
Subject: 131030 1306
From: Richard Meade [mailto:richardmeade@att.net]
Sent: Wednesday, October 30, 2013 1:01 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Subject: Regarding the Hyperion Bridge project....
To Whom it may concern,

I have read that a small group of cyclists have decided to try and delay if not kill this project. I would personally like to see the percentage numbers of cyclists vs automobiles that use the Hyperion bridge on any given day. Are these the same cyclists who ride through Hollywood by the hundreds, running red lights and preventing people from crossing the streets when they have the right to cross?

Maybe its time to require multi-geared bicycles to be licensed. I pay a vehicle license fee for the privilege of using the road so it is certainly not unreasonable to require the same for cyclists. Fees collected could be used to add bike lanes that would improve safety for all. Also, cyclists who do not obey the laws of the road could be identified by their license number the same as a car.

The Hyperion Bridge project should not be delayed or highjacked by a small group of cyclists who want automobiles off the city streets.

Sincerely,

Richard A. Meade
-----
Subject: 131030 1314
From: Mari Miller [mailto:mari.miller@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, October 30, 2013 1:08 PM
To: Podesta, Tami @DOT; tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All
Dear Ms. Podesta, Councilmember LaBonge, Councilmember O’Farrell, and Mayor Garcetti,
As someone who bikes or walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:

- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
- A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,
Mari Miller
809 East Acacia Avenue Unit F
Glendale, CA 91205
(818) 414-3264
-----
Subject: 131030 1319
From: Tokunow Susumu [mailto:susumu101@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, October 30, 2013 1:18 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Subject: Bke paths
All the bike riders like myself, that try to exit the bike path along the LA river to Hyperion Ave.,
must get off their bikes and carry it up a long flight of steps, and then enter very dangerous,
speeding, bridge traffic.
Definitely not bike friendly.
Regretfully - Alvin Susumu Tokunow
-----
Subject: 131030 1422
From: T Scott Keiner [mailto:scottkeiner@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, October 30, 2013 2:10 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Subject: LACBC Bicycle Plan for Glendale/Hyperion Bridge
Dear Tami:
I’m writing to express my support for LACBC’s modified plan for the Glendale/Hyperion Bridge. As someone who commutes and runs errands on my bicycle in the area, a dedicated bike path on the bridge would be of great benefit to me and provide a critical connection between Silver Lake and Atwater Village communities. Currently the only options for bicyclists crossing between the two neighborhoods are braving high speed traffic on Los Feliz or the Glendale/Hyperion bridge. Neither option is safe, both contain blind spots, and both put bicyclists in the path of vehicles entering and exiting the 5 freeway at high speeds. A bike path on the bridge would solve many of these problems and provide a critical and safe connection between two communities.
Thank you for your time and consideration,
Scott Keiner
-----
Subject: 131030 1554
From: James Edward Schuck [mailto:james@jamesschuck.com]
Sent: Wednesday, October 30, 2013 3:35 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT

Subject: The Bridge Debate

In its current configuration, that bridge is a freeway linking two streets that is in need of a "calming" of some kind. Traffic roars down that hill, discouraging all but the bravest pedestrians and bicycles have not even been considered. I would not ride a bike over that bridge if my life depended upon it. It is a link between Atwater and Echo, and as such, the proposed "Red Car " bridge proposal is a waste because it goes nowhere. People use the larger bridge as a gateway between two communities.

Scrap the Red Car Bridge and put more people access (bike and foot) on the Hyperion Bridge and incorporate some means to reduce the speed of auto traffic.

James Edward Schuck
www.jamesschuck.com
310.663.3074

-----
Subject: 131031 0855-2
From: scottb@roadbikecity.com [mailto:scottb@roadbikecity.com]
Sent: Wednesday, October 30, 2013 10:18 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT; tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: Bike Lanes on Hyperion Ave.

Dear Ms. Podesta, Councilmember LaBonge, Councilmember O’Farrell, and Mayor Garcetti,

As someone who bikes or walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:

- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
- A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River.

This project can positively change Hyperion Ave. for bicyclists, pedestrians, and automobile travelers alike.

Thank you,
Scott Blumenthal
-----
Subject: 131031 0856
From: Andee Brauer [mailto:aibrauer@yahoo.com]
Sent: Thursday, October 31, 2013 5:22 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
tom.labonge@lacity.org; Wenn.Chyn@lacity.org; mary.d.rodriguez@lacity.org;
Daniel.Halden@lacity.org; ana.guerrero@lacity.org; board@atwaterchamber.org
Subject: Hyperion Bridge Retrofit

As a homeowner and business owner in Atwater, I believe that a "road diet" on Hyperion’s main bridge to accommodate more bicycle lanes would substantially change traffic flow to Glendale Blvd so as to inconvenience both clients trying to reach my business and friends/family trying to reach my residence.

Furthermore, during evening rush hour it serve would to congest Hyperion south of Trader Joes/Gelson's even more severely than it is already. Please do NOT make the traffic worse on Glendale.

Thank you,
Andrea Brauer
3235 Hollydale Dr
Los ANgeles, Ca 90039
-----
Subject: 131031 0858
From: Margaret Jensen [mailto:joshuagrammy@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Thursday, October 31, 2013 8:23 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
tom.labonge@lacity.org; Wenn.Chyn@lacity.org; mary.d.rodriguez@lacity.org;
Daniel.Halden@lacity.org; ana.guerrero@lacity.org; board@atwaterchamber.org
Subject: Hyperion Bridge
Having lived in Atwater Village for more than 50 years, I oppose any changes to the current plan to
upgrade and retrofit the Hyperion Bridge. Although I supported bicycle use along the Los Angeles
River and the bicycle bridge over Los Feliz, I cannot support the proposal that would limit vehicle
traffic between Silverlake and Atwater Village. Please do not change the current plan!
Sincerely,
M. Grace Weisenstein
-----
Subject: 131031 0859
From: cecelia sonsini [mailto:restaurantbooks@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, October 31, 2013 7:30 AM
To: Podesta, Tami @DOT; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
tom.labonge@lacity.org; Wenn.Chyn@lacity.org; mary.d.rodriguez@lacity.org;
Daniel.Halden@lacity.org; ana.guerrero@lacity.org; board@atwaterchamber.org
Subject: Hyperion Bridge
Living near the intersection of Fletcher and Rowena, I go into Atwater on a daily basis and use the
Hyperion bridge to get back and forth. Taking away one lane for bicyclists would be horrible for
those of us who drive. Just look at how the loss of one lane
in each direction on Rowena between Glendale and Hyperion backs up traffic at rush hours (both
morning and evening).
The most frustrating part of having lost those lanes is that I rarely even see a bicyclist in the bike
lane, so, to me, the
bike lane is a complete waste of space.
Please don’t do the same thing to the Hyperion Bridge!!
Thank you
--
Cecelia Sonsini
-----
Subject: 131031 1056
From: Pamela Burgess [mailto:pamela@pamelaburgess.com]
Sent: Thursday, October 31, 2013 10:27 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Subject: Comment: Glendale/Hyperion Complex of Bridges Project
Hi Tami--
I am a resident of Atwater Village.
I am in favor of approving the Glendale/Hyperion Complex project as designed and presented.
I am NOT in favor of redesigning the current project to create more space for bikes or another bike lane.
The surrounding communities and businesses want to move forward with this project now. We do not want to drag this out for several more months bc of an 11th-hour appeal by those who were not engaged in the lengthy design process.
Thank you.

PB
Pamela Burgess
3799 Valleybrink Road
Los Angeles, Ca 90039
323-807-4456
pamela@pamelaburgess.com<mailto:pamela@pamelaburgess.com>
pamelaburgess.com<http://pamelaburgess.com>
-----
Subject: 131031 1057
From: john gutierrez [mailto:nejohng@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, October 31, 2013 10:36 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Subject: Hyperion Bridge
To Whom It May Concern
I am a Native Angeleno for the passed 68 years and have been a resident of Atwater Village for the passed 20 years. The proposed changes to the Hyperion Bridge are important to me because I use it daily. In its current condition it is very dangerous to navigate by bicycles. The pedestrian walkways are too narrow for bike rider and there are no bike lanes on the roadway. Changing the bridge to one lane in both directions make a lot of sense because vehicular traffic on the bridge is always light. Another issue for bicyclist is north bound riders leaving the bridge to Glendale blvd. with car from the 5 Fwy North Glendale exit. Some type of pedestrian caution light should be added. The same should be installed to the South side for pedestrian and cyclist trying to access the Hyperion Bridge. Thank You John Gutierrez 213 272-5464

-----
Subject: 131031 1242  
From: RLC [mailto:rlcronce@sbcglobal.net]  
Sent: Thursday, October 31, 2013 11:27 AM  
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT  
Subject: Glendale/Hyperion Bridge Project  
Please adopt the recommendations made at the Oct. 27th safety meeting. Adding a 4’ shoulder for use by bicyclists and narrowing the car lanes is fine. I would prefer larger car lanes, but I’m fine with room for bicyclists even tho I find them annoying in traffic. Let’s move forward and get this refurb started sooner than later. Overall it’s a great improvement to what is there now!  
Ronald Cronce  
3460 Atwater Ave  
Los Angeles, CA 90039  
(Atwater Village)  
-----
Subject: 131031 1553-1
From: Patrick Cleary [mailto:p_cleary@yahoo.com]
Sent: Thursday, October 31, 2013 2:04 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Subject: Comment on Proposed Glendale Boulevard-Hyperion Avenue Complex of Bridges Improvement

Dear Tami:

I'm a resident of Atwater, and a commuter to an office on the Miracle Mile. Sometimes I drive to work, and sometimes I bike. I use the Hyperion Bridge nearly every day. Because of the twists in the road, I think it would be a good idea to reduce the lanes to one in each direction. No one should be switching lanes in that small stretch anyways. Cars drive too fast because there is no intersection.

Let me go through a detailed description of how I cross the bridge via bicycle. I take a left at Glenfeliz, hoping the car behind me doesn't take up the third lane on Glendale Blvd., bike on the shoulder up until it narrows to nothing, then wait until the coast is clear and I can pedal onto the striped triangle separating the underpass/freeway on-ramp road and the elevated bridge. I walk my bike up to the sidewalk, and if there are no pedestrians on the sidewalk, ride it to start of the ramp up to Waverly, dismount, and walk it up to the top. Then I ride down the access road, stop at the stop sign, look both ways, and proceed along the shoulder to Rowena. I take Hyperion and then Fountain all the way to Vine, the next bike route, before heading south.

Coming home, I ride along Hyperion, and after crossing Rowena, I wait until the line of cars has gone ahead, and then pedal hard in low gear, hoping no rogue car comes barreling down behind me as I take up the right lane. The pot holes make it dicey because of the speed I gather. Then I have to signal and get over as soon as the merge lanes from the Glendale off-ramp join the bridge traffic.

Where is the design for a bike lane going Northeast to Atwater? The narrow bike path being proposed in the current plan is only suitable for bicycling into Silver Lake. Bicyclists need a lane in either direction.

I like the design put forward by Tomas O'Grady's group. The current plan does not do enough to make a safe path for cyclers and walkers. In my opinion, single lanes for cars will prevent future injuries and deaths.

thanks,
Patrick Cleary
Atwater Village/District 13

------
Subject: 131104 1014-1
From: Nishith Dhandha [mailto:nishifus@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, November 01, 2013 1:03 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Subject: EIR - Glendale-Hyperion Bridge Comments
EIR - Glendale-Hyperion Bridge Comments -
My concerns, briefly stated, are as follows:
1- Bicycle Connectivity: We have a existing bike lane starting on Rowena/Hyperion, yet the bridge
doesn’t provide a bicycle lane connection to that street and the rest of the network. It is a missed
opportunity.
2- Pedestrian Linkage: The undersized proposed 4-foot sidewalk @ Waverly, isn't wide enough to
allow 2 people to walk side by side from Silverlake to Atwater. This will discourage pedestrian
traffic along the bridge and either side of it. Min. width should be 6’.
3. Safety for Non-motor Vehicular Traffic: Although the bridge connects two very pedestrian
neighborhoods, the bridge is designed to move cars along it at disproportionately high speeds
relative to bikes and peds. It discourages pedestrian activity along the corridor and is an
impediment to the Mayor Garcetti’s objective to start a "Great Streets" initiative along Glendale
Blvd. and Hyperion St.
Although the aesthetics of the new bridge are wonderful, it is a completely missed opportunity in
terms of multi-modal functionality, pedestrian safety and connectivity. Please do not allow a
project with such promise to fall so flat.
We cannot allow a bridge that will exist long into the future (100 years) to be designed for a
transportation paradigm that is old and outdated. Streets are no longer just for cars and this
project needs to be adjusted to fit into the new pedestrian, multi-modal transportation paradigm.
Streets are civic spaces and should be safe and accessible for all.

Thank you,
Nishith Dhandha
1955 Taft Ave.
Los Angeles, CA  90068
323-313-6409<tel:323-313-6409>
-----
Subject: 131104 1014-2
From: Quinn Pond [mailto:quinn.pond@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, November 01, 2013 2:15 PM
To: Podesta, Tami @DOT; tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: Hyperion/Glendale Viaduct
Dear Ms. Podesta, Councilmember LaBonge, Councilmember O'Farrell, and Mayor Garcetti,
I just heard about the restoration and renovations to the Hyperion/Glendale Viaduct. First of all,
thank you for providing an investment in the bridge and a dedication to enhancing the
riverpathway! I saw the video and explanation at http://www.glendalehyperion.com/ and it looks
like you're taking a very responsible stance to improving this bridge - Thank you.
The only concern that I have is that I didn't see any mention of bicycle lanes in either direction.
Limiting transport across the bridge to cars and pedestrians seems restrictive to alternative
transportation (especially with such a nice path to the RiverPathWay).
I use the glen/hyp bridge regularly and it's already a pretty hairy experience biking across without
lanes (or even share the road signs).
Would you please consider including bicycle lanes in the renovations to this bridge?
Thank you for your service and your attention to this matter.
Sincerely,
Quinn Franklin
3191 Casitas Ave, Los Angeles, CA 90039
e: eskimoquinn07@hotmail.com<p: (920) 539-2695
-----
Subject: 131104 1014-3
From: Catherine Dent [mailto:cd@catherinedent.com]
Sent: Friday, November 01, 2013 2:47 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Subject:
I am a resident of Atwater Village,
I support the EnrichLA/Sodder alternate proposal for the bridge renovation.
Thank you for your time and effort
Catherine Dent

Catherine Dent
http://www.imdb.com/name/nm0219748/
Subject: 131104 1108
From: sahra sulaiman [mailto:sahra@streetsblog.org]
Sent: Monday, November 04, 2013 10:28 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT; tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: Hyperion-Glendale bridge -- please make it safe for all
Dear Ms. Podesta, Councilmember LaBonge, Councilmember O'Farrell, and Mayor Garcetti,

As someone who has lived two blocks from the Hyperion-Glendale bridge for nearly 12 years, I
can't tell you just how important it is to me and others in the neighborhood that it remain
accessible for all. There are few ways to traverse the river and freeways in one shot, and none of
them are comfortable for cyclists or pedestrians. The idea that we would sink so much money into
improvements only to ensure that pedestrians might not have easy access to the newly proposed
sidewalks or cyclists would not be able to use the bridge safely for the next 100 years seems
ludicrous to me. I have to traverse it several times a week as it is, and it currently feels like I take
my life into my hands each time I do.

Making the bridge faster also makes little logical sense. In the 12 years I have lived here, I have
never once seen the bridge backed up with traffic. I cannot understand the purpose of encouraging
cars to speed through faster than they already do only to be brought to a neighborhood pace a half
mile later.

I support the LACBC's call for narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and
pedestrians and the nixing of crash barriers and banked turns discourage speeding. I'd also like to
see enhanced sidewalks on both sides of the bridge or, if that is not possible, signalized crosswalks
that make it possible for those on the south side of the bridge to access it just as easily as those on
the north.

The bridge is special for connecting communities and for giving you amazing views of the city, the
river, and the mountains all at once. It deserves to be treated as a neighborhood and community
asset to be enjoyed and safely traversed by all.

Below, I paste an excerpt of what my experience is in traversing the bridge now that I recently
wrote for Streetsblog (http://la.streetsblog.org/2013/10/23/advocates-push-for-a-more-livable-
death-bridge-the-glendale-hyperion-bridge-saga-continues/). Regardless of the design
implemented, I will continue to need to traverse that bridge, as I imagine other cyclists will.
Making room for all will mean that I won't have to put myself in anyone's way when I do, and that
should make everyone happy.

+++ +
'I've lived a couple of blocks from the bridge for the past 12 years and, in theory, I am deeply in
love with it.

As I stroll across it into Atwater Village, I love to stop and gawk at the river, gaze at the hills of
Griffith Park and the Verdugos, or marvel at just how many cars are packed onto the 5 freeway
and wonder out loud where all these people could possibly be going.

Then, I get to the end of the narrow walkway and I am dumped out of my dream state onto the tiny
Peninsula of Pedestrian Despair (pictured below), protected from the cars whizzing by at 40+ mph
on either side by only a few white lines, and I have to begin calculating how fast I can dash across
two lanes to the safety of the far sidewalk.

At heavy traffic times, I often think to myself that I am grateful that I have no children or pets that
might be saddened if I were to be flattened while playing this real-life version of Frogger.

When I bike the bridge to get to a doctor's appointment or the post-office or the artwalk or one of
the many places I need to get to on a regular basis, the situation feels even more dire.

So dire, in fact, that I have learned to time my rides down the hill into Atwater to the light at
Hyperion and Rowena. Meaning, I wait until eastbound cars are stopped at a red on Hyperion to
give myself a head start.
"They'll see me this way," I tell myself as I move into the middle of the lane, take a deep breath and hold it for the duration of my sprint down the hill.

As someone who has been on a bike for 20 years and endured insane conditions (like being sexually assaulted while in motion<http://la.streetsblog.org/2012/06/07/metro-diary-getting-harassed-by-that-guy/>), it takes a lot for me to admit terror.

But the jaunt down the bridge manages to get me every time.

The road is in miserable condition - strewn with asphalt chunks, pebbles, cracks, uneven patches, and potholes. And, I've got cars coming up behind me at high speeds as well as cars that I can't see yet, but which will be coming up on my right at equally high speeds and trying to merge into my lane as I reach the end of the bridge. And, the whole time, I am entirely aware that whomever is behind me on the bridge is desperate to get past me because I am in the middle of the lane. I know that's where I have to be because of the poor conditions, the curves which make it harder for drivers to see me, and the fact that I need to give myself a buffer from traffic merging from my right, but to a driver who has never biked the area, I probably seem more like an entitled miscreant.

Sometimes, I nearly give myself whiplash trying to look over both my shoulders. Other times, I stare straight ahead and continue holding my breath, figuring that if I'm going to die, it is probably best if don't see it coming.

Riding back up the hill is equally as challenging.

Once you master riding in the middle of four lanes of traffic as you dash toward the bridge from the light at Glenhurst/Glenfeliz (accessing the bridge requires you to be in one of the two center lanes) and get comfortable with cars making last-minute, unsignaled lane changes right in front of you or nearly clipping your back tire, you are greeted by terrible conditions. The westbound asphalt is like cobblestone in sections (and not in a good way) and the curves and high walls along the bridge mean that drivers coming up fast from below can't see you (and you can't see them) as you slowly slog up the hill.

So, once again, I usually find myself taking up a lot of the lane for visibility purposes. And, while I'd like to think drivers are sympathetic because it is a long hill, I'm pretty sure that they hate me because they don't have any understanding of why I have to ride positioned as I do.

It is at these moments that I think about raising my fist to the sky and melodramatically invoking a pox upon city officials and engineers on behalf of drivers, cyclists, and pedestrians alike, but I'm usually too busy trying not to die."

* * * *

Best regards,
sahra

--

Sahra Sulaiman
Communities Editor for Boyle Heights and South LA, LA Streetsblog
Documentary Photographer/Researcher
M.A., A.B.D. International Relations, USC

-----
Subject: 131105 0846
From: Margaret Jensen [mailto:joshuagrammy@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Monday, November 04, 2013 11:01 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; tom.labonge@lacity.org;
mary.d.rodriguez@lacity.org; wenn.chyn@lacity.org; marie.rumsey@lacity.org;
Daniel.Halden@lacity.org; favboard@friendsofatwatervillage.org
Subject: Hyperion Bridge realignment
The Hyperion Bridge proposed realignment serves the needs of both the Silverlake and Atwater
Village communities. I urge you to proceed to implement the proposal without any changes.
Sincerely,
Margaret Jensen and Grace Weisenstein
-----
Subject: 131105 0849
From: E. Casson [mailto:ecasson@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 05, 2013 7:42 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT; +councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; +tom.labonge@lacity.org;
+mary.d.rodriguez@lacity.org; +wenn.chyn@lacity.org; +marie.rumsey@lacity.org;
+Daniel.Halden@lacity.org; +favboard@friendsofatwatervillage.org
Subject: HYPERION VIADUCT RESTORATION & RETROFIT PROJECT
I live in Atwater. I used to think I was a new resident but I've lived here for 22 years. I've been in
the area for 33 years. During all this time I've loved looking at this bridge/viaduct. Of course I've
also loved driving over it too! Friends of Atwater Village does a fabulous job of representing
Atwater Village needs. I have looked over the plans and want to join FAV in urging the speedy
improvements for the bridge/viaduct.
Edward Casson
3301 Garden Ave.
90039
-----
Subject: 131105 1256
From: Mark Mallare [mailto:nachimark@outlook.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 05, 2013 11:33 AM
To: Podesta, Tami @DOT; tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion highway--Complete & Great Streets for All
Dear Ms. Podesta, Councilmember LaBonge, Councilmember O’Farrell, and Mayor Garcetti,
As someone who bikes or walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical
that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is
designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the
project to include:
Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage
speeding
No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from
both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge
There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete
streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5
Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.
Sincerely,
Mark Mallare
3248 Cattaraugus Ave
LA, CA 90034
-----
Subject: 131105 1427
From: David Thorne [mailto:david.thrn@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 05, 2013 1:57 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT; tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe viaduct for all

Dear Ms. Podesta, Councilmember LaBonge, Councilmember O’Farrell, and Mayor Garcetti,

As someone who bikes or walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:

- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster

A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit. It would be a disservice to the communities on both sides of the bridge, and a rejection of idea of LA as a forward-thinking city, if the Caltrans/BOE plan is implemented in its present form.

Sincerely,
David Thorne
david.thrn@gmail.com<mailto:david.thrn@gmail.com>
Subject: 131106 0856
From: Karen Knapp [mailto:karen@atwatervillage.org]
Sent: Tuesday, November 05, 2013 3:43 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT; +councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; +tom.labonge@lacity.org;
+mary.d.rodriguez@lacity.org; +wenn.chyn@lacity.org; +marie.rumsey@lacity.org;
+Daniel.Halden@lacity.org; +favboard@friendsofatwatervillage.org
Subject: HYPERION VIADUCT RESTORATION & RETROFIT PROJECT
I think the current plan is the most productive and practical. While I understand that bicyclists
would like their own pathway across the bridge, I believe they can share the pedestrian path very
successfully, or use the widened car lane.
I would also like to reiterate the concern of many that the speed limit stay at 35 miles an hour, and
find ways of enforcing that speed.

Karen Knapp
Atwater Village Neighborhood Council
Central Atwater Representative
-----
Subject: 131106 0857
From: Julia Meltzer [mailto:julia@clockshop.org]
Sent: Tuesday, November 05, 2013 7:13 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All

Dear Ms. Podesta, Councilmember LaBonge, Councilmember O’Farrell, and Mayor Garcetti,
I walk and bike between Silver Lake and Atwater Village every day, it is absolutely critical that
Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. I have a daughter who also walks with me and each
time we cross the bridge and come to the end it is perilous. Everyone’s needs can be met if the
project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like
the project to include:
   - Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
   - Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
   - Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage
     speeding
   - No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
   - A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk
     from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge
There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete
streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5
Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.
Thank you for your consideration!

best,
Julia Meltzer
Clockshop<http://www.clockshop.org>
c: 323-633-9689
o: 323-522-6014
---
Subject: 131106 1017
From: Adam Meltzer [mailto:meltzer17@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, November 06, 2013 9:55 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Subject: Opposing the Current Design of the Glendale/Hyperion Bridge

Division of Environmental Planning -California Dept. of Transportation District 7
100 S. Main St.
Los Angeles, CA 90012
RE: Opposing the Current Design of the Glendale/Hyperion Bridge

Dear Ms. Podesta,

I am writing as the chair of the Green Committee of the Los Feliz Neighborhood Council. I was pleased to hear that the city is planning to retrofit the Glendale/Hyperion bridge to make it safer from earthquake damage. We are lucky to live in a city and a country that takes pro-active measures to avoid catastrophes due to unsafe structures.

I, as many others on the committee are cyclists and believe that our roads in Los Feliz and the surrounding area should be safe to ride on. Our sidewalks should be wide enough for people to walk without fear of speeding vehicles. The Glendale-Hyperion bridge is a perfect example of a structure that fails in both regards. While we are excited at the prospects of what the bridge could be we are disappointed with the current plans to retrofit and expand the bridge.

The proposal speaks about the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU). This excerpt taken from the summary points out the importance of planning and designing for bicycle and pedestrian use.

SAFETEA-LU addresses the many challenges facing our transportation system today - challenges such as improving safety, reducing traffic congestion, improving efficiency in freight movement, increasing intermodal connectivity, and protecting the environment - as well as laying the groundwork for addressing future challenges. SAFETEA-LU promotes more efficient and effective Federal surface transportation programs by focusing on transportation issues of national significance, while giving State and local transportation decision makers more flexibility for solving transportation problems in their communities.

In the Glendale Boulevard-Hyperion Avenue Complex of Bridges Improvement Project; Initial Study with Proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration/Environmental Assessment and Programmatic Section 4(f) Evaluation prepared on August 23rd there is virtually no mention of bike paths besides the shared pedestrian path on the red car bridge. The required widths of the lanes, sidewalks and shoulders would easily leave room for a bike lane on either side and sidewalks if the bridge were not built as a four-lane defacto freeway.

According to the initial study in section 1.2.2.2 in the curb-to-curb widths section they clearly state the regulatory measurements (width) needed to build the bridge at.

Under American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) design standards, a minimum curb-to-curb width of 56 feet is required to remove the deficiency related to deck geometry. This includes 12-foot inner lanes, 14-foot curb lanes (12-foot travel lane and 2-foot shoulder), and a 4-foot median along Hyperion Avenue.

The Northbound Glendale Boulevard Bridge and the Southbound Glendale Boulevard Bridge (both over the Los Angeles River) have two 12-foot-wide travel lanes each, and these bridges do not meet AASHTO standards.

The project would improve a functionally obsolete bridge that traverses a major freeway (I-5) and the Los Angeles River, as well as seismically strengthen the viaduct complex to meet current seismic standards.

(continued)
If you were to create a bridge with one lane of traffic going in each direction and then increasing the shoulder to create a bike lane to 4 feet on either side you will effectively reach 56'. These are critical measurements, which could be reconfigured to include one lane going in each direction on the bridge and including a bike lane and sidewalk safe for all. Traffic studies as referred to in the PROPOSAL say the road can easily accommodate, at rush hour, the amount of cars going over that bridge with one lane going in either direction.

We have the opportunity to create a 21st century multi-modal friendly bridge. Why not create that and address all the stated design issues on page I-5 of the initial study document?

As someone who bikes or walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:

- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Lower the designed speed limit to 35mph
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with way finding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster

A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge.

There is no reason for this project to be inconsistent with the 2010 bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. Please consider this as you move forward with this project. I would like confirmation that you received and read this letter. Thank you for your time.

Respectfully,
Adam Meltzer
Chair of the Los Feliz Neighborhood Council Green Committee

CC:
Tami Podesta, tami.podesta@dot.ca.gov
Councilmember LaBonge, tom.labonge@lacity.org
Councilmember O'Farrell, councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org
Mayor Garcetti
Members of the Green Committee that support this letter are:
Katy Robinson (Co-Chair of the GC)
Adam Meltzer (Co-Chair of the GC)
Don Ward
Indu Subalya
Alyson Schill
Rick Ziegler
Gabriela Sosa
Duke Graham
Andy Lenigan
Jen Almiron
Bonnie Carter
Michael Samulon

Stay strong and look forward,
Adam Meltzer,
Los Angeles, U.S.A.
323-864-9130- cell
meltzer17@gmail.com
Skype: meltz77
SITE: www.artsearthpartnership.org
Facebook: http://www.facebook.com/artsearthpartnership
Twitter: @artsearth
Live Sustainably!
CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: The information contained in this message and any documents, files, previous messages or other information attached to it, may be privileged, confidential and protected from disclosure. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient(s), you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately by replying to the message and deleting it from your computer.
-----
Subject: 131107 0928
From: Paul Romero [paul_romero818@yahoo.com]
Sent: Saturday, October 05, 2013 1:27 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Subject:

Dear Caltrans and BOE

I am writing you today about the Hyperion bridge you guys are planning to do work on in Atwater Village. I read a articel saying you want to post a 55mph zone and I most say that is ABSOLUTLY DANGEROUS! I went to John Marshall High School and walking on that narrow side walk with cars flying by just inches away then having to cross the street at the bottom of the bridge, wait for it's safe to cross. I think it's a accident waiting to happen and I would hate to see young students having to go thru that.

Then theirs the case of bikes going thru their. It's would be unsafe and unreasonable for cars to be going that fast when their are bicyclist going thru their. Just think about what would happen. Theirs a guy riding his bike, car is already at 55mph and all of a sudden he has to slow down/slam on the breaks. The driver might hit the guy then by that time since he's going so fast he would just go into the freeway and get away or he might stop causing the car behind him to hit him.

I just see so many bad things that could happen if you put the speed at 55mph and I hope you guys come the sense that this idea is not the best for this street.

Sincerly,
Paul Joshua Romero
Subject: 131107 0932
From: nancy wedeen [nanpsycle@icloud.com]
Sent: Friday, October 04, 2013 10:20 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org
Subject: Bicycle roads & streets

Hello ...  
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All

We bike all over the LA area. We need safe streets.

As someone who bikes or walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:

* Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
* Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
* Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
* No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
* A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Please consider carefully. Bicycle routes and/or lanes improve communities!

Sincerely,

nancy & richard
we noho wedeens

Cycle & Recycle
Mini IPad
Subject: 131107 0933-1
From: Shannon ORourke [shannonorourke@me.com]
Sent: Friday, October 04, 2013 10:30 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; tom.labonge@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway – Build a Safe Viaduct for All

As someone who bikes or walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:

* Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
* Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
* Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
* No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
* A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,

Shannon O’Rourke
2101 Hollyvista Avenue
Los Angeles, CA  90027
Subject: 131107 0933-2
From: David P. Dapper [dpdapper@me.com]
Sent: Saturday, October 05, 2013 10:32 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; tom.labonge@lacity.org; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All

Dear Ms. Podesta,

As someone who bikes or walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, the project should include:

* Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
* Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
* Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
* No crash barrier and banked turns that will only encourage people to drive even faster
* A full-width crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans’ complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,

David P. Dapper
1155 South Grand Avenue
#1411
Los Angeles, CA 90015
Subject: 131107 1023

Dear Tami Podesta --

Thank you very much for this opportunity to comment on the proposed Hyperion Bridge renovation.

Today is actually my son’s 9th birthday and his wish was that we walk to school. We live in Atwater Village but he goes to school at Franklin Elementary in Los Feliz, so to walk to school is a bit of a challenge. It’s not that far -- a little more than a mile -- but to do it requires crossing what he and his 8 year old friend refer to as the "Death Bridge."

Well, I’d like to report that we made the trip this morning -- and we survived!! It was a terrifying experience crossing the bridge. The sidewalks are far too narrow, there is no cross walk in Atwater that enables you to get to the sidewalk on the bridge, and the cars go by so fast that if one person happened to be sending a text message and swerved even a few feet out of their lane we would have all been goners. That quick and easy -- See you later!

I bring this up to say -- I know that the new bridge renovation is going to happen one way or another. And I look forward to it because anything will be better than what is there now. But I beg you to please consider making this a community destination -- and not just a way for cars to speed through our neighborhood. This is a neighborhood! Many people in Atwater would love to walk to Silver Lake/Los Feliz, and vice versa -- but they can’t do so because the bridge is not engineered with pedestrians in mind.

I have taken a long hard look at the EnrichLA/Sodder alternate bridge renovation design and what I really love about it is that it is making the bridge a community destination. The LA River is SO beautiful in this area, and yet there is no way to get to it safely from the bridge. No way to stop and enjoy it from the bridge. This is a once in a lifetime opportunity to transform this bridge into something we can all really be proud of and enjoy -- not just whiz over at 40 mph. Let’s please take the time to consider all options and really do this right!!

Thank you so much for your consideration.

Greg Brouwer
3767 Edenhurst Ave.
Atwater Village, 90039

On Friday, October 25, 2013 8:51 AM, "Podesta, Tami L@DOT" <tami.podesta@dot.ca.gov> wrote:

Dear Mr. Brouwer:

The comment period for the Glendale Blvd. Hyperion Ave. Complex of Bridges Improvement Project environmental document has been extended to November 7, 2013, so you still have time to submit your comment.

Please see the project website for more information:

http://www.glendalehyperion.com/

Tami Podesta
Senior Environmental Planner
213-897-0309

Department of Transportation
Division of Environmental Planning
100 South Main Street, Ste. 100
Los Angeles, CA 90012

From: Greg Brouwer [mailto:gbrouw@yahoo.com]
Sent: Thursday, October 24, 2013 10:40 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Subject: bridge comments?

Hi Tami -- is it too late to comment on the proposed Hyperion-Glendale bridge construction? Thanks!

====================
Subject: 131107 1242

From: Christine Anthony [mailto:canthony2@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Wednesday, November 06, 2013 10:01 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: gene gilbert
Subject: Glendale-Hyperion bridges project.

Ms. Podesta,
As a resident of Atwater Village, the community at north end of this span, my comment is to get on with it. The proposal to build a bridge that will accommodate traffic at higher than posted speeds addresses the reality of what the traffic will do. It will become necessary for our community to put in place a lower speed limit through the business district and we should fight for that and then for the authorities to enforce it. That there is a dedicated pedestrian and bicycle bridge to be constructed over pylons just downriver from the G-H span solves concerns about accommodation for those forms of traffic. As all the add-ons to this earthquake upgrade to a dangerous structure slow the design and implementation process, before you know it the whole thing will get knocked down in just that earthquake.

Thank you,
Christine Anthony
4064 Perlita Ave.
Los Angeles, CA 90039
ph 323 376 6463

-----
Subject: 131107 1259

From: Meher McArthur [mailto:mehermc@aol.com]
Sent: Thursday, November 07, 2013 12:20 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Subject: Hyperion Bridge Renovation

Dear Ms. Podesta,

I am a Silver Lake resident currently residing in Atwater Village while our Silver Lake home is being repaired after a fire. In the last year, my family and I have spend a lot of time crossing the Hyperion Bridge, and we are concerned that the proposed renovations to the Hyperion Bridge are moving in the wrong direction, as it were, since it will make the bridge even less pedestrian- and cyclist-friendly than it already is. (I have walked across the bridge a few times - the sidewalk is frighteningly narrow! I also see many school kids walking across that bridge and cyclists contending with cars speeding over a blind hill) and create a further separation of these two neighborhoods.

I would urge you to consider the alternative proposal made by Los Angeles Walks, which would transform the bridge into a multi-modal thoroughfare, used by cars, buses, bicycles and pedestrians alike. It will be more in keeping with the history of our neighborhoods (which used to be multi-modal) and more in line with future developments happening in these neighborhoods, particularly the revitalization of the LA River that could bring more people across the bridge - ideally pedestrians and cyclists. Los Angeles is a City that will succeed in the future by depending less on cars - look at the success of CicLAvia!

It would truly enhance all of our neighborhoods to make this key route one that is more hospitable and safe for all community members.

Thank you for your consideration.

Meher McArthur
Silver Lake/Atwater Village Resident
Los Feliz Ledger contributor "Keen to be Green" column
Asian Art Curator, Author and Educator
(323) 459-7791

-----
Subject: 131107 1301-1 (See 131107 1023 in the emails database)

From: Greg Brouwer [mailto:gbrouw@yahoo.com]
Sent: Thursday, November 07, 2013 10:23 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: j crovitz; Linda Moore; Michael Rogozen; Moreno, Cesar l@DOT; shay doong; Wenn Chyn; tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org; allisonferraro@losfelizledger.com
Subject: Re: bridge comments?

Dear Tami Podesta --

Thank you very much for this opportunity to comment on the proposed Hyperion Bridge renovation.

Today is actually my son's 9th birthday and his wish was that we walk to school. We live in Atwater Village but he goes to school at Franklin Elementary in Los Feliz, so to walk to school is a bit of a challenge. It's not that far -- a little more than a mile -- but to do it requires crossing what he and his 8 year old friend refer to as the "Death Bridge."

Well, I'd like to report that we made the trip this morning -- and we survived!! It was a terrifying experience crossing the bridge. The sidewalks are far too narrow, there is no cross walk in Atwater that enables you to get to the sidewalk on the bridge, and the cars go by so fast that if one person happened to be sending a text message and swerved even a few feet out of their lane we would have all been goners. That quick and easy -- See you later!

I bring this up to say -- I know that the new bridge renovation is going to happen one way or another. And I look forward to it because anything will be better than what is there now. But I beg you to please consider making this a community destination -- and not just a way for cars to speed through our neighborhood. This is a neighborhood! Many people in Atwater would love to walk to Silver Lake/Los Feliz, and vice versa -- but they can't do so because the bridge is not engineered with pedestrians in mind.

I have taken a long hard look at the EnrichLA/Sodder alternate bridge renovation design and what I really love about it is that it is making the bridge a community destination. The LA River is SO beautiful in this area, and yet there is no way to get to it safely from the bridge. No way to stop and enjoy it from the bridge. This is a once in a lifetime opportunity to transform this bridge into something we can all really be proud of and enjoy -- not just whiz over at 40 mph. Let's please take the time to consider all options and really do this right!!

Thank you so much for your consideration.

Greg Brouwer
3767 Edenhurst Ave.
Atwater Village, 90039

---
On Friday, October 25, 2013 8:51 AM, "Podesta, Tami L@DOT"
<tami.podesta@dot.ca.gov<mailto:tami.podesta@dot.ca.gov>> wrote:
Dear Mr. Brouwer:
The comment period for the Glendale Blvd. Hyperion Ave. Complex of Bridges Improvement Project environmental document has been extended to November 7, 2013, so you still have time to submit your comment.

Please see the project website for more information:

http://www.glendalehyperion.com/

Tami Podesta  
Senior Environmental Planner  
213-897-0309

Department of Transportation  
Division of Environmental Planning  
100 South Main Street, Ste. 100  
Los Angeles, CA 90012

From: Greg Brouwer [mailto:gbrouw@yahoo.com]  
Sent: Thursday, October 24, 2013 10:40 PM  
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT  
Subject: bridge comments?

Hi Tami -- is it too late to comment on the proposed Hyperion-Glendale bridge construction? Thanks!

-----
Subject: 131107 1301-2

From: Sascha Rice [mailto:sascha@sascharice.com]
Sent: Thursday, November 07, 2013 10:35 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT; tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Cc: info@la-bike.org; Joe Mellis
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All

Dear Ms. Podesta, Councilmember LaBonge, Councilmember O’Farrell, and Mayor Garcetti,

I live, work, exercise, shop, and raise my children in Silverlake. I travel between Atwater and
Silverlake everyday, often many times a day.

I am writing because it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Avenue be made safe for people like me
and my children.

And as leaders in the community, you have an amazing opportunity to take this modest action and
make extraordinary change.

Connecting our wonderful city hubs with accessible and safe transportation-ways is a priority for
me and this will do wonders to make Los Angeles a leader in urban development.

We walk our daughter to Ivanhoe school every morning and in the afternoon and on weekends
our son and daughter ride the neighborhood on their bikes. This is the way children grow and
how they learn to navigate their city. This kind of human experience is what makes this area so
highly valued.

Atwater Village has become a beautiful vibrant destination, but I am too frightened to allow my
family to walk or ride bikes over the bridge. When a friend was killed by a bus on her bicycle, I
stopped riding in the city. I teach my children bicycle safety, but I need you to provide better
safety conditions. Like the change around the reservoir, addressing the Hyperion safety hazard
will do wonders to creating a safer community.

I can choose to drive because it is unsafe, but what about my children? How are they supposed to
get around safely? They are quite capable of walking or riding their bikes, but it is up to our city
leaders to make it safe. Making our city safe for kids (who can not drive) is your responsibility.

Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban
pedestrian community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:

* Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
* Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
* Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage
speeding
* No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
* A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk
from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge
* Beautification with plants to bring drivers into the human space

It is your responsibility to make this project consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete
streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle and pedestrian access
across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make satisfy driver’s needs as well.
The safety of your constituents is your responsibility. Please don't characterize this as a "fridge bicycle movement." This is about safety for all.

I understand working these considerations into action will extend the project's completion horizon and it will be absolutely worth it.

Sincerely,

Sascha
2645 Ivanhoe Drive Los Angeles CA 90039

Sascha Rice
Director | Writer | Producer
To learn more about Sascha's EMMY NOMINATED feature go to:
www.patbrowndocumentary.com<http://www.patbrowndocumentary.com>
MyCaliforniaNow.com<http://mycalifornianow.com/>
Subject: 131107 1301-3

From: Catherine Jurca [mailto:cathjurca@gmail.com] On Behalf Of Catherine Jurca
Sent: Thursday, November 07, 2013 11:07 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Subject: Hyperion Bridge project

Dear Ms. Podesta:

I am writing to object to the proposed redesign of the Hyperion Bridge. I drive across that bridge all the time to get from Glendale Blvd. to Los Feliz, and back again, and even I think it's a terrible idea not to include bike lanes and better pedestrian access. The project must take into account the safety of these two groups as well and make it a resource for all users. This plan is a major step backward in thinking about the transportation future of our city. It's a disaster that I hope your agency will remedy.

Best wishes,

Catherine Jurca

-----
Subject: 131107 1303-1

From: jennie.chamberlain@gmail.com [mailto:jennie.chamberlain@gmail.com] On Behalf Of Jennie Chamberlain
Sent: Thursday, November 07, 2013 11:33 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Subject: Glendale-Hyperion Complex of Bridges Improvement Project

Hello,
I’m writing to you as a long term resident of Los Feliz and Silver Lake.

I appreciate all of the hard work that has gone into trying to improve this bridge but I have several concerns regarding pedestrian and bike access and safety over the bridge.

Just to clear the air, I’m not sure why this is being painted in the media as a recent bike activists issue. For as long as I can remember, over a decade, community members like myself have been continually voicing our concerns for pedestrian and bike safety, for the desire to improve walkability and a sense of community in Los Feliz, Silver Lake and the adjoining Atwater neighborhoods. This desire has only grown stronger over the years. It is sad for me to hear that some folks think that because they have been working on this project for 9 years, it is simply OK to ignore other voices, of which there are many within the communities, who have as of yet not even been invited to the table.

I am frankly quite discouraged by all of the rhetoric of livable streets with a lack of follow through to make areas safe for pedestrians and cyclists.

On many occasions, starting back when my children were 4 (they are 8 now) they have asked to walk or bike over the bridge to their favorite papusa restaurant. Without a car this trip is simply reckless. And with children it would negligent.

To say that the bike path over the river will suffice does nothing to connect the neighborhoods. Trust me as I say I have carried there and my bikes up and down the stairs (the location a serial rapist chooses to use every few years or so to isolate his victims) that it is not simple or easy or straightforward. And then you still need to cross Riverside. All this while many services are along Glendale/Brand, not just up on Los Feliz Blvd.

There are a number of occasions when I would have to pack up my pajama clad children and load them into the car to pick up my husband who biked back from work in Eagle Rock at the Atwater side of the bridge simply because he felt it was too dangerous to cross. After hearing the public testimony of many hit and run victims I am now glad he did.

I was heartened to hear that the impact study of construction on the bridge, with 2 lanes of traffic closed, indicated that there would still easily be enough room to handle the volume of cars. So please do not provide unnecessarily fast and more lanes than are necessary for cars. I hope DOT will take this under careful consideration, reduce the number of car lanes and give space over to pedestrians and bikes so that they too will have safe passage.

I challenge you to close lanes to car and actually count pedestrian and bike users who travel over the bridge. As you see, currently they are uncountable - the bridge is simply too unsafe for most people to even attempt, even though they would gladly walk or take their bikes across.
I am also gravely concerned that if the bridge is designed for greater speeds rather than a drastic reduction in speed we will continue to have pedestrian accidents. Most of the harm done by cars speeding over the bridge (in lanes more plentiful and wider than is needed) is on the communities flanking the bridge. These zones, which are heavily trafficked by pedestrians, and would be even moreso if the bridge were slowed down, are under attack by cars speeding off the bridge. It makes no sense to speed this short stretch up and have cars fly into otherwise congested areas. We have had to many cyclist and pedestrian accidents (and deaths) in the neighborhood already.

I implore you to make the bridge and other passageways in our neighborhoods safe for pedestrians, cyclists, children and old people, for the many who regularly use non car transportation to work. This is not only a healthy thing to do for the community, it is a necessity. Many Angelenos, many Silver Lake residents, many Atwater residents have only one car per family or no car. They rely on you to make these roads safe.

As a neighborhood we have shown over and over again our commitment to walking. Ivanhoe school regularly has 80% of its students walking, biking or scooting at least a portion of the way to school - even without sidewalks on many of the neighborhood streets. Many more would like to ride their bikes to King Middle School and Marshal. Please take this into consideration. Make the neighborhood safer.

Thank You,
Jennie Chamberlain
310 770-6051

-----
Hi, I’d like to make a brief comment on the project.

As someone who lives in the area (and who rides a bike to work), I strongly support making any new infrastructure we build as friendly as possible toward cyclists and pedestrians. Curb lanes should be broad; bike lanes should be there when they make sense; otherwise bike "sharrows" should be painted in the lanes; sidewalks should be broad, smooth, and shaded by trees; it should be possible to cross roads safely; and so forth. This project represents a great opportunity to better connect two great neighborhoods. I strongly feel that we should get it right and not continue to make the mistake of over-privileging automobile traffic.

Thank you!

Brandon Harvey
1751 Lucretia Ave.
Los Angeles, CA 90026

-----
Subject: 131107 1305-1

From: Daniel Chamberlain [mailto:daniel.chamberlain@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, November 07, 2013 12:16 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Subject: Public comment on glendale-hyperion bridge

Hello,
I'm writing to you as a long term resident of Los Feliz and Silver Lake.

I appreciate all of the hard work that has gone into trying to improve this bridge but I have several concerns regarding pedestrian and bike access and safety over the bridge. As a regular user of the bridge I can tell you that it is already used by cars to travel over 50 mph between Atwater and Silver Lake. I would gladly trade a few MPH of that speed (which is already 15 MPH over the posted speed limit, observed by nobody) for the inclusion of pedestrian walkways wide enough for the dozens of high school kids that use it everyday and the inclusion of protected bike lanes for cyclists moving across the city or coming up from the lovely river path. As it stands right now, traffic comes barreling off the bridge into slow traffic in Atwater or into stand-still traffic in front of the Silver Lake Trader Joes. This traffic needs no encouragement to go faster, and in fact the overall safety of these neighborhoods, of pedestrians, of cyclists, of employees, and of drivers would be best supported by taking measures to slow the traffic over the bridge.

I am also gravely concerned that if the bridge is designed for greater speeds rather than a drastic reduction in speed we will continue to have pedestrian accidents. Most of the harm done by cars speeding over the bridge (in lanes more plentiful and wider than is needed) is on the communities flanking the bridge. These zones, which are heavily trafficked by pedestrians, and would be even moreso if the bridge were slowed down, are under attack by cars speeding off the bridge. It makes no sense to speed this short stretch up and have cars fly into otherwise congested areas. We have had many cyclist and pedestrian accidents (and deaths) in the neighborhood already.

As a neighborhood we have shown over and over again our commitment to walking. Ivanhoe school regularly has 80% of its students walking, biking or scooting at least a portion of the way to school - even without sidewalks on many of the neighborhood streets. Many more would like to ride their bikes to King Middle School and Marshall. Please take this into consideration. Make the neighborhood safer.

Allowing for safe, family-friendly connections between Silver Lake and Atwater will benefit both neighborhoods, and the city as a whole. Businesses will be revitalized as the neighborhoods would be better connected, and we would be getting closer to having a healthy, living, sustainable city.

Please alter the design to include deliberate and meaningful provisions for the many citizens who would prefer to walk or bike over the bridge. There is more than enough space on the bridge for a lane of cars each way, an emergency lane if needed, and safer spaces for bikes and pedestrians.

Daniel Chamberlain

-----
Subject: 131107 1305-2

From: Michael Shifflett [mailto:doctor@thedilettantes.net]
Sent: Thursday, November 07, 2013 12:07 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT; tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All

Dear Ms. Podesta, Councilmember LaBonge, Councilmember O'Farrell, and Mayor Garcetti,

As someone who bikes between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone's needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:

* Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
* Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
* Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
* No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
* A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,
Michael Shifflett
327 Welcome St
LA, 90026

--

Michael Shifflett
Dilettante
c. 213.359.1591
e. doctor@thedilettantes.net<mailto:doctor@thedilettantes.net>

-----
I've been a homeowner and resident of Adams Hill of 21 years, and all that time have considered Atwater and Silverlake to be part of my extended neighborhood. I patronize the cafes & restaurants & grocery stores there frequently, and worked for the better part of 4 years in a building right at the foot of the bridge, on the Atwater side. I've always thought that the Hyperion Bridge complex has a tremendous amount of wasted potential- it's situated wonderfully for views of the river and the city, but with it's high solid walls, high speed traffic, and narrow sidewalks, it's impossible to enjoy those views. I believe we have an opportunity now to change the bridge from something that's unpleasant and dangerous into something beautiful and enjoyable, a destination, and to improve it's functionality for a borad set of users at the same time. I’d like to see wides sidewalks on both sides, bike lanes, park benches, and a single lane for car traffic each direction. I also think a crosswalk in the middle of the bridge would be helpful- it would allow pedestrians and sightseers to enjoy views up and down the river, and would have a traffic calming effect as well. It currently takes only 30-40 seconds to cross the bridge at the current posted speed limit; no one will lose any significant time if we slow traffic on the bridge for a few hundred feet. We’re only talking about a few seconds of driver's time, in exchange for a huge improvement in the quality of life in this area.
Subject: 131107 1306-2

From: Jeannie Olander [mailto:jeannieolander@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, November 07, 2013 12:56 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; marie.rumsey@lacity.org; Mitch.Ofarrell@lacity.org;
christine.peters@lacity.org; eric.garcetti@lacity.org; john.brady@lacity.org
Subject: Hyperion Bridge

Tami Podesta & Hyperion Bridge Team,

I am concerned that the Hyperion Bridge design has not incorporated the critical need for bike
lanes on the bridge or a safe pedestrian crossing at the junction of Hyperion Avenue and Glendale
Blvd. Many constituents in the adjacent neighborhoods rely solely on walking and biking as part
of their primary, daily commute. If the Hyperion Bridge is designed to solely move cars quickly
with no thought to the risk to pedestrians and bicyclists, then there will be tragic accidents.

Some folks choose to bike and walk, but others do not have a choice. Please understand how this
bridge will affect the daily lives of those people living and working in these neighborhoods. Please
put yourselves in their shoes. We need to design infrastructure that considers the vast percentage
of our population that don’t have cars to drive.

Thank you for your time and attention to this urgent matter.

Jeannie Olander
323.620.1487

-----
Subject: 131107 1306-3 (Referenced as 131106 1545-2 in the Letter Comments Database)
Attachments: Hyperion Bridge Letter.pdf; _Certification_.htm

From: Roadblock [mailto:roadblock@midnightridazz.com]
Sent: Thursday, November 07, 2013 12:01 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT; tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Cc: Josh Chatten-Brown
Subject: Hyperion Public Comment

Dear Tami

I am a member of the groups Vision Hyperion, Midnight Ridazz and Angelenos for a Great Hyperion Bridge as well as several other emerging citizen action groups.

I would like to submit my concerns regarding the proposal for the Hyperion Glendale Bridge Complex.

I appreciate the thought of a citizen advisory board, however ground zero for that board must include BOTH sidewalks AND bike lanes the length of the bridge in order to mitigate my concerns.

The current proposed plan creates a danger by removing the sidewalk on the south side as well as the banked roads and engineered speed designed for high speed.

Removing the sidewalk would create a hazard for me as a cyclist since many people will likely use the shoulder or bike lane if not provided an ADA compliant space and in particular this danger will be present at night.

Many people use bike lanes as their side walk for running and walking and this would create a danger.

The presence of crash barricades would create an emergency vehicle hazard in the event of a major collision.

The IAES document itself affirms that a road diet is feasible for the bridge with no additional impact on peak hour traffic. Page 103

attached are diagrams regarding my concerns including a diagram that would mitigate my concerns.

removing the sidewalk is a NON negotiable.

thanks

-don ward
stake holder.
Subject: 131107 1306-4

From: Jeannie Olander [mailto:jeannieolander@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, November 07, 2013 12:56 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; marie.rumsey@lacity.org; Mitch.Ofarrell@lacity.org;
christine.peters@lacity.org; eric.garcetti@lacity.org; john.brady@lacity.org
Subject: Hyperion Bridge

Tami Podesta & Hyperion Bridge Team,

I am concerned that the Hyperion Bridge design has not incorporated the critical need for bike lanes on the bridge or a safe pedestrian crossing at the junction of Hyperion Avenue and Glendale Blvd. Many constituents in the adjacent neighborhoods rely solely on walking and biking as part of their primary, daily commute. If the Hyperion Bridge is designed to solely move cars quickly with no thought to the risk to pedestrians and bicyclists, then there will be tragic accidents.

Some folks choose to bike and walk, but others do not have a choice. Please understand how this bridge will affect the daily lives of those people living and working in these neighborhoods. Please put yourselves in their shoes. We need to design infrastructure that considers the vast percentage of our population that don't have cars to drive.

Thank you for your time and attention to this urgent matter.

Jeannie Olander
323.620.1487

-----
Good morning, please absorb and incorporate the following in all future public projects. The Hyperion Bridge Project needs to be redesigned. The Redesign of all future public works projects need to embrace a new and progressive set of criteria. First: Water must be treated as a resource to be slowed and kept on site, instead of moving into the ocean as fast as possible. Two: Paved road ways must be designed to embrace as many different uses as possible. The term complete streets in all of its many aspects must become an excepted term of art. In keeping with the above two part design colloquium the Hyperion design project needs an extensive and complete reassessment. Beginning at Rowena heading northerly on Hyperion Ave., transform the 60 feet currently of utilized as four lanes of automotive, light trucks, and buses into one lane north and down hill with two lanes south and up hill. This will accommodate; three 11 foot lanes for automobiles, two 6 foot bicycle lanes, two 3 foot separations to be placed between the cars and bicycle /pedestrian space and two 4 foot pedestrian sidewalks. These new pedestrian and bicycle accommodations will require shade trees, permeable pavement, water catchments and road separation from the fast automotive traffic. The water catchments are to be designed to absorb all rain, at rates; of up to 4 inches in one week, 12 inches in one month or a potential 50 inches in one year. The absorption area will be the entire 100 feet of city right of way and any other current feed areas that can not be adsorbed and kept in the grounds where those rains fall. The entire length of Hyperion from Rowena to Glendale Blvd and all other roads connected with this project must be constructed to accommodate cars, bicycles and pedestrians, water and plantings must also be considered from the above standard. Any existing regulation countermanding these design criteria will need to be reviewed for life safety concerns. City municipal code and zoning requirements can be granted variances and modifications as necessary. There are already several state water conservation requirements that require similar conservation strategies on private property. We are asking to apply those standards to this and all future public works projects. AB 1358 is germane here. As are several other recently enacted legislative directives. Please come to understand that the base line design criteria needs to be, how will our grate grand children's grate grand children be affected by our actions today?

thank you

good diggin'

jim

-----
Subject: 131107 1307-2
Attachments: signature.asc; _Certification_.txt

From: Robert "Fixer" Smith [mailto:fixer@livenation.com]
Sent: Thursday, November 07, 2013 11:51 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Subject: Comments on Glendale Boulevard-Hyperion Avenue Complex of Bridges Improvement

I am an Atwater Village resident and former Atwater Village Neighborhood Council member and co-chair. I wanted to take this opportunity to weigh in on the 2005 plans for this bridge project and the possibilities of a newly revised plan.

The character and make-up of this neighborhood has changed dramatically since 2005, as has the City and its Plans and Ordinances. It would be ludicrous to take a plan that is so old and outdated and try to make such a major, lasting change to the neighborhood. It would not take much time or effort to consider the changes being proposed to keep this project in alignment with the overall transportation goals of the City while also IMPROVING the bridge and surrounding area for people using all forms of transportation.

The trends seem to be a movement towards less single person automobile transportation, not more. We need our core infrastructure to reflect that trend.

Thanks for your consideration.

--
Robert Smith | Post Production Manager
(:: +1.323.207.6484 | +1.323.769.4789 fax | x44993 internal LN
8:: fixer@livenation.com | AIM: bigdaddyfix
*:: 7060 Hollywood Blvd, 2nd Floor, | Hollywood, CA, | 90028
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All

Dear Ms. Podesta, Councilmember LaBonge, Councilmember O'Farrell, and Mayor Garcetti,

As someone who bikes or walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:

* Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
* Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
* Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
* No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
* A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,
Ezra Horne
3944 1/2 Marathon St
Los Angeles, CA 90029

-----
Subject: 131107 1326

From: Fabienne Bouville [mailto:fbouvil@yahoo.com]
Sent: Thursday, November 07, 2013 12:39 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Subject: Hyperion bridge

Hello,
As a resident of atwater village, i would like to express my support to integrate a bike path and pedestrian access to the hyperion bridge project. I feel it is also important to preserve its historic and original design for the sake of our neighborhood's identity.
Thank you very much,
Fabienne Bouville
3837 Brunswick ave
Los Angeles, CA 90039

-----
Subject: 131107 1327

From: Mitch Suskin [mailto:msuskin@kamosuskin.com]
Sent: Thursday, November 07, 2013 7:05 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT; tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Cc: info@la-bike.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway! Build a SAFE Viaduct for ALL

Dear Ms. Podesta, Councilmember LaBonge, Councilmember O'Farrell, and Mayor Garcelli:

As someone who bikes and walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is critical that Hyperion Ave be made safe for pedestrians and bicyclists. Everyone's needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through our urban community. Project must include:

- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide space for cyclists and pedestrians
- A complete crosswalk on Atwater end of viaduct to let people access sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give cyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge.

There's NO reason this project cannot be consistent with bike plan and Caltrans streets policy. The viaduct is currently dangerous and the greatest barrier to safe access across the I-5 Freeway and the Los Angeles River. This project must change that and make all travelers safer.

Thanks very much,

Mitch Suskin
4380 Lemp Ave
Los Angeles, CA

-----
Subject: 131107 1403

From: Ryan Snyder [mailto:ryan@rsa.cc]
Sent: Wednesday, November 06, 2013 8:18 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Subject: Hyperion Bridge

Hello Tami

I just wanted to state my desire to see a design of the Hyperion bridge that is much more pedestrian and bicycle-friendly. In this era of global warming it makes little sense to spend public money to simply move cars faster.\n
Thanks!

Ryan Snyder
Ryan Snyder Associates
10501 Wilshire Boulevard, #1910
Los Angeles, California USA 90024
Tel: 310-475-3895
-----
Subject: Hyperion Bridge Renovation

Dear Ms. Podesta,

I am the mother of 3 children ages 8, 6, and 3 and our family has lived in Silver Lake for 4 years now.

We live on Panorama Terrace and often walk, as a family, to Trader Joe's, Pinkberry, and local restaurants. We would love to walk across the Hyperion Bridge into Atwater Village as a family as well but it is not safe. A few times I have done that walk by myself and always get nervous at the end when I have to dash across 2 lanes of traffic, I could not imagine shepherding 3 little people across (and then have to do it again on the return!)

I urge you, in renovating the bridge, to proceed with the option that best supports pedestrians in the neighborhood. If more people were encouraged to explore our neighborhood and Atwater Village on foot both local businesses and our sense of community would benefit.

Sincerely,
Doris Del Castillo
Los Angeles, 90039
323-663-0853

-----
Subject: 131107 1421 (Referenced as 131107 1303-1 in the E-mail Database)

From: jennie.chamberlain@gmail.com [mailto:jennie.chamberlain@gmail.com] On Behalf Of Jennie Chamberlain
Sent: Thursday, November 07, 2013 2:01 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Subject: Re: Glendale-Hyperion Complex of Bridges Improvement Project

One more thing....

At the Public Hearing for the Hyperion Glendale bridge, many people used these words to characterize the bridge and their experience using it -

TOO FAST
TOO DANGEROUS
TOO LOUD
TAKING YOUR LIFE IN YOUR HANDS
RECKLESS DRIVING
A DEATH BRIDGE
HEAD-ON COLLISIONS
SPEEDING OFF THE BRIDGE INTO CONGESTED NEIGHBORHOODS
DANGEROUS FOR CARS, BIKES AND PEDESTRIANS
NOT SAFE

No one talked about the need to speed up their commute. No one talked about the need to preserve car lanes. This is in stark contrast to discussions about other roads such as Rowena, which has successfully undergone a "road diet."

Please listen to the people. Please make this bridge safe for all forms of transportation. Stop creating a bridge that is faster than is needed and faster than is safe. The community is relying on your leadership.

Thank You,
Jennie Chamberlain

On Thu, Nov 7, 2013 at 11:32 AM, Jennie Chamberlain <jennie.chamberlain@post.harvard.edu<mailto:jennie.chamberlain@post.harvard.edu>> wrote:
Hello,
I'm writing to you as a long term resident of Los Feliz and Silver Lake.

I appreciate all of the hard work that has gone into trying to improve this bridge but I have several concerns regarding pedestrian and bike access and safety over the bridge.

Just to clear the air, I'm not sure why this is being painted in the media as a recent bike activists issue. For as long as I can remember, over a decade, community members like myself have been continually voicing our concerns for pedestrian and bike safety, for the desire to improve walkability and a sense of community in Los Feliz, Silver Lake and the adjoining Atwater neighborhoods. This desire has only grown stronger over the years. It is sad for me to hear that some folks think that because they have been working on this project for 9 years, it is simply OK to
ignore other voices, of which there are many within the communities, who have as of yet not even been invited to the table.

I am frankly quite discouraged by all of the rhetoric of livable streets with a lack of follow through to make areas safe for pedestrians and cyclists.

On many occasions, starting back when my children were 4 (they are 8 now) they have asked to walk or bike over the bridge to their favorite papusa restaurant. Without a car this trip is simply reckless. And with children it would negligent.

To say that the bike path over the river will suffice does nothing to connect the neighborhoods. Trust me as I say I have carried there and my bikes up and down the stairs (the location a serial rapist chooses to use every few years or so to isolate his victims) that it is not simple or easy or straightforward. And then you still need to cross Riverside. All this while many services are along Glendale/Brand, not just up on Los Feliz Blvd.

There are a number of occasions when I would have to pack up my pajama clad children and load them into the car to pick up my husband who biked back from work in Eagle Rock at the Atwater side of the bridge simply because he felt it was too dangerous to cross. After hearing the public testimony of many hit and run victims I am now glad he did.

I was heartened to hear that the impact study of construction on the bridge, with 2 lanes of traffic closed, indicated that there would still easily be enough room to handle the volume of cars. So please do not provide unnecessarily fast and more lanes than are necessary for cars. I hope DOT will take this under careful consideration, reduce the number of car lanes and give space over to pedestrians and bikes so that they too will have safe passage.

I challenge you to close lanes to car and actually count pedestrian and bike users who travel over the bridge. As you see, currently they are uncountable - the bridge is simply too unsafe for most people to even attempt, even though they would gladly walk or take their bikes across.

I am also gravely concerned that if the bridge is designed for greater speeds rather than a drastic reduction in speed we will continue to have pedestrian accidents. Most of the harm done by cars speeding over the bridge (in lanes more plentiful and wider than is needed) is on the communities flanking the bridge. These zones, which are heavily trafficked by pedestrians, and would be even moreso if the bridge were slowed down, are under attack by cars speeding off the bridge. It makes no sense to speed this short stretch up and have cars fly into otherwise congested areas. We have had to many cyclist and pedestrian accidents (and deaths) in the neighborhood already.

I implore you to make the bridge and other passageways in our neighborhoods safe for pedestrians, cyclists, children and old people, for the many who regularly use non car transportation to work. This is not only a healthy thing to do for the community, it is a necessity. Many Angelenos, many Silver Lake residents, many Atwater residents have only one car per family or no car. They rely on you to make these roads safe.

As a neighborhood we have shown over and over again our commitment to walking. Ivanhoe school regularly has 80% of its students walking, biking or scooting at least a portion of the way to school - even without sidewalks on many of the neighborhood streets. Many more would like to ride their bikes to King Middle School and Marshal. Please take this into consideration. Make the neighborhood safer.
Thank You,
Jennie Chamberlain
310 770-6051<tel:310%20770-6051>

-----
Subject:  131107 1550

From: Diane Edwardson [mailto:diane.edwardson@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, November 07, 2013 3:17 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; councilmember.labonge@lacity.org
Subject: Glendale Boulevard-Hyperion Avenue Complex of Bridges Improvement

I do not think you need to cater to the bike riders on the Glendale Hyperion Bridge project. Frankly I’m sick & tired of losing motorized traffic lanes of to bikes. In this case, there are a number of alternative bridges being constructed to cross the river - including one on the old bridge footings adjacent to the Hyperion Bridge. This is a major commuter corridor.

It’s safer for everyone involved to just get the bikes onto an alternative route. As it is the bike riders.

A great deal of attention was paid to preserving & restoring the historic character of the bridge complex. Don’t screw it up.

--
Diane Edwardson
2642 Corralitas Dirve
Los Angeles CA 90039
(323) 666-1392
diane.edwardson@gmail.com<mailto:diane.edwardson@gmail.com>

-----
Subject: 131107 1553-1

From: Craig Collins [mailto:craig.collins@silverlakereservoirs.org]
Sent: Thursday, November 07, 2013 3:24 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: Eric Bruins
Subject: Please file this as a comment to the Hyperion Bridge Retrofit documents

The following is a comment on the proposed Hyperion/Glendale Bridge Seismic Retrofit Project. Please submit this with project documents:

This project contains many essential and highly desirable features, including historic restoration of bridge elements, some needed bicycle and pedestrian improvements, and realignment of critically deficient traffic patterns. It is always refreshing to see comprehensive solutions to complex transportation retrofit projects.

However, key flaws in the design are glaringly lacking in basic connectivity. After all, a bridge is the most important structure to provide connections, so its inadequacy threatens the entire project to fail its most important function.

The project fails to contemplate the village nexus of Silver Lake and of Atwater, which are rapidly becoming more pedestrian and bicycle oriented communities. Directing high-speed traffic into these already congested zones is unneeded and creates greater safety conflict between different travel modes.

It is also important to understand that recent changes in California statutes on LOS (Level of Service) standards allow flexibility to meet modern multi-modal transportation goals. Thus, although the prioritization of rapid auto travel might have been relevant when this project began ten years ago, they are no longer necessary or sufficient for modern planning goals. Moreover, inappropriate prioritizing of automotive travel at the expense of basic connectivity and access for bicycle and pedestrian use exposes the project to potential legal action under CEQA and long-term liability for basic safety inadequacy.

Here are primary issues that need to be addressed, and important opportunities to explore fully:

1). Engineering of the Hyperion bridge with banked turns, wider traffic lanes, concrete divider, and 55 mph speed standard is inappropriate and a poor use of funds. Costs of this unneeded enhancement should be redirected to improving other important elements.

Key failure is lack of the most basic bicycle access, at both the west and east end of the bridge complex. Although bicycle access to the LA River path is improved, the critical need is for safe bicycle access between the communities of Atwater and Silver Lake. There is simply no safe way for bicyclists to continue in the direction of travel. Not only is there no adequate lane on the bridge, bicycle travelers at each end are dumped into high speed automotive traffic.

This places the project in non-compliance with the Bicycle Plan. Alternative proposals have already surfaced with a more comprehensive approach. These include new bicycle ramps, wider bike lanes and sidewalks, and narrower or fewer traffic lanes to support safe bicycle and pedestrian travel.
2.) The eastern Hyperion/Glendale merge is challenging for bicycle and pedestrian access and safety. However, it can be solved with a forward-looking view towards maximizing the village appeal of both Atwater and Silver Lake neighborhoods. Reengineering this critical issue is necessary.

3.) The project fails to assess the congestion of traffic from north/east bound Hyperion and Glendale to the I-5 North ramp. This causes significant congestion at the Valleybrink intersection and requires all freeway-bound traffic to U-turn.

Earlier plans for the project included creation of a left turn from Glendale Blvd. North to the I-5 North ramp. This involved repurposing the unneeded Glendale Southbound U-turn under the Hyperion bridge, into a signalized approach for Glendale Northbound traffic to conveniently access the I-5 North ramp. This element eliminates the need for Glendale traffic to use the congested U-turn at Valleybrink to access the I-5 North ramp, thus substantially reducing traffic that must make the Valleybrink U-turn.

4.) An unmet opportunity is to create a pedestrian plaza adjacent to the Pedestrian/Bike Bridge over the Los Angeles River on the Red Car Pilings, using the existing floodwater channeling abutments. This can be accomplished with open-air steel grating as used on many bridges, to maintain daylight on the river, and can be raised above the height of the abutments as needed for flood control.

We have seen no plans for the new bridge. It is essential that it be in character with the adjacent Hyperion/Glendale structure, and with adequate width for both pedestrian and bicycle use.

There is still opportunity for this project to achieve its potential, and to avoid unneeded legal delay that can only increase costs. Sensible fine-tuning of the engineering can result in a bridge project the entire city can be proud of and that will well serve the next century's needs.

Thank you,

Craig Collins

NB: this is provided as a personal comment and is not the official position of Silver Lake Reservoirs Conservancy.

Craig Collins
President
craig.collins@silverlakereservoirs.org

www.SilverLakeReservoirs.org
Silver Lake Reservoirs Conservancy
P.O. Box 39735, Los Angeles CA 90039

-----
Subject: 131107 1553-2

From: Maeve McQuillan [mailto:maeveq@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, November 07, 2013 3:38 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Subject: Hyperion Bridge

Dear Ms. Podesta,

I am a Silverlake resident with two small kids. I urge you to consider the alternative proposal suggested by LA walks for the Hyperion Bridge renovation. Their proposal would allow the bridge to be used for multi-modal purposes. It would be advantageous to communities on both sides of the bridge, which currently are only safely accessible via car. I have crossed that bridge on foot and it is awful. Right now LA is at a turning point, more and more people are moving away from the car as the sole means of transportation, and it would be amazing if the Hyperion Bridge could play a part in this exciting change. We need to be forward thinking and continue the spirit of revitalization that is being exemplified in the LA River clean up and transformation.

Sincerely,

Maeve McQuillan

-----
Subject: 131107 1553-3

From: Jennifer Lao [mailto:jennifer.lao.2@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, November 07, 2013 3:46 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Subject: Hyperion Bridge Design - Cars vs. Community

Hi Tami,

I believe the City's design for the Hyperion Bridge is not conducive to building a community. It includes little traffic calming measures and will result in 55MPH traffic feeding into residential Silver Lake and Atwater. Please consider lowering the allowed or designed speed and removing the crash barriers.

The bridge is dangerous for pedestrians and it does not promote the City's goal to encourage alternative transportation. Please include safe lanes for both pedestrians and cyclists. The community doesn't want more accidents, injuries, or lives lost.

Thanks for your time,
Jennifer
Los Feliz Resident
Green Space Los Feliz Organizer

-----
Subject: 131107 1554

From: Roadblock [mailto:roadblock@midnightridazz.com]
Sent: Thursday, November 07, 2013 3:38 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT; tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Cc: Josh Chatten-Brown
Subject: Hyperion Public Comment

Dear Tami

I am a member of the groups Vision Hyperion, Midnight Ridazz and Angelenos for a Great Hyperion Bridge as well as several other emerging citizen action groups.

I would like to submit my concerns regarding the proposal for the Hyperion Glendale Bridge Complex regarding the CRASH BARRICADES and access to emergency vehicles:

Imagine a scenario like this... with 55MPH speeds the level of crashes will be more severe..... What if it's big enough to clog the lanes? what if a panicked 911 caller cant get their bearings and gives the wrong coordinates? EMS vehicles would need to reroute quite a distance to correct since the freeway crash barricades will prevent them from simply crossing over to the opposite direction of travel.

please see attached image for a visualization.

-----
Subject: 131107 1555 (Referenced as 131107 1555 as Letter Comments Database)

Attachments: updated to podesta.pdf; Glendale-Hyperion102913.pdf; Hyperion Sections and pictures of boardwalk print.pdf; _Certification_.htm

From: Tomasogrady@enrichla.org [mailto:tomasogrady@enrichla.org]
Sent: Thursday, November 07, 2013 3:18 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: Moreno, Cesar I@DOT; ‘Wenn Chyn’; tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org; allisonferraro@losfelizledger.com
Subject: RE: the bridge proposal

November 7, 2013

Ms. Tami Podesta, Branch Chief
Division of Environmental Planning
California Dept of Transportation District 7
100 S Main St, Los Angeles, CA 90012

Re: Glendale Boulevard-Hyperion Ave Bridges Improvement Project

Dear Ms. Podesta:

I want to begin by saying that the town hall meeting on October 28th for the Hyperion bridge redesign was civil, engaging, well organized, and a remarkable show of a new civic engagement in this city. Thank you. As a result of your hard work to give everyone a seat at the table, we see that you have received a number of very well thought out designs. We ask you and the city family look at all of these designs and consider the best ideas from each. They all have excellent methods of improving this design. As a public service we have created our own proposal.

We believe the “City” design on the table is a freeway over the river. It includes little traffic calming measures and will result in 55MPH traffic feeding into residential Silver Lake and Atwater. We ask that you lower the allowed or designed speed, remove the crash barriers and that you include generous and safe lanes for both pedestrians and cyclists.

We believe that given the renaissance of the LA River and given that the city leadership is asking the federal government to help finance an improved river, this bridge design should encourage lingering at the crossing and certainly should allow easy and safe travel by foot and bike.

Our proposal attached shows bike and pedestrian lanes. Our proposal additionally shows an expanded boardwalk park built on the old piers to actually make the bridge a destination as
opposed to just a crossing. This would be an expansion of your very smart proposal to install a non-car bridge on the old red car piers.

Finally given that your proposal states that the bridge can easily handle rush hour with one lane each way versus two and given that you will be eliminating all 5-North Silver Lake bound traffic (the cars will no longer have to u-turn and ride over the bridge), there seems to be a good argument to go further than our proposal and reduce this to a one car-lane bridge each way thereby giving plenty of room for very comfortable bike and pedestrian lanes.

Very sincerely,

Tomas O’Grady

Executive Director

www.enrichla.org <http://www.enrichla.org/>

323 387 3866

newwebheaderelongatedcr <http://enrichla.org/blog/>

-----
Subject: 131107 1612

From: emiliana dore [mailto:emdore@yahoo.com]
Sent: Thursday, November 07, 2013 3:58 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Subject: BETTER HYPERION BRIDGE DESIGN

Dear Ms. Podesta;

I have been a resident of Atwater Village for the past 15 years. I am writing to urge you to please consider a more bike and pedestrian-friendly bridge design for the Hyperion Bridge. The city has done so much in recent years to enhance and improve the LA River. Additionally, our Atwater community has grown significantly over the past ten years. There are so many wonderful, inviting restaurants and shops along Glendale Boulevard. We have truly become a village.

The updates to the Hyperion Bridge present a great opportunity to make our city even more inviting. Please consider an alternative proposal that embraces all that Los Angeles can be.

Thank you for your time,

Emiliana Dore

-----
Subject: Comments on Glendale Boulevard-Hyperion Avenue Complex of Bridges Improvement Project

Ms. Podesta:

Please make Hyperion safer for people. Please emphasize it's placemaking opportunity by configuring the street to best serve people, rather than automobile traffic only.

I am concerned that the proposed design for the Hyperion Ave viaduct will not be safe and inviting for pedestrians and cyclists.

We suggest improvements to the design to create a bridge that is safe for all users. Los Angeles Walks is a pedestrian advocacy organization dedicated to promoting walking and pedestrian infrastructure in Los Angeles, educating Angelenos and local policymakers concerning the rights and needs of pedestrians of all abilities, and fostering the development of safe and vibrant environments for all pedestrians. We view the viaduct as an important link between two walkable Los Angeles communities – Los Feliz/Silver Lake and Atwater where linkages are very limited due to the Los Angeles River and Interstate 5.

It is therefore extremely problematic that the proposed project is designed to freeway standards at 55 miles per hour, with a crash barrier and wide vehicle lanes that tend to encourage fast driving. These design standards are not appropriate in urban settings and would disadvantage pedestrians and cyclists and be a safety hazard for all users. Fortunately, modifications to the distribution and width of facilities on the right of way can significantly improve the viaduct as a complete street and provide a vital community connection.

very truly yours,

Will Wright, Hon. AIA|LA
Director, Government and Public Affairs
AIA Los Angeles
3780 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 800
Los Angeles, CA 90010
213.639.0764 office
310.309.9580 mobile
213.639.0767 fax
will
@aialosangeles.org <mailto:will@aialosangeles.org>
www.aialosangeles.org <http://www.aialosangeles.org/>

Subscribe to the AIA|LA Newsletter <http://tinyurl.com/dxpcwbu>

-----
Subject: 131108 0846

From: Kryste Kurlander [mailto:k2@ktb.net]
Sent: Thursday, November 07, 2013 4:24 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Subject: HYPERION BRIDGE

We believe the “City” design on the table is a freeway over the river. It includes little traffic calming measures and will result in 55MPH traffic feeding into residential Silver Lake and Atwater Village. We ask that you lower the allowed or designed speed, remove the crash barriers and that you include generous and safe lanes for both pedestrians and cyclists. Thank you for your consideration.
Kryste

-----
Subject: 131108 0847-1 (Referenced as 131106 1545-1 in Letter Comments Database)

From: Karin Flores [mailto:kflores@folar.org]
Sent: Thursday, November 07, 2013 5:07 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: info@la-bike.org; leweye@gmail.com
Subject: COMMENT: Glendale Boulevard-Hyperion Avenue Complex of Bridges Improvement

November 7, 2013

Tami Podesta, Branch Chief
Division of Environmental Planning
California Department of Transportation District 7
100 South Main St, Los Angeles, CA 90012

RE: Glendale Boulevard-Hyperion Avenue Complex of Bridges Improvement

Dear Ms. Podesta,

Friends of the Los Angeles River, a non-profit organization, has advocated on behalf of the river since 1986, and here we offer our comments for the above project.

We have learned that Councilmember O'Farrell would like to create an advisory board for the design of the bridge, and Friends of the Los Angeles River would like to be invited to participate on this board.

We notice that you do not reference under "related projects" the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers document, "Los Angeles River Ecosystem Restoration Integrated Feasibility Study". If Alternative 16 or 20 is chosen, this will reconfigure the west bank of the river north of the bridge, which could potentially impact your detention/infiltration basin in Sunnynook River Park.

FoLAR would like to see pedestrian continuity created on the east bank of the river under the bridge complex. We have been told verbally that it is feasible to cut a horizontal walkway into the
trapezoidal bank, but that funds are not available for this element in the current project budget. We hope to achieve this pedestrian connection in the future.

The community has expressed in both recent meetings the desire to make this bridge a river destination, with much more room for bicyclists and pedestrians, and more safety protection through separation of these pathways from car lanes. The idea of creating lookout stopping places has also been suggested, and it seems very appropriate, considering the current wildlife and the large-scale plans for increased river habitat quality.

Lastly, the current dimensions for the pedestrian facility on the Red Car piers should be widened, so that bicyclists and pedestrians can each have a lane, preventing clashes between the users. An engineer at the community meeting explained that the piers provide enough room to expand this pathway, although it would be a challenge to the project budget. If it cannot be expanded in this phase, perhaps it can be designed to allow for a future expansion.

Sincerely,

Lewis MacAdams
Co-Founder and President
Friends of the Los Angeles River
570 West Avenue 26, Suite 250
Los Angeles, CA 90065
Tel: (323) 223-0585
www.folar.org
Subject: 131108 0847-2

From: Kathryn Savage [mailto:kmsavage@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, November 07, 2013 4:50 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: Keep Sidewalks on Both Sides of Hyperion Bridge

When I walk across Hyperion Bridge to visit friends in Silver Lake, I do not feel that the City of L.A. cares about my safety.

I do not feel safe walking on the north side stairways. They lead to homeless encampments and the stairways are dark and secluded. Even in a group, my friends and I don’t feel safe taking the north side stairways.

To walk across the bridge on the south side, we have to brave a dangerously narrow sidewalk. I choose to walk on the south side because I see it as the lesser of two evils, so to speak. But we need to have sidewalks on both sides of the bridge.

Hyperion currently moves cars at the expense of safe access for pedestrians, making it an undesirable place for those in our community who would make it safer. That is why there is no safe way to walk across Hyperion Bridge, especially to walk across it alone at night.

It is imperative that there be a sidewalk on both the north and south sides. Do not remove the south side sidewalk. Taking away the current south side sidewalk does not make walking across the bridge safer. In order to make walking across the bridge safer, we need wide sidewalks on both sides.

I would also like to voice a concern that many in the community have expressed about emergency vehicles not being able to get through to a car collision if cars are backed up and there is a median crash barrier.

Sincerely,
Kathryn Savage

-----
I've lived in Silverlake for more than 40 years, and would it be wonderful, to walk or bike over the Hyperion bridge to Atwater village SAFELY! I attempted a walk two weeks ago over this lovely bridge to the post office in Atwater and managed to arrive, but it was difficult and dangerous. There are portions a pedestrian must walk on sidewalk that is only 18” wide, next to speeding traffic. Riding a bicycle would be phenomenal! PLEASE, PLEASE, PLEASE make the bridge safe for pedestrians, bicyclists, and automobiles, so we may COEXIST with Love, slower speeds, and Happiness!

Thank you, Robert del Campo. 213-880-2612

Sent from my iPhone

-----
Subject: 131108 0847-4 (Referenced as 131017 1134-2 in the E-mail Database)

From: Kimberly Greenhut [mailto:kimproduces@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, November 07, 2013 4:38 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Subject: Hyperion Bridge Design

Please consider an Hyperion Bridge design that gives cyclists and pedestrians safe and direct passage (without stairs) over the freeway. It would be great if it also included access to the LA River.

This is an opportunity to improve quality of life in Silver Lake and Atwater. Let’s build the city we want to live in. One with infrastructure that supports healthy choices for individuals and the environment and that encourages people to come out and be a part of their community.

Thanks you for you consideration.

Sincerely,

Kimberly Greenhut

--
_____________________________
Kimberly Greenhut
kimproduces@gmail.com<mailto:kimproduces@gmail.com>
415-260-6879

-----
Subject: 131108 0847-5

From: Nina Grossman Warner [mailto:ninagrossman@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Thursday, November 07, 2013 4:26 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Subject: Hyperion Bridge

Dear Ms. Podesta:

We believe the “City” design on the table is a freeway over the river. It includes little traffic calming measures and will result in 55MPH traffic feeding into residential Silver Lake and Atwater. We ask that you lower the allowed or designed speed, remove the crash barriers and that you include generous and safe lanes for both pedestrians and cyclists.

Thank you
Nina Warner
Atwater Resident

-----
Subject: 131108 0849-1

From: Ross Tierney [mailto:rftierney@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, November 07, 2013 10:22 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT; tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All

Dear Ms. Podesta, Councilmember LaBonge, Councilmember O’Farrell, and Mayor Garcetti,

As someone who bikes or walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:
* Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
* Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
* Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
* No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
* A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,

Ross Tierney

4525 Franklin Ave, LA CA 90027

-----
Subject:  131108 0849-2

From: Kay Camphuis [mailto:kaycamphuis@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, November 07, 2013 6:03 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Subject: Hyperion Bridge Design

Dear Ms. Podesta,

Please please help those of us who like to walk to nearby businesses for our needs. We live in Silverlake/Los Feliz and often walk to Atwater Village across the Hyperion Bridge. It is now noisy, and dangerous. We think consideration for pedestrians and bicyclists in the new design will encourage less traffic, less pollution, and more exercise for the many Angelenos who are trying to make our beautiful city more walkable. By the way, I am 66 and my husband is 70. One of the reasons we live in a walkable neighborhood is that soon enough we may not be driving at all. This is about making LA a livable city for all ages. There is so much beauty here, let’s grab the brass ring and make it even more special.

Kay Camphuis
3776 Tracy St
Los Angeles, CA 90027

-----
Subject: 131108 0849-3 (Referenced as 131017 1134-2 in Letter Comments Database)

From: Karin Flores [mailto:kflores@folar.org]
Sent: Thursday, November 07, 2013 5:07 PM
To: Podesta, Tami @DOT
Cc: info@la-bike.org; leweye@gmail.com
Subject: COMMENT: Glendale Boulevard-Hyperion Avenue Complex of Bridges Improvement

November 7, 2013

Tami Podesta, Branch Chief
Division of Environmental Planning
California Department of Transportation District 7
100 South Main St, Los Angeles, CA 90012

RE: Glendale Boulevard-Hyperion Avenue Complex of Bridges Improvement

Dear Ms. Podesta,

Friends of the Los Angeles River, a non-profit organization, has advocated on behalf of the river since 1986, and here we offer our comments for the above project.

We have learned that Councilmember O’Farrell would like to create an advisory board for the design of the bridge, and Friends of the Los Angeles River would like to be invited to participate on this board.

We notice that you do not reference under "related projects" the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers document, "Los Angeles River Ecosystem Restoration Integrated Feasibility Study". If Alternative 16 or 20 is chosen, this will reconfigure the west bank of the river north of the bridge, which could potentially impact your detention/infiltration basin in Sunnynook River Park.

FoLAR would like to see pedestrian continuity created on the east bank of the river under the bridge complex. We have been told verbally that it is feasible to cut a horizontal walkway into the trapezoidal bank, but that funds are not available for this element in the current project budget. We hope to achieve this pedestrian connection in the future.

The community has expressed in both recent meetings the desire to make this bridge a river destination, with much more room for bicyclists and pedestrians, and more safety protection through separation of these pathways from car lanes. The idea of creating lookout stopping places has also been suggested, and it seems very appropriate, considering the current wildlife and the large-scale plans for increased river habitat quality.

Lastly, the current dimensions for the pedestrian facility on the Red Car piers should be widened, so that bicyclists and pedestrians can each have a lane, preventing clashes between the users. An engineer at the community meeting explained that the piers provide enough room to expand this pathway, although it would be a challenge to the project budget. If it cannot be expanded in this phase, perhaps it can be designed to allow for a future expansion.

Sincerely,
Lewis MacAdams

Co-Founder and President

Friends of the Los Angeles River

570 West Avenue 26, Suite 250

Los Angeles, CA 90065

Tel: (323) 223-0585

Subject:  131108 0849-4

From: D Thom Bissett [mailto:dthomb@mac.com]
Sent: Thursday, November 07, 2013 6:03 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT; tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: From a Silver Lake Resident: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All

Dear Ms. Podesta, Councilmember LaBonge, Councilmember O'Farrell, and Mayor Garcetti

As along time Silver Lake Resident and avid cyclist, just the idea that there are plans to make the Hyperion Viaduct even more Bike and Human unfriendly amazes me in the worst of ways.

Currently there are no safe routes for anyone cycling to get to my neighborhood or even Los Feliz from the LA Bike Bike Path or any other Bike Friendly streets in Glendale or beyond. Fletcher Avenue, Glendale Blvd and Los Feliz are extremely unsafe options for cyclists. And with the horrendous street conditions and endless DWP construction, why would you contemplate making the streets even more unsafe?

I need to use the Hyperion Viaduct several time a week to get to Atwater Village, and even if I didn’t cycle, I don’t feel safe in a car with the speeds the other drivers barrel down into Atwater Village.

Thank you and now to the "Form Letter" sent to me about this matter:

As someone who bikes or walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:

- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
- A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,

D Thom Bissett
3220 Drury Lane
Los Angeles, CA 90039

PS! Pave our streets up to non-3rd World standards!

-----
Subject: 131108 0849-5

From: Jonathan Berman [mailto:jb@carpestella.com]
Sent: Thursday, November 07, 2013 5:23 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Subject: bridge

I bike and or walk over the bridge.
I avoid using cars and often commute to work.
Please make the bridge priority cyclists and walkers,
let the polluting cars wait.

Please let me know. My zip is 90026, I am in the area.

-------------
Jonathan Berman, Associate Professor
Visual and Performing Arts Department

-----
Subject: 131108 0849-6 (Referenced as 130930 0841-5 in the E-mail Database)

From: Vyki Englert [mailto:vyki.englert@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, November 07, 2013 5:44 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT; tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All

Dear Ms. Podesta, Councilmember LaBonge, Councilmember O'Farrell, and Mayor Garcetti,
As someone who bikes or walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical
that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone's needs can be met if the project is
designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the
project to include:
* Bike lanes or cycle tracks on Hyperion Ave.
* 4 foot or greater sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks
* Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage
  speeding
* No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
* A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk
  from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge.

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete
streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5
Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.
Sincerely,
Vyki Englert
120 S Vignes Street Apt 403 Los Angeles, CA 90012

-----
Subject: HYPERION BRIDGE

From: Barbara Thomas [mailto:barbarathomasm@icloud.com]
Sent: Thursday, November 07, 2013 10:58 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Subject: HYPERION BRIDGE

I believe the "City" design on the table is a freeway over the river. It includes little traffic-calming measures and will result in 55MPH traffic feeding into residential Silver Lake and Atwater. We ask that you lower the allowed or designed speed, remove the crash barriers and that you include generous and safe lanes for both pedestrians and cyclists.

Thank you

Barbara Thomas

-----
Subject: 131108 0850-2

From: Barbara Thomas [mailto:barbarathomasm@icloud.com]
Sent: Thursday, November 07, 2013 10:58 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Subject: HYPERION BRIDGE

I believe the "City" design on the table is a freeway over the river. It includes little traffic-calming measures and will result in 55MPH traffic feeding into residential Silver Lake and Atwater. We ask that you lower the allowed or designed speed, remove the crash barriers and that you include generous and safe lanes for both pedestrians and cyclists.

Thank you

Barbara Thomas

-----
Subject: 131108 0850-3

From: Richard Corsini [mailto:rick@corsinstark.com]
Sent: Thursday, November 07, 2013 11:33 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: Melissa Casey
Subject: Hyperion Bridge renovation

This project presents an important opportunity for the city to respond to the paradigm shift now occurring here, away from an auto culture and towards the emerging urban culture in Los Angeles, with a repeatable prototype that reconceives our urban bridges to better serve our needs.

The Hyperion Bridge sits at the nexus of Silver Lake, Atwater Village and the LA River. Each has been developing its own identity and cultural significance independently, especially over the last 10 years. If linked urbanistically, the synergy of two neighborhoods and a park can form a significant piece of LA's emerging, vibrant urban mosaic.

Conceived complexly, i.e. with multiple overlapping performance criteria, not a singular criteria of automobile speed and safety, the Hyperion Bridge can respond to its community's multiple needs functionally and beautifully, without compromise.

The vehicular lanes should be reduced to one in each direction, plus a third emergency lane. The design speed should be reduce from 55 to 35 mph. A protected bicycle lane and widened sidewalk should be installed on both sides, with new seating, possibly following the historic seating on the bridge), and low level lighting. The extra 30 to 40 seconds it might take to cross the bridge as a motorist will be offset by the new experience of the bridge as a destination and a promontory, not merely a utilitarian vehicular link. With slower traffic from the bridge, feeding the intersection, accidents at Rowena and Hyperion Avenues will likely be reduced. Linkage from the bridge to the new park and LA River bike path below with new bike and pedestrian ramps is also very important. There should be no unsightly Jersey barriers, medians, etc. on the bridge. Separation of the bike lane from vehicular lanes is also necessary, possibly with well-designed bollards, planter boxes, curbs, etc.

I believe the biggest design challenge will be a signalized crosswalk at the north (Atwater) end of the bridge and safe merging of pedestrian and bike traffic there. It is very crucial for the neighborhood to have a safe crossing at this point, and challenging because of the multiple grade separations.

This design cannot be solved satisfactorily by traffic engineers alone. You need talented design professionals, architects and landscape architects, on this design team!

Sent from Rick's iPad

-----
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All

Importance: High

Dear Ms. Podesta, Councilmember LaBonge, Councilmember O’Farrell, and Mayor Garcetti:

As someone who bikes or walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:

* Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
* Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
* Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
* No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
* A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,
Kara Sergile
1115 Moncado Drive
Glendale, CA 91207

[Image removed by sender.]

This email is free from viruses and malware because avast! Antivirus protection is active.

-----
Subject: 131108 0852

From: Sam Hobbs [mailto:Sam@SamHobbs.org]
Sent: Thursday, November 07, 2013 7:46 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT; om.labonge@lacity.org; ouncilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway; Build a Safe Viaduct for All

I have previously lived on Hyperion Boulevard (near Baller Hardware) and when I did it was for more than a decade. I developed a serious case of asthma residing there. I believe that the abundance of vehicle emissions contributed to my health problems. My porch constantly had black dust on it.

I am concerned about the health of current residents of Hyperion Boulevard and the nearby area. I believe that Hyperion Boulevard gets too much vehicle traffic. It is unhealthy for our residents to attempt to support more traffic along Hyperion Boulevard. I believe it is a huge mistake to not support pedestrian and bicycle traffic along Hyperion Boulevard. We do not need more vehicles there.

I have been a resident of The City of Los Angeles for most of my 59 years.

As many others have said, the following are very practical and desirable:

* Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
* Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
* Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
* No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
* A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

--

Sam Hobbs

15912 Rnaldi Street

Granada Hills, CA

-----
Subject: 131108 0855 (Referenced as 131017 1106-4 in the Letter Comments Database)

Attachments: HYPERION_BRIDGE_ALTERNATIVE_Page_2.jpg; HYPERION_BRIDGE_ALTERNATIVE_Page_1.jpg; HYPERION_BRIDGE_ALTERNATIVE.pdf; 20131014Hyperion.jpg; _Certification_.htm

From: Daveed Kapoor [mailto:daveed@racdb.com]
Sent: Thursday, November 07, 2013 11:57 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Subject: Hyperion Bridge

Hi Tami -

I am writing with urgency to express my concern regarding the city of los angeles’s proposed retrofit of the glendale hyperion complex of bridges. There are serious negative environmental impacts with this proposal.

We need sidewalks on both sides of the main Glendale Hyperion blvd connector between Atwater Village and Silverlak; no median & sidewalk crash barriers; and no banked roadbeds.

At RAC Design Build we prepared (2) 24x36” boards (attached as jgps & pdf, also available online here: http://racdb.com/HYPERION_BRIDGE_ALTERNATIVE.pdf <http://racdb.com/HYPERION_BRIDGE_ALTERNATIVE.pdf> ) of an alternate design that we feel is ideal for our communities: one 25mph lane for cars in either direction, sidewalks on both sides and a 12’ wide landscape buffered cyclorack that can accommodate emergency vehicles.

Per the Environmental document: two lanes is acceptable solution based on current peak hour traffic volume. They found current peak volume to be 1,325 vehicles/hr & that during construction two lanes @ 25mph could accommodate as many as 1,500 vehicles/hr, screencapture attached.

The crash barriers are not consistent with the historic landmark status of the bridge. Rebuild the balustrades and make them strong enough to withstand impacts, no concrete k rails should be permitted as they comprimise the original design.

Thank you for your attention. Please contact me with any questions.

Daveed Kapoor AIA

RAC DESIGN BUILD

3048 North Coolidge Avenue

Los Angeles, CA 90039
c | 323.252.8510
f | 888.808.3711
www.racdb.com
www.studiocortez.com
www.vimeo.com/racdb
Subject: 131108 1247

From: Doug Blush [mailto:madpix@me.com]
Sent: Friday, November 08, 2013 10:25 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT; tom.labonge@lacity.org; Mitch.Ofarrell@lacity.org;
john.brady@lacity.org; eric.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: Hyperion Bridge project comments

Hello Ms. Podesta, Mr. Brady, Coucilmembers LaBonge and O'Farrell, Mayor Garcetti and all at LA City Hall,

I'm a Silverlake local of over 22 years, an avid biking and hiking enthusiast and a great fan of the many new measures going into effect to expand access and auto-alternative pathways in the LA River/Griffith area. I'm also a documentary filmmaker and often look for subjects of interest in our community.

I apologize for these comments coming a day late (I was just informed of the deadline today), but I wanted to express my deep desire to see the impending Hyperion Bridge project take great account of the needs of bikes, pedestrians and non motor vehicle access. I believe the current Bureau of Engineering plans do not go nearly far enough to assist these needs, and should be re-examined before this very impactful and long-range project goes into effect. I know MANY of my neighbors and friends feel the same way, and we see this new project as a huge opportunity to enhance our unique area. The ideas forwarded by members of LA Walks and others are great suggestions of how this project can benefit everyone, no matter the transportation choice.

I hope that there's continued movement to study the accessibility issues of sidewalks, crossings and traffic control that will soon literally be set in stone for years to come.

Thanks for your attention,

Doug Blush
2500 Silver Lake Terrace
Los Angeles, CA

-----
Subject: 131113 1011

From: Aguiluz, Hyginus [mailto:hyginus.aguiluz@lausd.net]
Sent: Wednesday, October 09, 2013 12:40 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All

As someone who bikes or walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:

* Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
* Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
* Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
* No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
* A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,

Hyginus Quintos Aguiluz
4420 La Clede Avenue
Los Angeles, CA 90039

Helen Bernstein High School - Home of the Fiery Dragons!
1309 North Wilton Place
Hollywood, CA 90028
Phone: (323) 817-6437
Fax: (323) 860-9711
AME/APEX/BTLR/STEM - We’re all BERNSTEIN DRAGONS!
Please consider the environment before printing this e-mail It’s a matter of priorities. If you can afford a high tech phone, you should be able to buy school supplies.

-----
Subject:  131113 1017

From: Ronna [mailto:kingsizesoundlabsla@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, November 07, 2013 1:21 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Subject: Hyperion beige proposal

Ms. Pedesta,

Los Angeles Walks is concerned that the proposed design for Hyperion Ave. bridge will not be safe for walkers and cyclist.

Please if you can do a alternative plan safe for all!

As as a business owner at 2959 Glendale blvd, right at the beginning of the bridge entering Silver Lake, cars flyby and a very fast speed and its very dangerous for pedestrians and drivers.

Please for the safety of others please modify the proposed plan!

Ronna-

Ronna Bronstein-Trumfio
Studio Manager
Kingsizesoundlabs.com
323-533-0022 cell

Sent from my iPad

-----
Subject: 130930 0821

From: Dave Duce [mailto:dave_duce@hotmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, September 25, 2013 10:34 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org
Subject: Glendale/Hyperion Bridge Bike Lane

Hello Tami,

Recently I attended the community workshop for the Glendale Hyperion Bridge Project.

I understand there is a need to retrofit the Glendale/Hyperion Bridge for seismic code, and appreciate the effort to preserve the historic fabric and nature of the bridge, this is great news. Thank you Caltrans staff and City of LA staff for pushing this bridge rebuild project forward.

I am a resident/property owner in Atwater Village and Franklin Hills. I use the Glendale Hyperion Bridge at least four times a day, many days more than that. I am a pedestrian, cyclist, driver and fan of the bridge.

Cars and bikes sharing lanes when their speeds are so different is a recipe for a fatality. We need at least an up-hill/SB bike lane or someone will die on the semi-blind corner. Speeds on that stretch are already around 50+mph, with the addition of planned K-rails, driver perceived safety levels will increase and speeds will also increase, yet cyclist are expected to share the same lane. Many students commute to Marshall High on that road. It's a numbers game, someone will get run over if we do not separate bikes and cars. I urge you to drive and observe the speeds as they are currently on the Glendale/Hyperion Bridge, or better yet ride or walk over the bridge and judge the safety levels yourself for families with kids.

Why are the LA Master Bike Plan and Complete Streets not being implemented on this perfect occasion to do so?

Please don't deprive the residents of Silver Lake, Franklin Hills access to the Bike Trails of the LA River Plan, this will be viewed as a mistake as future generations who look back at the choices we make today.

We love our bridge, it's an iconic neighborhood symbol and an homage to our veterans. Let's keep it as a neighborhood bridge and increase its functionality by allowing all people to use it safely.

Dave Duce
Pedestrian, Cyclist, Driver, Admirer of LA

-----
Subject: 130930 0822
From: Bryan J. Blumberg [mailto:bjtwuk@yahoo.com]
Sent: Thursday, September 26, 2013 8:24 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Subject: Glendale-Hyperion Complex of Bridges Improvement Project COMMENT CARD

Date: Thursday, September 26, 2013

Please submit any comments on the proposed project tonight by placing this card in the comment box or send it by October 11, 2013 via email to Tami.Pdesta@dot.ca.gov, or by mail to:

Tami Podesta, Branch Chief
Division of Environmental Planning
California Department of Transportation District 7
100 South Main St, Los Angeles CA   90012

Name: BRYAN J BLUMBERG
Address: 4246 Holly Knoll Drive, Los Angeles, CA 90027-3243
Email: bjtwuk@yahoo.com

Organization represented, if any: Citizen of the City of Los Angeles

Comment:

There were 23 bicyclists who lost their lives in Los Angeles County in 2012. So far, before the end of the 9th month of 2013, there have already been 28 deaths of bicyclists in Los Angeles County. As the death toll of bicyclists rises, it is irresponsible to spend $50,000,000 remodeling the Hyperion Viaduct without providing for the safety of all who cross it.

I live in the Franklin Hills and travel by bicycle for most of my daily errands. Whether I go to Downtown Los Angeles, Glendale, Burbank, North Hollywood or Sherman Oaks, I either use the LA River bikeway or cross it. The only streets in the entire area which can be used are Los Feliz Blvd, Hyperion Avenue or Glendale Blvd. None of them are safe for bicyclists.

In Atwater, Glendale Blvd. has a bike lane which leads to the Hyperion Viaduct, but crossing Hyperion by bicycle is very risky today. In Los Feliz, Griffith Park Blvd. has a bike lane leading to Los Feliz Blvd, but Los Feliz Blvd is dangerous for bicyclists particularly where it crosses the Golden State Freeway. Recently Rowena Avenue was put on a road diet and given bicycle lanes, but Glendale Blvd from the LA River Bike Path to Rowena has substandard lanes and metal grates.

By widening traffic lanes on Hyperion and installing a center median wall, I fear that motor vehicles will travel at higher than posted speed limits, which will make it even more dangerous for bicyclists than it
already is.

In order to protect the lives of all of the citizens of Los Angeles, including bicyclists, please reconsider your plan. Please include a bike lane on Hyperion Avenue.

==================================
BRYAN J. BLUMBERG
4246 Holly Knoll Drive
Los Angeles, CA 90027-3243 USA
phone: 323-660-1888
email: bjtwuk@yahoo.com <bjtwuk@sbcglobal.net>

-----
Subject: 130930 0823-1
From: Marc Caswell [marcacaswell@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, September 26, 2013 9:26 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: Hyperion/Glendale Bridge Proposal is in Violation of Caltrans DDR61-R1
Ms. Podesta & Honorable LA City Representatives:
As someone who lives just a few miles from Hyperion/Glendale Bridge I am astonished and outraged by this new proposal -- which fails to include basic amenities for people who bicycle and walk.
The failure to recognize the LA Bicycle Plan's proposal for a bike lane is in direct violation of Caltrans Deputy Directive 61-R1 <http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/tpp/offices/ocp/complete_streets_files/dd_64_r1_signed.pdf> which calls on staff to "Ensure incorporation of bicycle, pedestrian, and transit travel elements in all Department transportation plans and studies."
Failure to include even a basic bicycle lane -- let alone a sidewalk on only one side of the road; and to design it freeway-level speeds so close to Ivanhoe Elementary School, Griffith Park and Red Car River Park is reckless and callous to the nearby residents.
To design a street for such high speeds without the basic infrastructure for safe bicycling, in direct violation of Caltrans DDR61-R1, places Caltrans and the City/County of Los Angeles in various states of legal liability should someone be injured while bicycling on this street.
I urge you to reconsider the proposal and include, at a minimum, a standard 5-foot bicycle lane in each direction.
Sincerely,
Marc Caswell
Silverlake Resident
415-418-0657<tel:415-418-0657>

-----
Subject: 130930 0823-2
From: Marino Pascal [pascal@locationscout.com]
Sent: Thursday, September 26, 2013 11:27 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org; councilmember.cedillo@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Safe bridge for bicycles and pedestrians
This issue is close to me because my daughter was hit by a car while biking
on Hyperion Ave bridge.
As someone who bikes and walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it
is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people
like me. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for
appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like
the project to include:
Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians
and discourage speeding
No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access
the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists
an alternative through the dangerous merge
There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan
and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the
greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA
River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.
Sincerely,
Marino Pascal
2525 Crestmoore Pl
Los Angeles, CA 90065
--
Marino Pascal
323-963-FILM (3456)
http://locationscout.com
-----
Subject: 130930 0824-1
From: Matt Ruscigno [mailto:mattruscigno@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, September 26, 2013 12:04 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: mayor.garcetti@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org
Subject: Please, No Hyperion/Glendale Freeway

Tami,
Hello. As a public health professional, I’d like to express my concern about ‘improving’ the Hyperion /Glendale bridge by increasing traffic speeds to 55 MPH. This bridge is a connector between two dense neighborhoods that are very walkable and bikeable. The bridge currently is dangerous enough for anyone willing to brave it without being enclosed in a personal automobile- something I have to do often. Why make it less friendly to everyone else when Los Angeles, the country and even the world is working to expand travel options to include everyone- not just those in a car, in a rush.
This bridge is very important for all types of people with varying transportation choices. It’s 2013, automobile-centric design is on the way out. Let’s keep Los Angeles moving forward in a progressive, safe way. And doesn’t the 2010 Bike Plan call for bike lanes anyway? This seems like a no-brainer.
Thank you for considering this,
Matt Ruscigno, MPH, RD
ps. If you need more info on how gas taxes don't cover road costs: http://shar.es/Kcawq

www.truelovehealth.com
www.twitter.com/mattruscigno <http://www.twitter.com/truelovehealth>
-----
Subject: 130930 0824-2
From: sheigh [sheigh@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, September 26, 2013 9:57 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: Hyperion Ave. - Safety First, Community Second, Freeway Speeds Last
I live in Silver Lake and support the businesses in Atwater Village. I
cross Hyperion Ave. on my bicycle, or on foot, with my dog to travel to and
from both Silver Lake and Atwater. I travel to support the small businesses
blossoming in Atwater. The farmers markets, the outdoor cafes and bistros,
the juice shops, the yoga and dance studios, the pet shops, the Atwater
library.
As you consider plans to revamp the Hyperion-Glendale complex of bridges
you must prioritize the safety of our local residents and the visitors to
our neighborhoods.
Another key consideration for future growth is the emergent LA River
business district, ideal for cyclists, runners, skaters and even kayakers
and bird watchers.
As an active resident of the area, making Los Angeles more livable, to me,
means making our roadways more safe. This includes providing safe passage
for the walkers and cyclists who tragically and unnecessarily make up 39%
of the road fatalities in Los Angeles each year.
The reckless pursuit of vehicular speed on our neighborhood roadways will
only worsen if our footbridge is built to freeway standards at 55 MPH with
no bike lanes and no safe areas for pedestrians.
As someone who bikes or walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it
is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me.
Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate
speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project
to include:
  Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
  Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
  Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and
  pedestrians and discourage speeding
  No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even
  faster
  A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people
  access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists
  an alternative through the dangerous merge
There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan
and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest
barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This
project can change that and make all travelers benefit.
Sincerely,
Sheigh Crabtree
Teviot Street, Silver Lake, 90039
-----
Subject: 130930 0825-1
From: Katie Bennett [katie.bennett@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, September 26, 2013 11:31 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
    mayor.garcetti@lacity.org

Subject: Concern for Hyperion Bridge Design - use NACTO Design Standards

As a native Angeleno, who just moved from Mid-City to Silverlake, a move
motivated by better bike amenities and proximity to my friends and
community, I am am saddened to learn that cyclist have to fight for their
safety; again. I frequently travel between Silver Lake and Atwater Village
via Hyperion Ave and it is already terrifying when I am on my bike, and
sometimes even in my vehicle. It is essential that Hyperion Ave. be made
safe for people like me. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is
designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I
would like the project to include:

- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians
  and
- Traffic lane design to discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
- A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access
  the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an
  alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan
and Caltrans complete streets policy and NACTO's design principles (of
which LA is an active member). The viaduct is currently the greatest
barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This
project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,
Katie Bennett
3255 Descanso Drive

-----
Subject: 130930 0825-2
From: Mark Vallianatos [mvalli@oxy.edu]
Sent: Thursday, September 26, 2013 11:37 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: Safe, complete street on hyperion viaduct
I'm a professor at Occidental College who teaches the College's course on transportation policy and streets. I also walk, bike, ride transit and drive between Silver Lake and Atwater Village.
The semester is barely a month old and my students have already heard me explain how, in the 'bad old days,' road engineers designed streets with wide lanes and 'forgiving' design features supposedly to protect speeding drivers. You don't have to be a transportation researcher to understand that incorporating these rural highway features in urban settings end up encouraging dangerous speeds. Roads designed with wide lanes and crash barriers kill pedestrians, cyclists and drivers directly by encouraging fast driving, and indirectly by discouraging healthy, active transportation because residents are scared to use streets designed like speedways.
When I described these past mistakes in road design to my class and explained how streets are currently being changed to protect all users -- and designed to discourage speeding - little did I know that the City and Caltrans were working on a project straight out of the discredited speedway playbook. I'm very disappointed to see that the design of the Hyperion viaduct includes wide lanes, banked turns and crash barriers that psychologically encourage drivers to speed. I'm also dismayed that there is no bike lane on Hyperion.
Please redesign this important linkage with narrower travel lanes (the newly released NACTO Urban Street Design Guide http://nacto.org/usdg/typically recommends 10 and 11 feet lanes on most city streets), without crash barriers or banked turns, bike lanes, with wider sidewalks, and with a complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct.
Sincerely,
mark vallianatos
3591 canada st, LA, 90065
--
mark vallianatos
policy director, urban & environmental policy institute
adjunct professor, urban & environmental policy
occidental college
mvalli@oxy.edu<mailto:mvalli@oxy.edu>
323 259 1458
-----
Subject: 130930 0825-3
From: Camille Dieterle [camilledieterle@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, September 27, 2013 12:56 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: Bicycle lanes critical on Hyperion roadway development!
Dear Leaders,
As someone who bikes or walks frequently between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:
   - Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
   - Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
   - Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
   - No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge
There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.
Sincerely,
Camille Dieterle
3220 Descanso Drive.
LA< CA 90026
-----
Subject: 130930 0825-4
From: Roadblock [roadblock@midnightridazz.com]
Sent: Thursday, September 26, 2013 11:23 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: mayor.garcetti@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
tom.labonge@lacity.org
Subject: Hyperion Bridge Public Hearing Request
Hi Tami
I would like to make a request for a public hearing for the Hyperion / Glendale Aqueduct project. Please inform me of the procedure to do so. I was told last night at the meeting that I need to follow a certain procedure to make this happen and I absolutely want this. There is NO WAY I will let our only route to Glendale be re-designed into a freeway like corridor. Too many of my friends have been maimed / killed on that road as it is. Thank you.
-Don Ward
silverlake / los feliz / atwater stake holder.
-----
Subject: 130930 0827-1
From: George Pillage [crappola@hotmail.com]
Sent: Friday, September 27, 2013 1:57 AM
To: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org; Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Subject: HYPERION / GLENDALE VIADUCT.
Dear Dinosaurs.
The dream of a city based on oil powered / manufactured transit machines is
OVER.
These days people ride bikes - though neither cal trans OR LADOT would know
because neither of you actually count bicycles in your traffic counts - and
people walk, and people take transit. Some people will always drive, but
it’s time to stop catering to them exclusively as you dinosaurs have been
doing now for decades.
That being said...
STOP TRYING TO CREEP IN A FREEWAY into my neighborhood please. THANK YOU.
As someone who bikes or walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it
is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me.
Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate
speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project
to include:
Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians
and discourage speeding
No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access
the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an
alternative through the dangerous merge
There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan
and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest
barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This
project can change that and make all travelers benefit.
Sincerely,
George
-----
Subject: 130930 0827-2
From: Noah Mercer [noah_ten@yahoo.com]
Sent: Friday, September 27, 2013 2:24 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: Hyperion bridge changes
I routinely bike over the Hyperion bridge into Atwater (and back) and it’s a
terrible experience: I need to crank out as much speed as possible to
minimize the difference between me and the fast-moving traffic while
simultaneously avoiding potholes and debris and trying to stay out of the
way of said traffic. At the end of the bridge it gets worse: Suddenly I
have more fast-moving traffic coming up on me from my right rear, wanting
to cross my lane and two others to get to the first u-turn light, and they
can’t see me in advance because I’m descending from above them. And of
course there’s still the speeding traffic to my left, leaving me sandwiched
like a smear of mustard between pieces of steel.
Coming back home is even worse: I have to cross two lanes of fast-moving
traffic to enter the bridge, but this time I’m moving uphill, making me a
slow-moving obstacle for drivers in a hurry.
But even while juggling all of this I still find time to wonder at the kids
I see walking over the bridge on their way to and from Marshall High: How
do they possibly enter and exit the bridge alive each morning and afternoon
when they have to walk across those same lanes of fast-moving traffic?
There’s a lot that could be done to improve this situation for cyclists,
pedestrians and schoolchildren:
Add bike lanes
Add traffic-slowing measures such as narrower lanes
Add a crosswalk with a signal at each end of the bridge
These sorts of changes would help make this important thoroughfare linking
Silver Lake and Atwater consistent with the bike plan and the Caltrans
complete street plan and should be included in the redesign.
Sincerely,
Noah Mercer
Los Feliz
-----
Subject: 130930 0827-3
From: Will Bassett [bookbike13@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, September 27, 2013 2:39 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT

Subject: Hyperion Avenue is a street. It needs to carry some of the ever growing bike traffic in this area. Move forward and accept the bike as a real alternative form of transportation, Plan for it now and in the future. More bikes lead to few autos on the roa...

-----
Subject: 130930 0828-1
From: Jayme Filippini [jaymefilippini@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Friday, September 27, 2013 3:21 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: councilmember.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: Fix Hyperion bridge - Bike lanes and safe cross walks and sidewalks

I have often run from Atwater to Silverlake reservoir to exercise and have experienced firsthand how fast cars travel on the Hyperion bridge that connects these two communities. It is truly terrifying - this has to be 100x worse on a bike!

I've heard the plans to improve this thoroughfare do NOT include safe paths for bikes and adequate crosswalks for cyclists and pedestrians crossing the bridge and accessing the river...Given the new law that requires cars give 3ft space for cyclists - how can this be done if you include a new median and no bike lanes? Not only that, bike lanes seem so important now that so many people are taking alternate (non-automotive) transportation to get around LA. I've tried to take my kids on bike rides and the travel on major streets without bike lanes is harrowing! I'll have to wait til they get older, which is unfortunate as I need the exercise now!!!

Please consider all the public comment supporting a revised plan to include bike paths and adequate cross walks on the Atwater side to access the river bike path - it can only help to alleviate car traffic in the area and keep people safe and healthy.

Thank you,
Jayme Filippini
460 Mt Washington Drive
Los Angeles, CA 90065
323-276-9480

-----
Subject: 130930 0828-2
From: John Kayon [johnkayon@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, September 27, 2013 3:36 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT; tom.labonge@lacity.org; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org; info@la-bike.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All
I ride and vision LA as taking the lead on Carbon free transport.
Also as someone who bikes or walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone's needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:
Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge
There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.
Sincerely,
John L Kayon
Los Angeles CA.
Concerned Cyclist
-----
Subject: 130930 0828-3
From: Richard Risemberg [rickrise@earthlink.net]
Sent: Friday, September 27, 2013 1:13 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: Glendale/Hyperion Bridge
To Ms. Podesta of the DOT, Mayor Garcetti, and Council Members LaBonge and O'Farrell:
The plans for the Glendale/Hyperion bridge revealed at the recent community meeting represent nothing less than a clumsy tumble back into the past of endless reflexive pandering to the car.
For decades we have built wider and faster roads, only to discover that they induce more traffic and congestion, degrade public health, and crush healthy commercial activity along their corridors.
While city after city in the US, following the lead of healthy and prosperous Northern European communities, has been emphasizing walkability and bicycling, with brilliant results, we in Los Angeles are repeatedly subjected to constant retrograde efforts to boost car speeds through our neighborhoods, replacing a salubrious street life with speed, noise, fumes, crashes, and empty sidewalks.
Silver Lake and Atwater are little success stories in the drab landscape that old-school traffic engineering has made of Los Angeles. Now, plans to rebuild the Glendale/Hyperion bridge--a bridge I traverse frequently by bicycle, and whose form and setting I know well--seem intended to result in a chopped-off snippet of superhighway, with wide lanes and banked turns that are guaranteed to induce dangerous and aggressive speeding. The drivers swooping over the bridge will not be willing to slow down when they approach Rowena or Glenhurst, nor will they have much regard for cyclists or walkers trying to make their way to neighborhood shops--let alone cyclists on the bridge itself.
Everywhere else in the civilized world--from other West Coast cities such as Seattle and San Francisco, to the powerhouse towns of Chicago and New York, to planetary capitals including Washington DC, Paris, and London, forward-thinking engineers have chosen to slow down and de-emphasize the car, and to support walking, cycling, and transit, which cannot co-exist with shrieking motor traffic.
It is well-known and thoroughly proven now that nurturing the cyclist and the walker results in more cohesive communities, less crime, healthier populations, and increasingly profitable businesses.
Messieurs Labonge and O'Farrell, ladies and gentlemen of CalTrans and the DOT, if you let this unconsidered project move forward as presented, you will be remembered as the last, lost befuddled champions of an obsolete obsession with speed over people, with chrome-plated arrogance over prosperous communities, with the ignorant and presumptive past over the prosperous future the rest of the world is bounding into without us.
Richard Risemberg
648 1/2 S. Burnside Ave. (CD4)
Los Angeles, CA 90036
323-428-4669
Subject: 130930 0828-4
Attachments: pastedGraphic.tiff; _Certification_.htm
From: Byron Head [byronhead@airmail.net]
Sent: Friday, September 27, 2013 4:12 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All

...............You Cheap Lying Bastards - Again
As someone who bikes between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is
absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me.
Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate
speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project
to include:
  Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
  Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
  Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and
  pedestrians and discourage speeding
  No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even
  faster
  A complete crosswalk or bike friendly flyover on the Atwater end of
  the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale
  Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge.
There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan
and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest
barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This
project can change that and make all travelers benefit.
I’m 63 and own 4 different bikes any one of which I ride daily. And I
bought an electric assist bike at the Alt Car Expo in Santa Monica last
weekend where they tend to give a crap about bike riders.
Most Sincerely,
Byron Head
4804 Laurel Canyon
Los Angeles
-----
Subject: 130930 0829-1 (Referenced as 131107 1307-1 in the Letter Comments Database)

From: james bledsoe [jamesbleds0e@yahoo.com]
Sent: Thursday, September 26, 2013 11:43 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT

Subject: Glendale Boulevard-Hyperion Avenue Complex of Bridges Improvement

Why widen the bridge at all. The primary reason i hear while volunteering at the Bicycle Kitchen for not riding bicycles is "I am afraid of cars". If we calm traffic and build a safe cycling infrastructure we will solve many transportation problems. At the same time being able to use bicycle for the bulk of our daily trips to the store, work and recreation destinations will reduce the over all need to earn money there by giving us all more time to do useful things with our families and friends. i understand this notion of earning less is contrary to the conventional measures of wealth and prosperity. Let me simply respond in advance, money does not grow on trees but apples do and if you have apples you don't need money. Also i understand this topic is focused on the DOT's work but the real underlying issue is our collective quality of life. It is very important to consider the far ranging and complex results of any infrastructural design decisions. The cost of widening the bridge will prevent the reworking of some other infrastructural issues, like restoring the LA River or building more subway and light rail facilities. Simply repainting a lot of our existing roads and adding inexpensive lane divers will allay the fears of many potential cyclist and we will all live better.

-----
Subject: 130930 0829-2
From: Eyal Amiran [eyalamiran@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, September 27, 2013 5:25 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org
Subject: Hyperion
Dear Tami Podesta,
I oppose the expansion of Hyperion. We need to preserve those qualities that make Silver Lake so attractive—take them away, and the value of the place will diminish, and with it property taxes and future development. We need a careful balance, not a bigger road, noise, and pollution. How does such an expansion improve the livability of Silver Lake? does it help pedestrians and bicycle riders? does it encourage small shop traffic and character in this part of town?
Sincerely,
Eyal Amiran
2013 Micheltorena Street
Silver Lake
-----
Subject: 130930 0831-1
From: Michael Blanchard [mlblanchard@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, September 27, 2013 5:55 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
    mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: Hyperion Freeway? No, thank you. Make LA safe for pedestrians and cyclists
As someone who bikes, walks and runs between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community.
Specifically, I would like the project to include:
   - Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
   - Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
   - Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
   - No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
   - A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge
There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.
Sincerely,
Michael Blanchard
5124 Vincent Ave
Los Angeles, CA 90041
-----
Subject: 130930 0831-2
From: Erial [etu.edu@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, September 26, 2013 9:43 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All
I was going to copy and paste but I just wanted to share. Every time I have
to bike over Hyperion I feel like -- well this could be it today someone
hits me with their car and drives off. It’s happened to a few of my cycling
friends.
As a commuting cyclist and driver -- I believe we need to encourage safety
all around. Biking not only reduces traffic, it makes citizens healthier
and builds a better community. Not to mention, if we make LA the capital of
bikes and pedestrians, imagine tourist renting bikes and exploring
businesses beyond Hollywood boulevard; everyone wins. Angelinos are
starting to use bikes as a method of transportation more and more and it’s
awesome. However, if we do not meet this demand with providing safe passage
it will not be a lasting boom of an alternative method of transportation.
We need to invest in our future Los Angeles! We can't let those Portland or
Long Beach go-getters out pace us -- with their nice bicycle lanes and
fancy trains. We have almost 365 days of sunshine and you want people to be
bound to their cars to go 10 minutes away? I say be the elected leaders
that we all know you are step up to the plate and hit a home run -- or
knock some points off that ERA (if your a pitcher) -- let's make LA safe
for cyclist! Also, I urge you to walk or bike the section of Hyperion in
question -- it is indeed terrifying.
Respectfully,
Erial Tompkins
-----
Subject: Hyperion Avenue Plan

Dear Tami Podesta

As a cyclist, pedestrian and homeowner in the community of Silver Lake for over 20 years, I am concerned about the plans for the Hyperion Bridge over the 5 freeway having a design speed of 55 miles per hour. It is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:

- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
- A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. Crossing the Hyperion viaduct from Atwater to Silver Lake is currently very unsafe and needs to be adapted for cyclists, autos and pedestrians to coexist. This project can make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,
Rita Valencia
valencia.rita@gmail.com

-----
Subject: 130930 0833-2
From: Josef Taylor [josef.taylor@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, September 27, 2013 7:15 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT

Subject: Glendale-Hyperion Crossing
Hi, I’m writing to express concerns over the new plans for the
Glendale-Hyperion Crossing.
There are currently no bridges in this area with any bike infrastructure,
and it is a heavily used corridor for anyone who lives nearby. Please
consider the exploding number of people who have chosen to use bicycles for
their daily transportation recently. It’s not a fad, it’s not a sport. It’s
LA catching up to the rest of the world. Our elected officials get this,
which is why the 2010 bicycle master plan specified bike lanes on the
bridge. To do anything short of exceeding the expectations in that plan is
to deliberately sabotage our future, and the safety of countless angelenos.
Please work to reduce the speed of traffic on this crossing and make it
safe, not just for motorists, not just for spandex-clad sports cyclists,
but for bicyclists and pedestrians, humans, from 8 years old to 80.
Josef Taylor

-----
Subject: 130930 0834
From: Rik Williams [rjw297@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, September 27, 2013 2:48 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: Please make Hyperion bike-friendly
To whom it may concern,
As someone who frequently cycles throughout northeast LA (including Atwater and Silver Lake), I was deeply disappointed to learn that the planned Hyperion Avenue Viaduct rehabilitation includes essentially no facilities for bicycles and pedestrians. This stretch of road connects two busy commercial/residential districts that are almost always teeming with bike and foot traffic, and connecting them with a 55mph thoroughfare will only continue to endanger cyclists who need to cross between these areas.
On the other hand, a design that enhances bike and pedestrian safety will provide a unique, contiguously bikeable and walkable community, while still providing ample capacity for automobile traffic. In the Hyperion Viaduct redesign I strongly encourage you to include such enhancements, including bicycle lanes, well-marked crosswalks, and slower traffic speeds, for the safety of this vibrant urban neighborhood.
Sincerely,
Rik Williams
318 N Avenue 52
Highland Park, Los Angeles, 90042
-----
Subject: Don't turn Glendale and Hyperion into freeways -- make them safe for everyone

Dear Ms. Podesta:

I am writing to express my concerns regarding the DEIR for the Glendale/Hyperion bridge complex improvement project. Specifically, I find deeply troubling the inadequate safety measures for bicycle and pedestrian users and the seeming prioritization of automobile speed over all other design considerations. I urge Caltrans and the City of Los Angeles to rethink the need for high design speeds on the renovated bridge complex and to provide safe, dedicated access for nonmotorized users. In addition, I request that the various agencies involved in the project hold a formal public hearing to allow members of the community to openly voice their concerns.

The Glendale/Hyperion bridge is particularly well-used by people riding bicycles in spite of the fact that it is not very bike-friendly, as it is one of only a few crossings of the Los Angeles River between Silver Lake and Atwater Village. The City of Los Angeles is well aware of this fact -- so well aware that it included bike lanes on Hyperion Avenue as part of the 2010 Bicycle Plan.

Despite this recognition of the bridge as an important connecting route for nonmotorized users, the proposed renovations of the bridge, as described in the EIR, fail to adequately accommodate safe bicycling and walking. Caltrans and the City's Bureau of Engineering (BOE) are designing Hyperion to freeway standards with a design speed of 55 miles per hour. Based on that design speed, they are pursuing a median crash barrier, banked turns, and excessively wide car lanes. Those decisions leave no room for bike lanes and just a narrow sidewalk on only one side of the street. This is particularly perplexing when we consider that the speed limit on the street segments that lie at each end of the bridge is 35 mph. I cannot fathom what benefit is gained from encouraging drivers to accelerate to freeway speeds for the length of the bridge and become acclimated to those speeds just as they reemerge into an urbanized area where people live, work, shop, walk and ride bikes. Simply designing the bridge to normal city street standards would leave enough room for everyone and would avoid turning Hyperion into a de facto expressway.

As someone who regularly bikes between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion be made safe for people like me. Everyone's needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:

- Bike lanes on Hyperion Avenue
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Boulevard
Finally, I ask that a formal public hearing be held to allow all potential users of the bridge the opportunity to voice their concerns and know that their comments will be incorporated into the record. It is crucial that the needs of non-automobile bridge users be taken into account.
There is no reason for this project to be inconsistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can help to overcome that barrier and provide safe and comfortable alternatives to the automobile for many thousands of Angelenos. I urge the reconsideration of the dangerous design proposed for this project.

--
Niall Huffman
945 South Sycamore Avenue, Los Angeles
nhuffman28@gmail.com
714.323.1878

-----
Subject: 130930 0836-1
From: otbhans@gmail.com [mailto:otbhans@gmail.com] On Behalf Of Hans Keifer
Sent: Friday, September 27, 2013 7:54 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: Make Hyperion Ave. Viaduct Safe for Biking and Walking

Dear Tami,

As someone who bikes or walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:

- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
- A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,

Hans Keifer
11716 Babbitt Ave
Granada Hills, CA

-----
Subject: 130930 0836-2
From: underconsume@gmail.com [underconsume@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, September 27, 2013 5:43 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Subject: Hyperion safety
As someone who bikes or walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone's needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:
- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
- A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Best,
Ron McGill
310~701~0510
-----
Subject: Proposed Hyperion-Glendale Bridge Changes

Ms. Podesta,

I’m writing to express my strong concern about the proposed changes and upgrades to the Hyperion-Glendale bridge. I’m not an avid cyclist or die-hard pedestrian, but I do recognize the importance of accommodating a variety of means of transportation, wherever possible, and particularly when there are limited access points across a barrier like the LA River and 5 Freeway. This is especially true given that this bridge links two bike-friendly and pedestrian-friendly communities that lack real connections between them for people not driving.

It is really upsetting to me to learn that the proposed changes to the bridge include design modifications intended to accommodate 55 MPH traffic, which requires widened lanes and takes away what little space could have been in place for bikes and pedestrians while making it that much more dangerous for bicyclists and pedestrians to cross this bridge. Supposedly, the speed limit is 35 MPH, but the design just assumes people will drive 20 MPH over the speed limit and attempts to accommodate that. What an absolute shame. LADOT should be ashamed for having come up with this design proposal, particularly as recent data shows that nearly 90% of LA’s new residents in the past year have low- to no-vehicle households. These are folks who are walking, bicycling, taking transit, etc., and we’re designing a long-overdue upgrade to a bridge that is almost singularly-focused on cars? So utterly disappointing.

I understand that the proposal includes a widened sidewalk on the north side of the bridge, which comes at the expense of any sidewalk on the south side and which is only accessible by crossing what is essentially an on-ramp to the 5 Freeway (by the way, have you ever tried to walk across a freeway on- or off-ramp without a traffic signal to aid you? It’s one of the scariest experiences you can have as a pedestrian).

I’m so disappointed at the lack of vision and creativity in LADOT’s proposal for the Hyperion-Glendale bridge "upgrades" and wanted to voice that opinion while I hope there’s still time to revisit this proposal and hopefully recognize just how important a linkage it is between two of LA’s most walkable and bikeable neighborhoods.

Thank you for reading this and for your willingness to hear what I have to say.

-Luke Klipp

email: lukehklipp@gmail.com
phone: (415) 203-3102

Work like you don’t need the money, Love like you’ve never been hurt, and Dance like nobody’s watching.

---
Subject: 130930 0836-4
From: Natalie Cardenas [msohno213@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, September 27, 2013 6:53 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
    mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway – Build a Safe Viaduct for All
As someone who bikes or walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it
is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me.
Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate
speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project
to include:
   Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
   Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
   Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and
   pedestrians and discourage speeding
   No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even
   faster
A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people
access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists
an alternative through the dangerous merge
There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan
and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest
barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This
project can change that and make all travelers benefit.
Sincerely,
Natalie Cardenas
1427 McCollum Street
Los Angeles CA 90026
-----
Subject: 130930 0836-5
From: Stambler@aol.com [Stambler@aol.com]
Sent: Friday, September 27, 2013 6:59 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: Hyperion-Glendale Bridge Redesign
At the community meeting the other evening regarding the bridge, the
engineers and officials indicated that the three reasons for the redesign
were seismic retrofitting, traffic capacity, and historic preservation. I
fail to see how renovating the bridge to accommodate traffic traveling at
55 miles per hour is in keeping with any of those reasons. It would seem to
make much more sense to apply the traffic-calming principles that have
proven so effective in other neighborhood streets. The viaduct is a primary
passageway for pedestrians and bikes as well as cars and trucks. It's hard
to imagine that the city and state can't come up with a more sensible
approach -- one that takes into consideration the needs of all travelers --
than the design that is currently on the table.
Mark Stambler
3001 Maxwell Street
Los Angeles 90027
-----
Subject: 130930 0837-1
From: Kalee Thompson [mailto:kalee.thompson@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, September 27, 2013 8:31 AM
To: Podesta, Tami @DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: Hyperion Bridge
Hello,
It has come to my attention that city plans to renovate the Hyperion bridge that connects Los Feliz to Atwater Village are not bike and pedestrian friendly. I feel strongly that we need to slow traffic in these areas and create a safer and more welcoming environment for those who choose or have no choice but to bike or walk.
In my opinion, any renovation to bridges crossing the LA River should include bike lanes. There is already a shortage of safe ways to get across the river in these neighborhoods.
Please prioritize the safety and support of cyclists and pedestrians. It will make our city a happier, friendlier, and safer place.
Thank you,
Kalee Thompson
Biker, Walker, Mother, Resident of NELA

Kalee Thompson
718.930.9891
Twitter: Kaleewrites
Read My Book!
WWW.DEADLIESTSEA.COM
-----
Subject: 130930 0837-2
From: Darren Conly [djconly@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, September 27, 2013 7:54 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT

Subject: Please better accommodate bicycles in the Hyperion-Glendale bridge redesign!

As a cyclist and 3-year resident of Los Angeles, I am only too aware of the challenges brought about by the fact that this bridge does not feature any sort of bicycle infrastructure. If I, or any of the many cyclists inhabiting Silver Lake, Echo Park, Atwater Village, or Glendale wish to travel between these areas, it is unnecessarily difficult under current conditions.

In particular, getting from Atwater Village to Silver Lake via bicycle is difficult as it requires either braving the Hyperion bridge with vehicles traveling over 55mph, or it requires taking a more circuitous, hilly route via Glendale Boulevard.

Normally, we would just have to accept these conditions as-is since building new infrastructure is very expensive. But the fact that the Hyperion bridge is being rebuilt is a perfect opportunity to feasibly and efficiently make a vital connection in the growing network of bicycle infrastructure in Los Angeles. Doing so would also further the LADOT’s goal of promoting more sustainable transportation options.

In short, please make the most of the opportunity presented by this project. Don't use it to promote the outdated status quo of facilitating vehicular traffic in an area with so much potential for alternative forms of transportation. Take advantage to provide a safe and convenient connection for all road users between these two vibrant neighborhoods.

Sincerely,
Darren Conly
MURP, UCLA Class of 2012

-----
Subject: 130930 0837-3
From: ds [d.sofly@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, September 27, 2013 7:33 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
    mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway – Build a Safe Viaduct for All!
As someone who bikes or walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:

- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
- A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge.

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe walk/bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,
Diana Estrada
4210 Los Feliz, Los Angeles, CA 90027
-----
Subject: 130930 0838-1 (Referenced as 131108 0847-2 in the E-mail Database)
From: Kathryn Savage [kmsavage@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, September 27, 2013 8:03 PM
To: Podesta, Tami @DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: Make Hyperion Avenue Safe for Everyone
I am a young woman who frequently rides my bike between Atwater Village and Silverlake, and I demand that Hyperion Avenue be made safe for bicyclists and pedestrians. We need to provide infrastructure that makes walking, biking and driving feasible and safe, not infrastructure that solely permits cars to speed recklessly and endanger our communities. Hyperion Avenue should have:
- bike lanes, as designated by the City's 2010 bicycle master plan
- a sidewalk on each side of the street
- well-marked crosswalks
- narrower traffic lanes to give space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
Hyperion Avenue should NOT have:
- a dangerously high speed limit of 55 miles per hour through our communities
- a median crash barrier and banked turns, encouraging reckless driving
- extra-large car lanes, leaving room for only a narrow sidewalk on one side of the street
In 2010, the City of L.A. set a goal for itself to install bike lanes on Hyperion Ave. There is no reason for this project not to fulfill that goal. Moreover, Hyperion Avenue needs bike lanes precisely because it connects two communities, both of which have a huge, fast-growing number of bicyclists and pedestrians. Our city streets are not freeways! They are avenues for safely moving traffic, pedestrians and bicyclists throughout our communities.
Sincerely,
Kathryn Savage
12354 Sarah Street
Studio City, CA 91604
-----
Subject: 130930 0838-2
From: Will Clark [clarkws@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, September 27, 2013 8:33 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
    mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway!
I must say, I’m very disappointed with the design for Hyperion Ave, one of
the EXTREMELY few routes crossing the 5 and the LA River between Silverlake
and Atwater Village, and an area that already very strongly privileges car
traffic to the detriment of all other modes of transit. This is the kind of
retrograde thinking that Los Angeles has been trying to change in its
infrastructure and planning, and this design sends the wrong message to
pedestrians, cyclists and others who wish to experience their city in a
safe, humane way.
As someone who travels frequently in this area as a cyclist and as a
pedestrian, I find these proposals disappointing, and against the ethos of
comprehensive transit advocated by our newly elected mayor, who should lead
this issue by endorsing a redesign for Hyperion Ave that comprehensively
and safely encourages the multiple forms of transportation other than
automobiles. Such a project would include:

- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and
  pedestrians and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even
  faster
- A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people
  access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists
  an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan
and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest
barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This
project can change that and make all travelers benefit.
You have an opportunity to do this right.
Sincerely,
Will
--
310.924.7318
-----
Subject: 130930 0838-3
From: John Cork [johncork@mac.com]
Sent: Friday, September 27, 2013 8:28 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: mayor.garcetti@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
tom.labonge@lacity.org
Subject: Hyperion: Let’s do it right!
A great deal of time, effort and passion was put into the LA 2010 Master Bike Plan, and part of that was recognition that Hyperion was an important street that needed improvement for pedestrians and cyclists.
I know. I use it all the time.
Silver Lake and Atwater Village are burgeoning neighborhoods, filled with folks who want to walk to cafes, shops, clubs and neighbors. They have grown to be so popular because they have developed a street life independent of the car traffic that flows through them. The LA River and the 5 freeway have worked as social and economic barriers between these two great neighborhoods. How CalTrans deals with Hyperion changes will help unify or hamper this wonderful community.
This is an area filled with schools - public and private. This is an area filled with cyclists who want and need many safe access points to the LA River Path - a crown jewel of the area. Any changes in Hyperion need to take into consideration the requirements of students who want to walk or bike to school and the practical needs of those who use the LA River Path on a regular basis. I know folks who do not use the path but live less than two-tenths of a mile from it. Why? They feel they can’t get to an entrance safely on their bicycles.
The other morning, I was compelled to drive from Glendale into Silver Lake via Hyperion. It was a slow-moving train of cars. Many drivers were talking on their phones. Some were texting. No cyclists used Hyperion while I was in that traffic jam.
Now, I want you to imagine another scenario. Same traffic jam, but in the bike lanes are dozens of cyclists huffing past every couple of minutes. On the sidewalks are a steady stream of walkers. The cyclists move faster than the traffic. LAPD has responsibly cracked down on the distracted drivers, who now look at the scene rather than their cell phone screens. And each day, a few more of those drivers do the calculus - the cyclists are moving; the drivers are not. The cyclists look like they are having fun; the drivers are not. And each day, another kid going to Franklin or Ivanhoe or Lyceé thinks they might want to ride a bike to school rather than ride in a car.
And each week, there is one less car in the Hyperion traffic jam.
You can make that happen. You can make these neighborhoods stronger. You can raise the safety and quality of life quotients for those in all the neighborhoods that access the LA River Path by making Hyperion safe for cyclists and walkers. You can strengthen the businesses of the neighborhoods by giving those who ride and walk the path better access to the wonderful cafes and shops of Atwater and Silver Lake.
Do the right thing. Make the work on Hyperion reflect the values of those who live there. Los Angeles may be "life in the fast lane," but more and more are choosing "life in the bike lane." Honor that choice.
Best,
John Cork
2516 Kenilworth Ave.
Los Angeles, CA 90039
323 273-1375
-----
Subject: Hyperion-Glendale bridge complex redesign

Ms. Podesta, Mr. Mayor, and Distinguished Councilmen,

I am writing to express my severe concern about the proposed redesign of the Hyperion-Glendale bridge complex. This structure links a variety of mid-sized and small local roadways with commercial and residential neighborhoods. My first concern is that the bridges are being designed to accommodate highway level traffic speeds of up to 55 mph. These bridge spans are short and end on all sides in dense areas with lots of local traffic, pedestrians, shops, and homes. There is simply no reason to design this structure to encourage drivers to reach freeway speeds. It is unsafe and provides no benefit to traffic flow as these high speeds will only produce back ups at either end as well as leading to increased collisions.

Perhaps more importantly, the roadway design that would allow these high speeds requires that there would be little to no remaining space on the bridges to accommodate cyclists or pedestrians in any reasonable manner. Not only is this extremely short-sighted, it directly violates Los Angeles’ Complete Streets policy that requires the access of all users to be a primary consideration in road design. This area is a key linkage point across the Los Angeles River with no nearby alternatives serving these important neighborhoods. It should provide access for all people.

Whatever is constructed, we will be living with it for literally generations. I strongly encourage you to follow common sense and the law and move forward with a design that will accommodate safe movement by all people while encouraging safe driving and smooth traffic flow.

Thank you for your attention.

David Matsu
Los Angeles, CA

-----
Subject: 130930 0839-2
From: Ray Simmons [rayinla@aol.com]
Sent: Friday, September 27, 2013 9:04 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: Hyperion-Glendale Bridge Design
I am writing to express my dismay that the Department of Transportation and
Bureau of Engineering has proposed redesigning the Hyperion-Glendale Bridge
to accommodate 55 mph speeds.
The fact that currently drivers recklessly speed over this iconic bridge is
not a reason to increase the allowed/engineered speed. Rather DOT/BOE
should pursue TRAFFIC CALMING measures. This bridge is not part of a
freeway and increased speeds on our streets lead to more accidents and more
importantly FATALITIES.
Our roads should not be viewed as automobile sewers to "throughput" as many
vehicles as possible. They should be designed to accommodate all users
SAFELY.
Ray Simmons
821 S Mansfield Ave Apt 1
Los Angeles CA 90036
"The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and
effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated,
and no Warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by Oath or
affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the
persons or things to be seized.” - Amendment IV, The Constitution of the
United States of America.
“All, too, will bear in mind this sacred principle, that though the will of
the majority is in all cases to prevail, that will, to be rightful, must be
reasonable; that the minority possess their equal rights, which equal laws
must protect, and to violate would be oppression.” - Thomas Jefferson
-----
Subject: Looming disaster of Hyperion/Glendale bridge redesign

Hello,

I am a resident in Council District 13 and was a supporter of both O'Farrell and Garcetti in this past year’s elections. As a person growing more and more concerned about pedestrian safety, I am outraged and saddened to hear that the Hyperion/Glendale bridge is planned to be redesigned to accommodate speeding cars over safety. I've read that the new design will accommodate speeds up to 55 miles per hour, since that is currently the average speed on this bridge. So the lesson learned seems to be that if you are ignoring the speed limit and driving 55mph we will reward you by changing the road to accommodate you. This is ludicrous. What I love about the Glendale Blvd area there in Atwater Village is the small town, main street feel that has developed by a good mix of businesses. But now we are encouraging speeding cars to dump into this business area (and residential area). Our engineers and politicians should be more proactive in preventing this type of roadway and bridge from being developed.

Sincerely,
Emily Morishita

-----
Subject: 130930 0839-4
From: Joshua Handel [swiftarcher@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, September 27, 2013 10:05 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT

Subject: Bicycle and Pedestrian accommodations needed on Hyperion-Glendale Bridge
Hi Tami,

I am thoroughly disgusted by the proposed re-design of the Hyperion-Glendale Bridge. Bridges are supposed to connect communities, not serve as a barrier between them - a barrier that can only be crossed if one wishes to contribute to our region's terrible air quality by driving one's car to travel a relatively short distance. Comfortable bicycle and pedestrian accommodations are needed on the new bridge. We are no longer living in 1955, energy prices will continue to rise and trips that can be made without climbing into the car will become the norm. High speeds should not be accommodated - they should be slowed to a reasonable speed that reflects the reality on both ends of the bridge - pedestrians on Glendale Ave and homes and a CHURCH on Hyperion.

Please reconsider your proposed BARRIER and design a BRIDGE for the community.

Regards,

Josh Handel

-----
Subject: 130930 0840
From: John E. Kerr [johnkerr87@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, September 27, 2013 10:08 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: mayor.garcetti@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org
Subject: Hyperion/Glendale bridge
Hello,
I am a resident of Los Angeles’ Sliver Lake neighborhood. I routinely travel to Atwater Village to see friends, shop, and eat, and I routinely take the Hyperion Bridge to connect between the two neighborhoods. As such, it is with much interest I have been following the proposed redesign of the bridge.
Unfortunately, the current plan is way out of line with the character of the neighborhood. As it stands now, drivers speed over the bridge at speeds in excess of 55mph, and it seems that the bridge is going to be designed to freeway standards. This is simple unacceptable. As someone who commutes via bicycle, the bridge complex, especially the Hyperion segments, should be redesigned to encourage slower speed and include bicycle and pedestrian upgrades. There should be wide sidewalks on either side of the historic structure, providing views of the L.A. River below.
Hyperion is the most convenient way for cyclists and pedestrians in Silver Lake to get to Atwater, as it avoids having to descend down the hill to the river ad then back up the opposite banks. It is wide enough, I believe to accommodate a cycle track, or psychically separated bike lane.
As it stands now, this bridge project is a disgrace and will encourage dangerously high speeds on both sides of the bridge. Please reconsider the plans for this bridge and adopt a plan that respects low speed limits, bicycle riders, and pedestrians.
Sincerely,
John E. Kerr
Silver Lake resident
-----
Hello,

I recently learned of the plan to widen the Hyperion & Glendale bridges, more specifically that bike lanes are being left out.

While I understand that the Hyperion section of the bridge is only so wide and that removing an auto traffic lane is politically untenable, I’m surprised that either a bike lane or cycletrack has not been proposed for the Glendale Blvd sections. Considering the bridge is already being widened, adding provisions for bicycles seems like a no-brainer.

I hope you’ll consider some form of real bike connectivity for the bridge widening.

best,
Brian Retchless
-----
Subject: 130930 0841-2
From: Kristen Cruise [mailto:kcruise@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, September 25, 2013 7:05 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Subject: Hyperion/Glendale bridge

Dear Ms. Podesta,
I recently moved from Santa Monica to Los Feliz. I used to commute to work on my bike in Santa Monica. I would love to do the same in Los Feliz. However, I do not feel safe on the Hyperion/Glendale bridge, and I know I am not the only person who feels this way. I ask for your support of the addition of bike lanes to the upcoming renovation and improvement plan for this corridor. This would also strengthen the economic and cultural exchange between Los Feliz/Silverlake and Atwater.
Thank you for your making our neighborhood safe, more environmentally responsible and more welcoming.

Kindly,
Kristen Cruise
e| kcruise@gmail.com
c| 310.846.7151
-----
Subject: 130930 0841-3
From: nathan carballo [nathan.carballo@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, September 27, 2013 10:52 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: Hyperion/Glendale Bridge

Tami,

Unfortunately I was not able to make it to a community discussion
concerning the changes planned on the Hyperion/Glendale viaduct that links
Silver Lake and Atwater Village. After hearing what said plans are, I am
afraid as a cyclist.

By adding an entrance to the LA river bike path, it is clear that the
concerns of cyclists in the community are somewhat important to you. This
is why I feel it needs to be said that the redesign of what seems to be
towards that more of a highway, with cement medians and banked turns, only
encourages already high speeds dangerous to cyclists. Why is the city
catering drivers who are driving over the posted speed limits by
encouraging drivers who are already driving over the posted speed limits by
catering a new design towards them?

When voting in the recent election, my decisions were HEAVILY based on each
candidate’s support of the city’s cyclists and pedestrians. During
campaigning. Mayor Garcetti praised the growing cycling, pedestrian, and
public transit community in this city. Why does it seem this project is
putting us on the back burner then?

I hope this message is heard and is taken into the consideration of the
candidates whom I voted for, because I believed they had my back. Thank you
so much for your time.

Nathan Carballo
nathan.carballo@gmail.com<mailto:nathan.carballo@gmail.com>
805-512-3166

--
Nathan Carballo
I.A.T.S.E. Local 728
805-512-3166
nathan.carballo@gmail.com<mailto:nathan.carballo@gmail.com>
---
Subject: 130930 0841-4
From: lakersalex [lakersalex@yahoo.com]
Sent: Saturday, September 28, 2013 12:58 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: Opposition to Hyperion-Glendale Complex of Bridges Rehabilitation
Project
While the current proposal is a lose-lose, there’s still time to halt the
project and turn things around. This project needs to go back to the
drawing board, with a new set of criteria.
The streets of our cities and towns are an important part of the livability
of our communities. They ought to be for everyone, whether young or old,
motorist or bicyclist, walker or wheelchair user, bus rider or shopkeeper.
But too many of our streets are designed only for speeding cars, or worse,
creeping traffic jams.
The current plan serves 1 priority: maximizing the theoretical throughput
of vehicles at the greatest velocity possible.
Please redesign this project with the idea that a 9 year old girl riding on
a bicycle can safely make her way across this bridge.
-----
Subject: 130930 0841-5
From: Vyki Englert [vyki.englert@gmail.com]
Sent: Saturday, September 28, 2013 3:52 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: Please consider bikes as a vehicle, esp in regards to Hyperion Bridge

Over, and over it has been proven with studies in cities big and small that cycling is not only a viable transportation alternative, but one that is necessary to build strong healthy neighborhoods. LA deserves to be a strong and healthy community.

As an experienced road cyclist that bikes often up to 18 miles each way to my workplace on the west side, I am used to navigating the roads in LA. Recently I have been riding across the existing construction and have been nervous as I navigate a narrow < 9ft wide road painted with sharrows and cars moving at speeds greater than 40mph.

Due to flat terrain, and beautiful weather, the potential here for a viable cycling culture is unparalleled in this country. Take this chance to show LA you are willing and ready to become the next bike city and improve the quality of life for everyone on the roads.

As someone who bikes or walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone's needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:

- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
- A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,
Vyki Englert
120 S Vignes Street Apt 403, Los Angeles, CA 90012

-----
Subject: 130930 0842-1
From: Mike Stein [mike.j.stein@gmail.com]
Sent: Saturday, September 28, 2013 5:32 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Subject: Hyperion Bridge Redesign
Please rethink the proposed Hyperion bridge redesign, so it is pedestrian and bike friendly.
Building a bridge to facilitate 55 MPH traffic, is building a bridge that is incredibly dangerous for anybody that isn’t in a car.
The Hyperion bridge connects communities in East LA, and spans what could become a beautiful LA river. People should be encouraged to walk and bike across it.
Hyperion isn’t a freeway. Instead of designing a bridge because people have been speeding on it, let’s design a bridge that encourages driving safely, and leaves a safe place for people on foot and bike to enjoy Los Angeles.
-----
Subject: 130930 0842-2
From: Jenni Armstrong [geekchick@geekchick.biz]
Sent: Friday, September 27, 2013 5:21 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT; tom.labonge@lacity.org;
councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: Hyperion Blvd is a 35mph street
Dear Tami
I am formally requesting that a PUBLIC HEARING be held regarding the
Hyperion Glendale Ave Viaduct Improvement Project.
What steps do I need to take to make this happen?
Thank you
--

Jenni Armstrong | 106 1/2 Judge John Aiso St. #249, Los Angeles, CA
90012 | geekchick.biz<http://geekchick.biz/> | serving west Los Angeles
since 2005 | phone: 310-42-JENNI (310-425-3664) | exclusive technical,
internet, network and workstation advice for professionals, proprietors and
leaders | geekchick@geekchick.biz<mailto:geekchick@geekchick.biz>
Subject: 130930 0842-3
From: Jenny Morataya [mailto:jenny8morataya@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, September 26, 2013 12:04 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All

As someone who bikes or walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:

- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
- A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,

Jenny Morataya
2611 Canada Blvd
Glendale, Ca 91208

-----
Subject: 130930 0843 (Referenced as 131108 0847-2 in the E-mail Database)
From: Kathryn Savage [kmsavage@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, September 30, 2013 4:11 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT; tom.labonge@lacity.org;
councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: Public Hearing - Hyperion Bridge Design
Dear Tami Podesta,
I would like to formally request that a public hearing be held regarding
the Hyperion Glendale Ave Viaduct Improvement Project.
Please let me know how we can make this happen
Most Sincerely,
Kathryn Savage
-----
Subject: 130930 0932-1
From: danger [mailto:danger3d@gmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, September 29, 2013 10:51 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
    mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: Subject: No Hyperion Freeway – Build a Safe Viaduct for All

As someone who bikes or walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:

- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
- A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,
David H. Aretsky 5654 oakdale ave.
woodland hills, ca
91367
-----
Subject: 130930 0932-2
From: Severin V Martinez [mailto:smartinez28@berkeley.edu]
Sent: Sunday, September 29, 2013 10:27 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org; Benson, Dale R@DOT; michelle.mowery@lacity.org
Subject: Please Stop the Hyperion Freeway Project!

To Whom it May Concern,

My name is Severin Martinez, I am a resident of Northeast LA and I frequently spend time in the areas affected by the proposed Hyperion Freeway Project, formally known as the Glendale-Hyperion Viaduct Improvement Project

After reviewing the informational website about this project (http://www.glendalehyperion.com), and viewing the youtube video with commentary from Mayor Garcetti, and Councilmembers LaBonge, and O'Farrell, I have a number of concerns with the current proposal design specifics.

Firstly, I am surprised that if this bridge is to be a permanent replacement that it provides absolutely no bicycle infrastructure along Hyperion Avenue. As you may know, the 2010 LA Bike Plan (approved by the city council when LaBonge and Garcetti both sat on the council) calls for bike lanes on Hyperion Avenue yet bike lanes are absent from the bridge retrofit. If this project is built without bike lanes we will simply have to go back and add bike lanes at a later date, an unnecessary and costly measure considering that bike lanes could be directly incorporated into the new bridge design. Yes, this project includes a separate bicycle-pedestrian bridge connecting to the LA River, however this does not preclude the need for bike lanes on Hyperion Avenue. If Hyperion will be designed for 55mph, it will be critical to have fully-separated bike lanes (also known as cycle tracks) across Hyperion Avenue. Sharrows will do absolutely nothing to improve safety or comfort of cycling on Hyperion Avenue and besides the approved LA Bike Plan calls for bike lanes, not sharrows.

Secondly, I am concerned about the part of this proposal that calls for eliminating the sidewalk on the eastbound side and widening the sidewalk on the westbound side of Hyperion. Of course, by eliminating pedestrian access on one side, any trip made by foot across the bridge suddenly becomes less convenient because if they approach the bridge on the eastbound side, they are forced to cross to get onto the westbound side then potentially needing to cross back to the eastbound side if that is where their destination is. Maintaining pedestrian access on both sides of the bridge will also offer pedestrians the opportunity to have more fantastic views of the LA River from the bridge. I understand that Garcetti, LaBonge, and O'Farrell are all champions of the LA River restoration– there is no reason why we should lose pedestrian access on the eastbound side of Hyperion Avenue as this will eliminate a unique vantage point of the LA River and surrounding urban landscape that is so uniquely
Los Angeles in its beauty.

Thirdly, 12ft and 14ft wide motor vehicle lanes are grossly excessive. It is a well-known fact that wider lanes encourage and tolerate higher speeds. What is the compelling reason to make lanes so wide when it will only allow for higher speeds? I assume the response will be because Caltrans standards call for minimum 12ft wide lanes. But what has this standard given us? Streets are no safer when lanes are this wide. Throughout Los Angeles many of the heaviest traveled streets have traffic lanes no wider than 11ft. When the LA Department of Transportation wants to make streets safer, they will narrow excessively wide lanes and create bike lanes. This proposal goes against the city's own practice of narrowing lanes to reduce speeding and improve safety. The basis of the wide travel lane standard assumes that bicyclists are non-existant and that the societal goal is to have traffic moving at high speeds. This may have been our societal goal in the 1970's but we have realized that higher speeds and wider lanes lead to more collisions in an urban context.

I am also opposed to any crash barriers. Crash barriers are a response to excessive, dangerous, and illegal speeding by drivers. However, if this bridge is to re-designed, it can be engineered to discourage speeding, namely through the implementation of narrower travel lanes. Crash barriers anticipate high speed collisions, this is why we have crash barriers dividing traffic on freeways. However, this bridge, and our neighborhood streets are no freeways nor should they be treated as such. The presence of sidewalks and bicycle infrastructure on both sides of the bridge should take precedence over a crash barrier for motorists. Ask yourself- what kind of a proposal is this if it offers crash barriers for motorists but offers no physical protection or consideration for cyclists?

I would also suggest a complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge.

What is being proposed is a dangerous situation that neglects to take into the comfort and safety of people walking and cycling. It should also be noted that high speeds across this bridge will degrade the experience along the LA River as it will only add to the noise and stress one deals with accessing the LA River on foot.

In reflecting on this project, I have some questions:

Does California not have a complete streets law– why is it being ignored on this bridge proposal?

Does the LA Bike Plan not call for bike lanes on Hyperion Avenue– why is this approved plan being ignored on this bridge proposal?

Will 12ft and 14ft wide lanes tolerate or encourage drivers to go faster than having 10ft or 11ft wide lanes? If so, how does this make the bridge...
safer if higher speeds are more likely to cause vehicular carnage?

Does the current bridge proposal make it safe or pleasant for parents to cycle with their children across Hyperion? If not, why are we not designing the bridge so that families can safely and comfortably cycle?

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Thank you for your time,

Severin Martinez
4658 Loleta Ave, 90041
-----
Subject: 130930 0936

From: Jeff Cannon [mailto:cannon.jeffrey@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, September 30, 2013 9:15 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All

As someone who bikes or walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Hyperion is the only direct route connecting these two neighborhoods. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community.

Even as it stands, avid cyclists like myself go well out of their way to avoid the Hyperion viaduct due to the lack of bicycle lanes and the predominance of high-speed motorists. The current plan will certainly make Los Angeles even less safe for cyclists and pedestrians alike.

Specifically, I would like the project to include:

- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turned that will make people drive even faster

- A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project not to be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,

Jeff Cannon
Silver Lake resident and daily cyclist
3342 Hamilton Way
Los Angeles, CA 90026
-----
Subject: 130930 0951-1
From: Debra Beck [prubx@comcast.net]
Sent: Saturday, September 28, 2013 6:03 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Subject: Hyperion Ave Plans in L.A.
My daughter and her spouse live on Hyperion Ave. and ride their bikes to
work. I am fearful for them already; the removal of bike lanes will be
truly hazardous for them. Please work with Los Angeles to change the new,
drastic roadwork plans.
Thank you,
Debra E. Beck
-----
Subject: 130930 0951-2
From: KEVIN HOPPS [kevinhopps@me.com]
Sent: Sunday, September 29, 2013 6:26 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: We don't need a Hyperion Freeway - Please build a safe Viaduct for everyone.

Dear Ms. Podesta,
If we are going to make an honest effort to help Los Angeles combat climate change and become an alternative transportation friendly county, we need to take into consideration the needs of cyclists and pedestrians. Freeway speeds have no place on city streets. Our streets need to be safe for those who bike and for those who walk. Therefore, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Avenue be made safe for cyclists and pedestrians. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:

- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs.
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding.
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster.

A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge.

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,
Kevin Hopps
12015 Kling Street
Valley Village, CA 91604

-----
Subject: 130930 1101-1 (Referenced as 131001 1509 in the E-mail Database)
From: Esther M. [mailto:esther90026@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, September 30, 2013 9:56 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
    mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All

As someone who bikes or walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it
is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me.
Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate
speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project
to include:
Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians
and discourage speeding
No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access
the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an
alternative through the dangerous merge
There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan
and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest
barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This
project can change that and make all travelers benefit.
Sincerely,
Esther Mazmanyan
1454 Glendale Blvd
Los Angeles, CA 90026
-----
Subject: 130930 1101-2 (Referenced as 131001 1506-2 in the E-mail Database)
From: Stephen Roullier [mailto:stephen.roullier@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Monday, September 30, 2013 10:01 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Subject: Hyperion Bridge

I was disappointed to learn that the plan recently unveiled for the Hyperion Bridge contains insufficient provisions for improving pedestrian and bicycle access and safety on the bridge. I believe that such a plan is ill conceived and disregards the needs and wishes of the residents of the surrounding neighborhoods.
I am a resident of Echo Park and I travel to Silver Lake and Atwater three or four times a week via bicycle. I patronize businesses in those neighborhoods and I ride the Los Angeles River bike path for exercise and recreation. At some point or another, all bicycle routes from my neighborhood to Atwater and back are difficult, dangerous and often both. The Hyperion Bridge is the most direct route between Silver Lake and Atwater, yet current conditions on the bridge make bicycle travel hazardous, and pedestrian use highly unpleasant.

I believe that as Los Angeles becomes inevitably denser, the only way for it to continue to function effectively is by encouraging modes of transportation besides the use of the personal automobile. The Hyperion Bridge is a classic design and an iconic feature of the neighborhood. We now have an opportunity to update the functionality of that design with an eye to the future of our city. I strongly urge you to change the current plan - which turns the Hyperion Bridge into a dangerous mini-freeway with no regard for the safe passage of pedestrians and cyclists - and instead put your efforts into devising and supporting a plan that serves our entire community.

Sincerely,

Stephen Roullier
1701 Clinton St. 90026

-----
Subject: 131001 1501-1
From: Roscoe Gordo [mailto:roscoe.gordo@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, September 30, 2013 11:57 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All

As someone who bikes or walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it
is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me.
Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate
speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project
to include:
Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians
and discourage speeding
No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access
the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an
alternative through the dangerous merge
There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan
and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest
barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This
project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,
Roscoe Aquilo-Gordo
-----
Subject: 131001 1501-2
From: colintb@earthlink.net [mailto:colintb@earthlink.net]
Sent: Monday, September 30, 2013 6:26 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org
Cc: mayor.garcetti@lacity.org; tom.labonge@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All

Dear Ms. Podesta and Council Member O’Farrell,

As someone who bikes between Silver Lake/Los Feliz and Atwater Village/Glendale, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. There are currently three main routes across the Los Angeles River and 5 Freeway in the area near the Hyperion Bridge (Los Feliz, Hyperion, Fletcher) and NONE of them have bicycle facilities for east/west travelers. The total lack of east/west bicycle infrastructure at these three locations is the greatest obstacle for people on bikes who might want to travel across the River and the I-5. Among the three routes, Hyperion is the worst and the one most in need of improvement.

Everyone’s needs can be met if the Hyperion project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. I’m very disappointed that the current proposal falls short of serving the needs of people on bikes or on foot. Specifically, I would like the Hyperion project to include:

1. Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
2. Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs.
3. Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding.
4. No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster.
5. A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge.

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the City of LA Bike Plan and Caltrans’ complete streets policy. The Hyperion viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,

Colin Bogart
1340 N. Edgemont St.
Los Angeles, CA 90027

-----
Subject: 131001 1501-3
From: jwhall@dslextreme.com [mailto:jwhall@dslextreme.com]
Sent: Monday, September 30, 2013 6:07 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All

I neither bike nor walk between Silver Lake and Atwater Village on a regular basis, however the proposed changes to Hyperion Ave are of grave concern to me. It’s alarming that a new design would totally ignore the burgeoning "Complete Streets" concept this far into the 21st century.

The abandonment of the 2010 Bicycle Plan lanes fits perfectly into the apparent mindset at work in developing this "improvement". The greatest concern though is that it is just one in a myriad of future projects. With that said, does it become the precedent for the future abandonment of non-motorized transportation accommodations?

Think about it. Think about those affected by it. Maybe someone you know.

Sincerely,

John Hall
24812 Hoeseshoe LN
Newhall CA, 91321
-----
Subject: 131001 1502-1
From: Thomas, Greg (NBCUniversal) [mailto:Gregory.Thomas@nbcuni.com]
Sent: Monday, September 30, 2013 6:04 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: Hyperion Bridge Project

As someone who lives at the Atwater base of the bridge, and bikes, walks, and drives between Silver Lake and Atwater Village EVERY DAY, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Traffic at this junction needs to be slowed down not sped up. I hear horrendous crashes all the time and I fear they will only get worse with higher speeds. Specifically, I would like the project to include:

- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster

And especially this:
A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge.

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,
Greg Thomas
2974 Glendale Blvd.
Atwater Village, CA 90039
-----
Subject: 131001 1502-2
From: cstegallucla@gmail.com [mailto:cstegallucla@gmail.com] On Behalf Of Chris Stegall
Sent: Monday, September 30, 2013 5:26 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: Hyperion Freeway? - Let’s Make it Safe For Everyone!

Hey there,
As someone who bikes and walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me (and the rest of us voters). Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:
• Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
• Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with way-finding signs
• Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and to discourage speeding
• No crash barrier and no banked turns that will only make people drive even faster
• A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,
Chris Stegall
11168 Acama St.
Studio City, CA 91602
-----
Subject: 131001 1502-3
From: eric potter [mailto:echoparkguitar@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, September 30, 2013 5:11 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org; Marcel Porras
Subject: Request for Public Hearing - Hyperion bridge project
hello - this is from eric potter, most of us have met through my work with
the Bicycle Kitchen, though i'm writing you on a personal level.
this Hyperion Bridge plan sounds terrible. i commute by bicycle on that
bridge everyday to my studio. it is a little dangerous right now, but it
appears this new plan will make it even MORE DANGEROUS.

i'm REQUESTING A PUBLIC HEARING for this project. it is completely out
of scale for the neighborhood that it should serve.
sincerely,
eric potter
-----
Subject: 1310001 1503-2
From: Daniel Martinez [mailto:danielmartinez323@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, September 30, 2013 4:02 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway! - Build a Safe Viaduct for ALL
As someone who bikes and walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it
is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me.
Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate
speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project
to include:
Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians
and discourage speeding
No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
(which is bad enough as it is)
A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access
the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an
alternative through the dangerous merge
There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan
and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest
barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This
project can change that and make all travelers benefit. I pray that
you listen to my concerns which are consistent throughout the city. With
more LA citizens considering commuting via bicycles, it is imperative that
they are not discouraged by plans to making our streets into highway type
streets. It is dangerous enough having drivers zoom past us at 35 mph, if
this street turns into a 55 mph street with no bike lanes, it will be a far
more dangerous pathway that many use to head towards Silverlake, Koreatown,
Hollywood and beyond! So let’s be more compassionate for each other
and let’s start making moves towards a safer and bike friendly LA!
Sincerely, Daniel Martinez
-----
Subject: 131001 1504-1
From: Lance Kanawi [mailto:lanceka@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, September 30, 2013 3:27 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: Hyperion Bridge rehab

I am a car-free resident of Los Angeles who finds myself making use of the Hyperion bridge on a regular basis, both on foot and on a bike. I was very disturbed when I heard about the plans to change the roadway on the bridge. The proposed freeway-like redesign strikes me as a plan from a bygone era, when the city was only concerned with flushing cars through the streets as fast as possible. LA has clearly entered a new era of multi-modal transportation, and those responsible for designing large infrastructure projects like this need to catch up. Specifically, there needs to be bike lanes on Hyperion Ave, as well as ADA-compliant sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks. The traffic lanes should be of standard urban-arterial width, to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding. The addition of a crash barrier and banked turns will make people drive even faster, and is probably the worst idea in the plan. Finally, we need a complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge, since proper lane striping for cyclists in situations like that seem to be beyond our traffic engineers at the moment. There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the city's bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Thank you for your time,

-Lance Kanawi
-----
Subject: 131001 1504-2
From: Bronwyn Beck [mailto:bronwyn@jokeisup.com]
Sent: Monday, September 30, 2013 1:43 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
    mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All

As someone who bikes and walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:

- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
- A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

I live on Hyperion Ave. just off the bridge and frequently walk and bike into Atwater Village. Every day I see motorists speeding off the bridge in front of my house at extremely unsafe speeds, and I oppose any plan that would encourage even higher speeds along this corridor. I often feel unsafe as a pedestrian and cyclist on the bridge as it is; any rehabilitation plan would need to make the bridge safer and more accessible for people like me who are simply trying to walk through their neighborhood, not more dangerous.

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,
Bronwyn Beck
3005 Hyperion Ave.
Los Angeles, CA 90027
-----
Subject: 131001 1504-3
From: Sean Deyoe [mailto:seandeyoe@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, September 30, 2013 1:29 PM
To: Podesta, Tami @DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
    mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway

Hello,

Like many other people, I was appalled to hear that the bike plan for the
Hyperion Blvd. bridge was being ignored and a new, freeway-like design was
being proposed in its place. I truly do not understand the logic of this.
Is the problem with this bridge that people are not able to go fast enough?
Certainly not. The problem is that people already do go far too fast.
Providing safety measures to allow for these speeds to continue rather than
mitigating the speeding itself would ultimately be counterproductive. It
would certainly be less safe for cyclists and pedestrians but also will
continue to be unsafe for drivers. If they can safely go 40mph, they will
go 55; if you increase it to 55, they will go 65 or 70. That's the way
driving works.

Inconveniencing -- and endangering -- cyclists and pedestrians so cars can
go a little faster for such a short distance is not only ridiculous, it is
shameful. If the current design is not safe for people to drive at the
speed they do (and it's not), then just add some speed bumps or something.
It's a bridge, not a freeway.

--
Sean Deyoe
439 S. Hobart Blvd. LA, CA 90020
-----
Subject: 131001 1504-4
From: Joe Bayes [mailto:jbayes@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, September 30, 2013 1:12 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: Please include pedestrian and bike access in the Hyperion Bridge redesign
Ms. Podesta,
I was disturbed to learn that Caltrans and the BOE are proposing redesigning the Hyperion bridge to freeway standards to accommodate 55mph motorized traffic, to the detriment of pedestrian and bicycle users of that bridge. The redesign has one substandard-width sidewalk and no bicycle lane, contrary to LA’s 2010 Bike Plan.
This bridge is in the middle of an urban area and connects two walkable residential areas, and any redesign should reflect that.
Please design the bridge to calm traffic to a speed that’s safe for residential and pedestrian areas, and include bike lanes and ample sidewalks on both sides of the bridge.
Thank you.
--
Joe Bayes -- jbayes@gmail.com
-----
Subject: Hyperion Ave I-5 bridge in Los Angeles

Dear Ms. Podesta,

I am writing to register my objection to the Hyperion Ave bridge project as currently designed, specifically the plan to build the lanes to freeway standards with a 55 MPH speed limit. This is a dangerous and anti-neighborhood plan that is completely out of place in a dense city with plenty of residents and pedestrians using the bridge and adjacent roads. Please allow bike lanes and traffic calming to happen, Los Angeles deserves better than this car-centric plan.

Mario Ramirez
-----
Subject: 131001 1505-2
From: Ryan Gratzer [mailto:gratzer@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, September 30, 2013 11:26 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: Please make the Hyperion-Glendale bridges more bike/ped friendly

I read that the Hyperion-Glendale bridges are slated for a redesign, and
that they may be made even less bike/ped friendly than they are now.
I should note that I don't even bicycle (in LA - too dangerous for me).
But I drive over this bridge every day. I go with the flow of traffic,
which is usually 35-40mph. I don't understand the logic behind redesigning
a half mile long bridge that connects two business districts with 55mph
designs. These bridges aren't bottlenecks, and speeding drivers up just to
slow down again once they traverse the bridge doesn't do anything to
alleviate traffic. If anything, it will just encourage people to go faster
through Atwater and Silver Lake.
I think it's important to support connections between routes for all modes
of transportation. In Atwater on Glendale Blvd, there are bike lanes.
Those lanes disappear on the bridge, and don't reappear in Silver Lake.
Less people will use the lanes in Atwater if they can't make safe
connections from them to other destinations.
I hope you guys end up making design decisions that work for the long-term
future of all residents, regardless of their chosen mode of transportation.

Thanks,
Ryan Gratzer
-----
Subject: 131001 1506-1
From: Dion Johnson [mailto:johnson.dion.b@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, September 27, 2013 8:38 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All

Dear Tami Podesta,

I work and live near Silver Lake and Atwater Village. Believe me that is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:

- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
- A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,
Dion Johnson

--
Dion Johnson | Studio
2640 North San Fernando Road
Los Angeles, California 90065
www.dionjohnsonstudio.com
213.321.6521
-----
Subject: 131001 1506-2
From: Stephen Roullier [mailto:stephen.roullier@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Monday, September 30, 2013 10:01 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Subject: Hyperion Bridge

I was disappointed to learn that the plan recently unveiled for the Hyperion Bridge contains insufficient provisions for improving pedestrian and bicycle access and safety on the bridge. I believe that such a plan is ill conceived and disregards the needs and wishes of the residents of the surrounding neighborhoods.

I am a resident of Echo Park and I travel to Silver Lake and Atwater three or four times a week via bicycle. I patronize businesses in those neighborhoods and I ride the Los Angeles River bike path for exercise and recreation. At some point or another, all bicycle routes from my neighborhood to Atwater and back are difficult, dangerous and often both. The Hyperion Bridge is the most direct route between Silver Lake and Atwater, yet current conditions on the bridge make bicycle travel hazardous, and pedestrian use highly unpleasant.

I believe that as Los Angeles becomes inevitably denser, the only way for it to continue to function effectively is by encouraging modes of transportation besides the use of the personal automobile. The Hyperion Bridge is a classic design and an iconic feature of the neighborhood. We now have an opportunity to update the functionality of that design with an eye to the future of our city. I strongly urge you to change the current plan - which turns the Hyperion Bridge into a dangerous mini-freeway with no regard for the safe passage of pedestrians and cyclists - and instead put your efforts into devising and supporting a plan that serves our entire community.

Sincerely,

Stephen Roullier
1701 Clinton St. 90026

-----
Subject: 131001 1509
From: Esther M. [mailto:esther90026@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, September 30, 2013 9:56 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
    mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All

As someone who bikes or walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it
is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me.
Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate
speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project
to include:
Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians
and discourage speeding
No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access
the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an
alternative through the dangerous merge
There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan
and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest
barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This
project can change that and make all travelers benefit.
Sincerely,
Esther Mazmanyan
1454 Glendale Blvd
Los Angeles, CA 90026
-----
Subject: 131001 1515
From: C R [mailto:chrismredwine@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, October 01, 2013 11:37 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All

Hello!
As someone who bikes between Silver Lake and Atwater Village (actually, I
cycle ALL OVER Los Angeles county, all day, every day! There is hardly a
street in LA that I don’t use to transport myself around, via bicycle), it
is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me.

PLEASE! Let’s make Los Angeles a safe and secure city, featuring
environmentally-friendly and health-conscious modes of transportation, more
readily available for the public. The only way to cut down on traffic
congestion, is to support Metro, Cycling and Walking! PLEASE, do not let
this important passageway become another extremely Un-safe zone, for people
who choose not to support a lifestyle with polluting, dangerous vehicles.
Thank you for listening and making the right choice!!!

Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate
speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project
to include:
Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians
and discourage speeding
No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access
the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an
alternative through the dangerous merge
There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan
and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest
barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This
project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,

Chris Redwine
Currently residing in North Hills, 91402
Los Angeles resident since 2005
-----
Subject: 131001 1516
From: Ben Cuevas [mailto:bencuevas@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, October 01, 2013 12:35 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org; board@silverlakenc.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All

As someone who bikes or walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:

- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
- A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,

Ben Cuevas
1307 Maltman Ave. Apt. 1
Los Angeles, CA 90026
bencuevas.com
bencuevas@gmail.com
323-698-4000

-----
Subject: 131001 1517-2
From: Kari Cassellius [mailto:smellslikechanel@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, October 01, 2013 12:54 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; ofarrell@lacity.org; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org;
board@silverlakenc.org
Subject: Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All

As someone who bikes between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave be made safe for people like me. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:

Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Plus, if you don't put I bike lanes I'm just going to ride my bike over that bridge all the time anyhow and slow down traffic.

Sincerely,

Kari Cassellius
1710 Camino Palmero st #14
Los Angeles, CA 90046
-----
Subject: 131001 1518-1
From: Jason Jenn [mailto:jasonrebegin@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, October 01, 2013 1:05 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org; board@silverlakenc.org
Subject: Build a safe viaduct on Hyperion Ave

I am someone who bikes or walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village from time to time. I feel it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:

Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,
Jason Jenn 4364 1/2 Melrose Ave  Los Angeles, CA 90029
-----
Subject: 131001 1518-2
From: William Schindler [mailto:brotherwm@att.net]
Sent: Tuesday, October 01, 2013 2:16 PM
To: councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org;
Podesta, Tami L@DOT; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org; board@silverlakenc.org
Subject: Hyperion freeway?

As someone who bikes or walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, I feel it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:
Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge
There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,

William Schindler
2114 Hyperion Ave
Los Angeles

-----
Subject: 131002 0724
From: Danila Oder [mailto:doder@usc.edu]
Sent: Tuesday, October 01, 2013 3:36 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All
Dear Ms. Podesta:
As someone who bikes between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, I would like
to see the viaduct be 'calmed' to accommodate bikes and pedestrians as well
as cars. These two neighborhoods are characteristically low-rise and
pedestrian-scaled. A freeway-speed viaduct sets up expectations in drivers
that are soon to be disappointed, and makes for an incongruous transition
from freeway to neighborhood and vice versa.
Specifically, I would like the project to include:
Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs Narrower
traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and
discoourage speeding No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people
drive even faster A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to
let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give
bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge
There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan
and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest
barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This
project can change that and make all travelers benefit.
Sincerely,
Danila Oder
530 S. Kingsley Dr. #402
Los Angeles, CA 90033
-----
Subject: 131002 0727
From: the one [mailto:larunner1@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Tuesday, October 01, 2013 3:39 PM
To: 'William Schindler'; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org; Podesta, Tami L@DOT; ‘Sam Gennawey - Katherine
Padilla & Associates’
Subject: RE: Hyperion freeway?

Mr. Schindler,

Perhaps you attended the informational meeting on the 25th at Friendship
Hall. It has also been presented at the Silver Lake NC governing board
meeting and at the SLNC Transportation and Public Works Committee meeting a
couple months ago. I have copied the representative San Gennawey on this
so he can hear your concerns. I do know that Council Member LaBonge
brought this project to the attention of the community on several occasions
a few years ago. I urge you to contact Mr. Gennawey and see where you can
make further comments on the project. He has been very open to listening
to the concerns and has been going out of his way to present the project.

Rusty Millar
SLNC

From: William Schindler [mailto:brotherwm@att.net <brotherwm@att.net>]
Sent: Tuesday, October 01, 2013 2:16 PM
To: councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org;
Tami.Podesta@dot.ca.gov; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org; board@silverlakenc.org
Subject: Hyperion freeway?

As someone who bikes or walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, I
feel it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people
like me. Everyone's needs can be met if the project is designed for
appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like
the project to include:
Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians
and discourage speeding
No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access
the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an
alternative through the dangerous merge
There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan
and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest
barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This
project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,
Subject: 131002 0728
From: Scott Epstein [scottevanepstein@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, October 01, 2013 11:34 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: Glendale/Hyperion viaduct
Dear Tami Podesta:
I write to you concerning the renovation of the Glendale/Hyperion viaduct complex of bridges. A huge renovation such as this project offers the perfect opportunity to accommodate all users, and I was very concerned to learn that the current plans do not include bike lanes on Hyperion that are in the 2010 bike plan, and is designed for fast traffic which would endanger bicyclists and pedestrians. Making this bridge bicycle and pedestrian friendly would also align to the city's commendable efforts to revitalize the LA river.
Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:

- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster

A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge.

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Thank you very much for your consideration.
Sincerely,
Scott Epstein
608 N. Hayworth Avenue, Apt. 10
Los Angeles, CA 90048
-----
Subject: 131002 1000
From: Thiago Winterstein [mailto:ticoinla@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, October 02, 2013 9:47 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All

As someone who regularly bikes between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. I have often felt unsafe riding on the Hyperion bridge and have often thought that the city could do a lot to improve it. Many riders I know and ride with have commented on how unsafe that bridge is and I’ve heard several stories of cyclists being injured when struck by cars on that bridge, despite the cyclist riding safely and obeying the rules of the road.

Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:

- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
- A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,
Thiago Winterstein

-----
Subject: 131002 1310
From: Leni Fleming [mailto:lenifleming@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, October 02, 2013 10:20 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT; tom.labonge@lacity.org; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: Hyperion Bridge

Dear Ms. Podesta, Councilman LaBonge and Mayor Garcetti:

I'm a longtime resident of Silver Lake and am writing to express my great concern about the current plan for the Hyperion Bridge.

Los Angeles must move forward, not backward. Focusing solely on convenience for automobile drivers (i.e. SPEED) is shortsighted. We need to be encouraging alternative means of getting around town. Two of the most basic are walking and biking.

The current plan for Hyperion virtually ignores both of these. Cyclists are relegated to the shoulder, at the same time that cars are going at least 55mph right beside them. Pedestrians will have a single sidewalk on this high-speed stretch of road. If, on the other hand, traffic lanes are narrower and there are dedicated bike lanes as well as sidewalks on both sides, everyone -- cyclists, walkers and drivers -- will get where they're going with greatly increased safety. It is true that the drive might then take a minute and a half rather than a minute -- but weigh that against a safer, more pleasant crossing for all 3 groups!

This bridge has the potential to be a significant symbol of progressive design for Los Angeles, with serious attention paid to cyclists and walkers -- as attention is paid in other major cities.

We ALL benefit by encouraging biking and walking. Planning this bridge with the sole goal of getting cars from point A to point B as fast as possible harks back to city planning in the 1950s, and does not reflect well on Los Angeles. We are more forward-thinking than that!

I appreciate your attention to my concerns.

Sincerely, Leni Fleming

2130 Apex Avenue

-----
Subject: 131003 0805
From: Ben Nero [mailto:ben.nero@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, October 02, 2013 2:07 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Subject: Glendale Hyperion bridge.

Mrs. Podesta,
Please add some sort of bike infrastructure to the Glendale-Hyperion project. I think that access is a major problem with the pedestrian bridge for cyclists. The options for using a bike to get from Silver Lake the Atwater Village will be go on some ridiculous, long, out of the way route, or ride on the freeway like bridge.
Thanks,
Ben Nero
-----
Subject: 131003 0808
From: Sally Schnitger [mailto:s.schnitger@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, October 02, 2013 3:38 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
    mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All

As someone who bikes or walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:
- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
- A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,

Sarah Schnitger
1549 Winchester Avenue
Glendale, CA 91201

-----
Subject: 131003 0855
From: Susanna Schick [susanna@sustainablefashionla.com]
Sent: Thursday, October 03, 2013 2:12 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All

Dear Public Servants,

I voted for Eric Garcetti thinking he would expand upon the revolutionary work Villaraigosa did before him, in implementing the 2010 bike plan. I feel so foolish for having trusted Garcetti.

A city of almost 4 million and growing does not have room for 4 million cars. We need more than 1% of us to ride bikes. Not just at CicLAvia, but everywhere, every day. I used to be one of those 1% until I had my pelvis shattered by a car. Unfortunately it was an LAPD car, so there was no way to prove this happened. I know perfectly well the fractures I experienced are impossible falling off a bicycle at 18mph. But that’s in the past, and I want to move forward.

The PTSD has made it hard for me to feel safe enough to ride around LA like I used to, so I rarely ride my bicycle now. But the LA river is the only place where I do feel safe. However, the only roads that offer access from the LA river to local restaurants are all terrifying. I would love to be able to just pedal up to Silverlake for lunch, shopping, etc.

The city needs to become a safe place for cyclists. By making it safer, more people will ride instead of drive, reducing traffic congestion, freeing people’s disposable income to be spent on local businesses instead of gas, and making LA a more awesome place for everyone. Why wouldn’t you want that?

Even Ford has recognized that people don’t want to sit in cars all the time, and now offers a Ford-branded Pedego, as reported here:

My article summarizing the research Ford did on the future of transportation, the full book is something I’d be happy to share with any of you. Practically every trend they identify shows people moving away from cars into walkable, bikeable communities:
http://gas2.org/2013/07/01/forget-the-prius-effect-here-comes-the-matrix-effect/Please do the right thing to make LA great. Portland only spent $60 million over the past 18 years to become the most bike-friendly city in America. We're spending over $1billion just to widen the 405!

As someone who bikes between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:

- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge
There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Many Thanks,
Susanna Schick, MBA
Sustainable Fashion LA<http://www.sustainablefashionla.com/> 919.265.9608
-----
Subject: 131003 0858
From: John Samarjian [samarjohn@aol.com]
Sent: Thursday, October 03, 2013 2:48 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Subject: hyperion Bridge re construct
I live on Glendale
blvd facing Redcar park..the bridge is definately apart of my every day experience. The speed of cars now traveling on this bridge is already way to fast..to have a 55 mi zzone over it into glendale is madness and extremely dangerous. The traffic congestion happens in the am for about 2 hours and just about the same in the evenings. It is not unbearable. The reorganization plans sound just like everything the city does OVERBLOWN. Someone really needs to return to the drawing table and come up with a plan that takes into account the villages the road traverses. John W Samarjian 2982 Glendale Blvd. LA90039
-----
Subject: 131003 0859-1
From: Leonardo Chalupowicz [sustainsl@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, October 03, 2013 10:54 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: LaBonge Tom; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org; Board SLNC
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All

As someone who bikes or walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:

- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
- A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Warm regards,
Leonardo Chalupowicz
Silver Lake Stakeholder
Subject: 131003 0859-2
From: Teresa Sitz [teresa_stewart_sitz@yahoo.com]
Sent: Thursday, October 03, 2013 1:14 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All

Dear Tami Podesta:

I am writing in regard to the Hyperion Avenue Bridge. This is the year 2013 and we need to plan for our future. The future must include pedestrians, bicyclists, mothers with children in strollers and those in wheelchairs and on mobility scooters. The automobile cannot continue to be our privileged form of transportation.

Please consider the following points.

There is no reason for the Hyperion Avenue Bridge to accommodate speeds of 50 miles per hour and higher. This is not a long bridge and ends rather abruptly at a stop light at Glen Feliz.

The bridge could be built to be traveled at normal speeds – 35 miles per hour.

Without accommodations for pedestrians, bicyclists, strollers and those in wheelchairs and on mobility scooters large portions of our population will either be denied access between Silver Lake and Atwater Village or will be required to take their own lives, and the lives of others, into their hands on crossing. Making the bridge inaccessible to these people is the same as exiling them in their own neighborhoods. This must stop. People with disabilities MUST be accommodated and NOT be treated as an afterthought or discriminated against.

People are not impaired – people with disabilities, mothers with small children, the poor who do not have cars, those who have chosen to live without supporting planet-destroying gasoline power – these people are not impaired. The ENVIRONMENT is impaired. It seems you are choosing to build this bridge with the intent of not serving, or excluding, the above-mentioned people. Requiring people to travel an additional mile and a half is not a viable alternative and is discrimination. This is unacceptable in 2013.

Please redo the bridge design to include:

1. Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
2. Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
3. Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
4. No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
5. A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit. This project could be a major win for the City in terms of accommodating ALL people and
especially those with disabilities. I strongly recommend that you hold public hearings on this issue. Thank you for your consideration. I hope you will do the right thing. Sincerely, Teresa Sitz PS Notification of receipt of this email by all parties is greatly appreciated. -----
Subject: 131004 0855-1
From: Ryan Johnson [mailto:rjohnson1848@gmail.com <rjohnson1848@gmail.com>]
Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2013 9:39 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Subject: Please consider bike facilities on new Hyperion Ave. Bridge

Good morning,
I have reviewed the EIR for the redesigned Glendale-Hyperion Crossing Bridges, and I am very concerned about the lack of dedicated bicycle facilities in the plan, especially on Hyperion Avenue. This is a topographically natural route for bicyclists, including myself, but the traffic speeds on the bridge are very intimidating and dangerous. This should be a great opportunity to include bicycle facilities on a new bridge, which would encourage more bicycle travel between the communities on either side of the LA River. And it would make it much safer for those who do choose to travel by non-motorized means.
Thank you for considering a revision to the design of the bridges.

--
Ryan Johnson
1118 Mohawk St, Los Angeles, 90026
-----
Subject: Public Comment for Hyperion Project - PLEASE include wider sidewalks AND bicycle lanes

Dear Tami and decision-makers,

As a local resident who walks, bikes and drives in this area, I am very familiar with the current dangerous conditions for bicyclists and pedestrians who use this bridge. This project has the potential to dramatically improve safety and access for all road users, if it includes safe bicycle infrastructure and ample space for pedestrians. Hyperion is the flattest route across the LA River north of downtown. It is therefore an ideal corridor for cyclists, and was therefore singled out by the L.A. Bicycle Plan for bike lanes.

I urge you to amend the project to include these Class II Bike Lanes, or even better, Class I protected bike lanes!

Thank you,

--

Wesley Reutimann
626-529-4615
-----
Subject: 131004 0855-3
From: K Fanslow [mailto:kfanslow@msn.com <kfanslow@msn.com>]
Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2013 4:05 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Subject: support bike lanes on Hyperion/Glendale bridge

I urge you in the strongest possible terms to support bike lanes as the Hyperion/Glendale bridge is widened. That the bridge is being WIDENED and the city sees no need to install bike lanes that were approved in the city's 2010 Master Bike Plan is truly appalling.
Traffic travels very fast on this street. Installing the bike lanes will not only provide a critical connector as the city expands its bike lane network, it will also make the street safer for all users including car drivers.
Far from being a "cyclist only" issue, installing bike lanes on the Hyperion/Glendale bridge is first and foremost a public safety issue.
Furthermore, as our fire department and police forces are stretched more thinly, as a city lets take a preemptive strike against the car crashes that plague this city and consume far too much of the fire department & LAPD’s resources and manpower.
Support bike lanes on the Hyperion/Glendale bridge now.
Sincerely,
K Fanslow
-----
Subject: Hyperion Ave Bridge
From: Robert deFerrante [mailto:rdeferrante@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2013 11:07 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Subject: Hyperion Ave Bridge

Ms. Podesta,

While the improvements to the Glendale Bridges are encouraging, the lack of a bicycle lane promised on the Hyperion Avenue Bridge means that instead of a smooth flow between the communities of Glendale, Hollywood, Silver Lake and Atwater, the city will have a hodge-podge of half measures that don’t get cyclists where they need to go in a safe and reasonable manner.

Please include bike lanes on the Hyperion Ave. Bridge!

Sincerely,
Robert deFerrante
Board Member, Pasadena Athletic Association
Pasadena, CA

--
"Be yourself. Everyone else is taken."
--Oscar Wilde
-----
Subject: 131004 0858
From: Jonathan Edewards <jedewards@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 25, 2013 12:26 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Subject: Bike Lanes must be added to Glendale-Hyperion Viaduct complex

Dear Tami,

I am writing to register my protest at the lack of bicycle lanes for the Glendale-Hyperion Viaduct complex.

If we are going to replace these bridges, we need to ensure conformity to the Bicycle Master Plan.

The Bicycle Master Plan calls for a dedicated (preferably protected, Class I) bike lane on the Hyperion Avenue Bridge.

Therefore, the EIR is not in accordance with the Bicycle Master Plan.

Please add protected bike lanes to all the bridges and roads that comprise the Glendale-Hyperion Viaduct complex.

The bridges must be re-built according to the best Complete Streets policies.

Jonathan Edewards  DOWNTOWN PASADENA NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION
507 S Madison Ave, Apt #5  Pasadena, California  cell (626) 676-3466  home (626) 529-3089
www.downtownpasadena.org

"Like" us on Facebook!

-----
Subject: Bike lanes are not appropriate for the Hyperion Bridge

Dear Ms. Podesta,

To address the concern of a bikeable link between communities east and west of the L.A. River and of a bike lane on the Hyperion Bridge in Atwater Village, Glendale Boulevard has had a Master Plan in place for over a decade, which did NOT include a bike lane, primarily for safety reasons. A few months ago, Atwater Village came to discover that the plan had been ignored through a 2010 vote by the Los Angeles City Council in favor of the a citywide bike friendly plan. This resulted in the unsafe bike lanes we now have on Glendale Boulevard: parked vehicles can and do open their doors into bikers in the bike lane, as the lane runs adjacent to the parallel parking on the northbound side of Glendale Boulevard.

Bike lanes are inappropriate on Glendale Boulevard, not only for this safety hazard but also because this route is designated for use by 18-wheel trucks making deliveries to grocery stores. Large trucks and bikes do not mix.

Glendale Boulevard now has bike lanes, but the bike coalition would have these lanes continue up and down the Hyperion Bridge. This is a recipe for disaster. The better southbound solution would be to continue the bike lanes on Glendale Boulevard, past Riverside Drive (UNDER the Hyperion Bridge) and up the hill to Rowena Avenue. This route just makes more safety sense. The northbound solution would take bikes on Glendale Boulevard from Rowena to Riverside Drive, across the freeway and L.A. River, and onward toward the city of Glendale.

Thank you for taking the time to read this letter.

Sincerely,

Lisa Waldner
Atwater Village Resident
Treasurer/Acting Secretary, Atwater Village Residents Association
Formation Committee, Atwater Village Neighborhood Council

-----
Subject: 131004 0903-1
From: Husseini, Salah
[mailto:Salah.Husseini@disney.com<Salah.Husseini@disney.com>]
Sent: Wednesday, September 25, 2013 2:59 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Subject: Hyperion/Glendale bridge

Dear Ms. Podesta,

I am a resident of Los Feliz and utilize the Hyperion/Glendale bridge every
day during my commute by bicycle to work. I am writing to strongly
encourage you to support the addition of bike lanes to the upcoming
renovation and improvement plan for this corridor. The bridge is quite
treacherous for bicyclists, particularly in the evenings, and the addition
of bike lanes would make a tremendous difference for my commute and that of
hundreds of other cyclists and pedestrians. Not only would this change
help bikers like myself, I also believe it would help connect the
neighborhoods of Atwater and Silverlake/Los Feliz by creating a more
walkable and bikeable area that families would be more willing to utilize.

Thank you for your consideration.

Best,

Salah Husseini
Senior Analyst
International Labor Standards
The Walt Disney Company
500 S Buena Vista St, Burbank, CA 91521-6706
Phone: 818-627-4576 | Tie Line: 8655-4576 | Fax: 818-627-4602
salah.husseini@disney.com

Please consider the environment before printing this e-mail.

This e-mail message is confidential, intended only for the named
recipient(s) above and may contain information that is confidential,
privileged, attorney work product or exempt from disclosure under
applicable law. If you have received this message in error, or are not the
named recipient(s), please immediately notify the sender at
1-818-627-4576 and delete this e-mail from your computer. Thank you.
Subject: 131004 0903-2
From: Alexander Moffat
[mailto:alexander.moffat@lacity.org<alexander.moffat@lacity.org>]
Sent: Wednesday, September 25, 2013 3:26 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Subject: Glendale Hyperion Bridges

Please, Please, Please put in BIKE LANES if you build any bridges anywhere - especially here. You have no idea how scary it is on a straight stretch of road (ie a bridge) with cars flying past and no bike lane.

- - Alexander Moffat
-----
Subject: Hyperion bridge

To: Tami.Podesta@dot.ca.gov
c:
bcc: info@la-bike.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All

Dear Ms. Podesta:

I am a pediatrician and cyclist who drives this route frequently to visit my patients at Childrens Hospital. While I have an interest in better traffic flow, I also believe that making more streets safer for cyclists will help this traffic flow, as more people feel safe to commute or travel by bicycle. I have friends that I cycle to meet in Silver Lake, but I dare not take this route. To be safe, I have to travel from Glendale across to the Equestrian Center, cross at Victory and take the bike path to Fletcher and up from there. I am a strong cyclist, but what about those that can't go many miles out of their way to cross the LA River?

Neither the Atwater/Glendale side of the bridge, nor the Silver Lake side are built to handle fast moving traffic. The traffic lights at either end make this untenable. It certainly might be a good idea to engineer the bridge structure for future considerations, at this time, with our current energy and environmental concerns, shouldn't LA be trying to encourage more bicycling? Therefore, the bridge should be built with the following considerations:
- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
- A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,
Richard H. Feuille, Jr., MD
Glendale, CA

-----
Subject: 131004 1351
From: Tom McMahon [mailto:tmcmahon@origprod.com]
Sent: Friday, October 04, 2013 8:05 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT; tom.labonge@lacity.org;
councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: Hyperion Bridge

Subject: No Hyperion Freeway – Build a Safe Viaduct for All
As someone who bikes or walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:
- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
- A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,

Tom McMahon
2101 Hollyvista Avenue
L.A., CA 90027

-----
Subject: 131004 1407
From: Allen MD, Warren [mailto:Warren.Allen@stjohns.org]
Sent: Friday, October 04, 2013 9:56 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: Hyperion Ave Viaduct

As the LA Times recently opined, Is LA ready to admit that non-motorists such as pedestrians and bicyclists have a legitimate right to safe transportation? I am worried that the recent preliminary plans for Hyperion are so car-centric that any other use for this critical thoroughfare would be impossible.

Now is the time to insure that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for non-motorists. Everyone's needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:
- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
- A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,

Warren M Allen, MD
1011 Pine St
Santa Monica, CA 90405-3923
-----
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All

As someone who bikes or walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:

- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
- A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,

Katelin Mitchell

-----
Subject: 131004 1408-2
From: Vahe G [mailto:vahe.gulyan@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, October 04, 2013 10:55 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All

As someone who bikes or walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:

- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
- A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,
Vahe G
505 A N. Normandie ave, los angeles, 90004
-----
Hi Tami,

I shared these comments with Councilmember O'Farrell's staff, and they suggested I pass them along to you for inclusion in the official record.

Can you confirm that you've received and processed these, and if there has been any consideration to the suggestions below, I'd love to hear it.

Thanks,
Alex

I run with my dog along the river quite often, and this morning I had an epiphany about an easy couple improvements that could be done as part of this project. They wouldn't cost much, and would really improve the pedestrian flow along the river.

I usually run along the east side of the River - the side closest to my house with no bikes! - starting from Fletcher and heading north. Once I get to the Red Car Park, there is no path to get under/over Glendale Blvd, so I tiptoe under the bridge on the uneven cobblestones OR I play human frogger to get across Glendale Blvd so I can go down the I-5 ramp towards Sunnynook Park.

There is also no pedestrian access from the river path to Glendale Blvd from the North. The east side of the River trail just dead ends into the side of the base of the bridge.

I think there are a couple improvements that would really encourage River access:
1. Add a path/boardwalk under the bridge that connects the east side river trail into a contiguous path. This could be a raised wood deck that leaves 7' of clearance under the bridge, maybe a couple lights, and a railing. Or you could pour some concrete to make a solid, flat area under the bridge.
2. On the north side of the Glendale Blvd bridge, along the east side of the River, they could add a simple stairway (7 or 8 steps and a railing) to let pedestrians get directly from the River path to Glendale Blvd.

Alex

-----
-----
Subject: 131004 1417-2
From: Ben Grangereau [bengranger@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, October 04, 2013 12:19 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: Hyperion Bridge
As someone who bikes, jogs, and walks between Silver Lake and Atwater
Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for
people like me. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed
for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I
would like the project to include:
Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and
pedestrians and discourage speeding
No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people
access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give
bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge
There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike
plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently
the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and
the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers
benefit.
A car-centric LA is an ideal of the past. Please make a Los Angeles
safer, more community-oriented city, not a place where cars fly
through neighborhoods at 55 mph. New construction project lend
themselves to making positive changes in our city, please don’t pass
up this opportunity!!
Sincerely,
Ben Grangereau
1811 Lucretia Ave. LA, CA 90026
-----
Subject: 131004 1417-3
From: ustrajem@gmail.com [ustrajem@gmail.com] on behalf of Christopher Lovejoy [lovejoy.chris@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, October 04, 2013 12:09 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All
As someone who bikes between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:
- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
- A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,
Christopher Lovejoy
2521 W. 5th St., Los Angeles, CA 90057
- Christopher
-----
Subject: 131004 1418
From: Trenton Strong [mailto:trenton.strong@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, October 03, 2013 3:48 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
    mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All

As someone who bikes or walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it
is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me.
Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate
speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project
to include:
   ·       Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
   ·       Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding
          signs
   ·       Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists
          and pedestrians and discourage speeding
   ·       No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive
          even faster
   ·       A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let
          people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give
          bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan
and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest
barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This
project can change that and make all travelers benefit.
Sincerely,
Trenton Strong
832 E. Edgeware Rd.
Los Angeles, CA 90026

--
t.s.
-----
Subject: 131004 1419-1
From: Juan Felipe Valencia [mailto:jfvalencia@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, October 03, 2013 3:03 PM
To: Podesta, Tami @DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: Please, No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All

Mrs. Podesta,

Please pardon my liberty to email you directly concerning the new plans that are being studied to rehabilitate the Hyperion-Glendale complex of bridges over the 5 Freeway and LA River connecting Silver Lake to Atwater Village.

As someone who bikes and walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. I bike everyday from my house to the LA River Bike Path through Fletcher because I’m afraid of being hit while crossing the Hyperion bridge.

Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community.

It would be ideal for the project to include:
1. Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave. This would require narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists (and pedestrians) and discourage speeding
2. Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with way-finding signs
3. No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
4. A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Thank you for your time.
Sincerely,
Juan Felipe Valencia
2449 Hyperion Ave.
Los Angeles, CA 90027
-----
Subject: 131004 1419-2
From: Benjamin Hyun [mailto:benjaminmhyun@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, October 03, 2013 2:46 PM
To: Podesta, Tami @DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All

As someone who bikes or walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:

- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
- A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,
Benjamin Hyun
4237 Longridge Ave, Unit 404
Studio City, CA 91604
-----
Subject: 131004 1420-1
From: neilbridge.uk [mailto:neilbridge.uk@googlemail.com]
Sent: Thursday, October 03, 2013 2:45 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
    mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All

As someone who regularly bikes and walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:

- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
- A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,
Neil Bridge, 2215 Baxter Street Los Angeles CA 90039
Subject: 131004 1420-2
From: Owen Gerst [mailto:gogerst@yahoo.com]
Sent: Thursday, October 03, 2013 12:40 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: Hyperion to Highway standards

Hello,
Are you aware that Los Angeles, at one point in it’s history, had the largest mass transit system in the entire world? As the story goes, the car and tire manufactures conspired to shut this system down so that they could sell more cars and tires, and this is why LA today is a Car-centric city.
I am writing you in regards to your your current plan to design Hyperion Ave to highway standards, and my thesis is that you are not being intelligent or thoughtful in your design criteria; you are just maintaining the corrupt status quo that benefits corporations and not the actual people who live in the city.
Recently the city redeveloped a path along the river that is both picturesque and functional; I both like it, and use it. In many ways this path is becoming it’s own “bicycle highway” because it is a safe way to travel long distances without the risk of getting hit by cars. I am an architect and artist, living in Lincoln Heights and I do not have a car. I use this path to get to many places, one of which is atwater village. For atwater village Hyperion is the logical exit ramp for bikes, yet your plan make this passage way inhospitable for bikes.
What is gained by designing it to car highway standards? A few people getting to their destinations by car a little sooner, but at the expense of making it more dangerous for bikers. Why? It seems to be a plan born out of thoughtlessness and lack of consideration for anything other than cars. As I said, I don’t have a car. I get around using the combination of my bike and the metro. I moved here from NYC where I developed this life-style and intend on keeping this life style. Part of why I choose to bike instead of drive has to do with an understanding of the larger world in which we live. The world dependent upon fossil fuels is in decline. The reason we have all these wars and problems with terrorism is because we depend upon fuel from the middle east. I don’t wish to be part of the reason for being in these countries and killing innocent people and destroying cultures. Beyond that, this way of living is simply unsustainable. The costs associated with driving are rising, making other transportation means more attractive to everyone. The architect in me understands that if LA wishes to be a vibrant city in the future it should stop being such a car centric-dinosaur, and get with the program. Cities should have a diversified portfolio of transportation options.
I’m happy with the metro and bike lane development that is going on, but by designing Hyperion to highway standards you are missing out on a opportunity to continue this development, and for the city to evolve naturally and change with the times. You are missing out on an opportunity to make LA a vibrant and diverse city of bikers, cars, and mass transit. You are a dinosaur if you do this.'
Sincerely,
Owen Gerst
-----
Subject: 131004 1421-1
From: Ezra Horne [mailto:ezrahorne@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, October 03, 2013 12:25 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: Tom LaBonge; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion "Freeway" - Build a Safe Viaduct for All Road Users

As someone who bikes or walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:
- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
- A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,
Ezra Horne
3944 1/2 Marathon Street,
Los Angeles, CA 90029

-----
Subject: 131004 1421-2
From: Hallstead, Jeff (KMNOW) [mailto:Jeff.Hallstead@kantarmedia.com]
Sent: Thursday, October 03, 2013 12:14 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.gov; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway--Wider Sidewalks and Bikelanes
As someone who bikes or walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it
is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave be made safe for people like me.
Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate
speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project
to include:
  Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
  Wide sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
  Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and
  pedestrians and discourage speeding
  No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
  A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people
  access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists
  an alternative through the dangerous merge
This project should be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete
streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe
bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can
change that and make all travelers benefit.
Jeff Hallstead
3159 Gracia St
Los Angeles CA  90039  (Atwater Village)
-----
Wake up, please. Bikes are here to stay. Your job may not be. As someone who bikes AND walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me.

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,
Jason Hadley
90039
-----
Subject: 131004 1423-1
From: Jason Brown [mailto:jasontbrown99@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, October 03, 2013 12:13 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: The Hyperion Viaduct ... Please read.

To all,

As a cyclist, I am concerned about the Hyperion Viaduct crossing. Increasing this city’s cycling infrastructure has the ability to relieve congestion, improve health among its citizens, and build stronger communities.

A common response I receive from people if I say I road from point A to point B is, "Wow, you’re brave." or "I would have never have thought to cycle there. Its dangerous." If more space were allocated for cyclists on our roads more people would be less intimidated of riding. We need bike lanes that connect with one another. My girlfriend and I love the Atwater farmer’s market. We ride from Echo Park to Atwater fairly often but what we dread is the crossing to get from Silver Lake into Atwater and vice a versa. We also have friends that live in Atwater and while we’d love to cycle over there for dinner parties and whatnot, the Hyperion crossing is just too dangerous at night. So we always drive if we know we are going to be there after sunset. The argument can be made that not a lot of cyclists take that crossing, so why adjust it for more cyclists? However, I truly believe that if the crossing were safer, there would be a significant change in the number of cyclists using the bridge. "If you build it, they will come." The change would result in more people cycling and fewer people driving.

http://www.youtube.com/watch?feature=player_embedded&v=pX8zZdLw7cs
Mikael Coville-Anderson on Infrastructure - He is an urban mobility expert with Copenhagenize Consulting

I have found that LA is a city where people work hard and for long hours. Many people don’t have time to go to the gym. Many people are aspiring to work in the film industry and essentially work two jobs just to get by. Or they may be taking care of their families once they get home from work. Studies have found that by engaging in moderate exercise on can reduce the risk of heart disease, stroke, diabetes, and cancer by up to 50%. Since our government is currently shut down because of looming issue of the cost of health care and who should pay for it, wouldn’t it be more cost effective to encourage more exercise? The side affects of exercise also give people more energy and can boost self-esteem. We could have more productive, happy people working and living in L.A.!

An article from the BBC from Ocober 1, 2013 on a recent study regarding the benefits of exercise and being healthy:
http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/health-24335710
The Hyperion Bridge was constructed in the late 1920’s. Without a doubt the crossing needs restructuring. However, with today’s population, congestion, and growing concern over our community’s health I plead with you to include bike lanes and sidewalks for pedestrians in the new plan. I agree with the LACBC’s request for the following:

- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
- A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

Sincerely,
Jason Brown
1708 Clinton St.
L.A., CA 90026
-----
Subject: 131004 1423-2
From: Kyle Woodward [mailto:klelandw@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, October 03, 2013 10:47 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
    mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: Build a safe viaduct for all!

To LADOT, Caltrans, et al. ---
As an Angeleno who bikes, walks, runs, takes mass transit, and --- yes!
--- even drives on Hyperion Avenue between Silverlake and Atwater Village,
I am concerned by the current plans to reduce non-automobile safety on the
Hyperion Viaduct. With limited river crossings, it is essential that the
available connectors take proper account of the fact that all transit from
one side of the river to the other must cross somewhere; as vibrant
sister districts, ensuring that the corridor from Silverlake to Atwater is
safe, controlled, and available to all transit modes is of the utmost
priority.

The viaduct renovation should and must include:

Bike lanes!
Widened sidewalks (the sidewalk under the bridge at the top of the
viaduct is a particular danger) and protected crossings (I challenge you to
try using the north sidewalk)
Speed-mitigation measures: there is no need to encourage reckless driving
with ridiculously large travel lanes

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan
and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest
barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This
project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,
Kyle Woodward (cyclist, commuter, jogger, and Costco/Trader Joe’s shopper)

4109 Normal, 90029

The mass transit options I am aware of avoid the viaduct, but the Glendale
Boulevard split at the base is unbelievably treacherous for pedestrians and
cyclists alike.
-----
Subject: 131107 0928  
From: Paul Romero [paul_romero818@yahoo.com]  
Sent: Saturday, October 05, 2013 1:27 AM  
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Subject: 
Dear Caltrans and BOE 
I am writing you today about the Hyperion bridge you guys are planning to do work on in Atwater Village. I read a artical saying you want to post a 55mph zone and I most say that is ABSOLUTLY DANGEROUS! I went to John Marshall High School and walking on that narrow side walk with cars flying by just inches away then having to cross the street at the bottom of the bridge, wait for it's safe to cross. I think it's a accdenten waiting to happen and I would hate to see young students having to go thru that. Then theirs the case of bikes going thru their. It's would be unsafe and unreasonable for cars to be going that fast when there are bicyclist going thru their. Just think about what would happen. There's a guy riding his bike, car is already at 55mph and all of a sudden he has to slow down/slam on the breaks. The driver might hit the guy then by that time since he's going so fast he would just go into the freeway and get away or he might stop causing the car behind him to hit him.  
I just see so many bad things that could happen if you put the speed at 55mph and I hope you guys come the sense that this idea is not the best for this street.

Sincerely,
Paul Joshua Romero

-----
Subject: 131107 0932
From: nancy wedeen [nanpsycle@icloud.com]
Sent: Friday, October 04, 2013 10:20 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org
Subject: Bicycle roads & streets
Hello ...

Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All
We bike all over the LA area. We need safe streets.
As someone who bikes or walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it
is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me.
Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate
speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project
to include:
  Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
  Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
  Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and
pedestrians and discourage speeding
  No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even
faster
  A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people
access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists
an alternative through the dangerous merge
There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan
and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest
barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This
project can change that and make all travelers benefit.
Please consider carefully. Bicycle routes and/or lanes improve
communities!
Sincerely,
nancy & richard
we noho wedeens
??
Cycle & Recycle
Mini Ipad
-----
Subject: 131107 0933-1  
From: Shannon ORourke [shannonorourke@me.com]  
Sent: Friday, October 04, 2013 10:30 PM  
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT  
Cc: councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; tom.labonge@lacity.org  
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway – Build a Safe Viaduct for All  
As someone who bikes or walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:  
   - Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.  
   - Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs  
   - Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding  
   - No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster  
   - A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge  
There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.  
Sincerely,  
Shannon O’Rourke  
2101 Hollyvista Avenue  
Los Angeles, CA  90027  

-----
Subject: 131107 0933-2
From: David P. Dapper [dpdapper@me.com]
Sent: Saturday, October 05, 2013 10:32 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; tom.labonge@lacity.org;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All
Dear Ms. Podesta,
As someone who bikes or walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it
is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me.
Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate
speeds through an urban community. Specifically, the project should include:

   Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
   Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
   Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and
   pedestrians and discourage speeding
   No crash barrier and banked turns that will only encourage people to
   drive even faster
   A full-width crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let
   people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give
   bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge
There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan
and Caltrans’ complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the
greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA
River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,
David P. Dapper
1155 South Grand Avenue
#1411
Los Angeles, CA 90015
-----
Subject: 131007 0934
From: Tomer Gurantz [tgurantz@yahoo.com]
Sent: Saturday, October 05, 2013 1:40 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All
As someone who bikes or walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone's needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:
  - Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
  - Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
  - Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
  - No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
  - A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge
There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.
Sincerely,
Tomer Gurantz
2009 Sierra place
Glendale, CA 91208
From: Eric Bruins [mailto:eric@la-bike.org]
Sent: Friday, October 04, 2013 9:26 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Subject: Glendale-Hyperion Project IS/EA comments

Tami,
Please find attached LACBC's comments on the Initial Study/Environmental Assessment for the Glendale Boulevard-Hyperion Avenue Complex of Bridges Improvement Project.
Should you have any questions, please do not hesitate to call.
Regards,
-Eric
--
Eric Bruins
Planning & Policy Director
Los Angeles County Bicycle Coalition
t: 213.629.2142, x127 / f: 213.629.2259
www.la-bike.org
Help build a better, bike-able L.A. County:
Become an LACBC member <http://la-bike.org/membership> today!
-----
Subject: 131007 1316-1
From: Keith Pluymers [mailto:kdpluymers@gmail.com]
Sent: Saturday, October 05, 2013 11:59 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All

As someone who bikes between Los Feliz, Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:
- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
- A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,
Keith Pluymers
4408 Russell Ave APT 1
Los Angeles, CA 90027
-----
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All

Dear Tami Podesta,

As someone who bikes or walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:

- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
- A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,

Jances Certeza
4445 1/2 Prospect Ave.
Los Angeles, CA 90027

-----
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All

Good morning to all who are reading this email. I hope your day is going well.

I am someone who bikes between Silver Lake and Atwater Village. I am writing to you today to show my agreement and to share my belief that it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me, and others who walk and shop in that area. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:

- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
- A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,

Joel A Lozada
1838 Winmar Drive
Los Angeles, CA 90065

-----
Subject: 131007 1318-1
From: todd wexman [mailto:twexman@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 07, 2013 6:53 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT; Tom LaBonge
Cc: councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; Tom LaBonge;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: Glendale/Hyperion bridge: Safe bridge for pedestrians and bikes too!!!

As someone who bikes or walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:

- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
- A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,

Todd Wexman

Todd Wexman
926 Tularosa Drive
Los Angeles, CA 90026
310/770-6211
twexman@gmail.com

-----
Subject: 131007 1318-2
From: Amy Chatfield [mailto:achatfie@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 07, 2013 9:11 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: Make Hyperion safe for bikers!

I bike between Silver Lake and Atwater Village about once a week (I live in
Franklin Hills). I would do this more often if there were a safe way to get
between the two communities. Currently I take my chances on Hyperion
Avenue; I was delighted to hear recently that this would be re-designed to
meet LA's future transit needs. However, I was entirely dismayed to learn
that the new plan does not include bike lanes, makes the sidewalk even
smaller, and does not include crosswalks.
It is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for bikers like
me and for pedestrians. Everyone's needs can be met if the project is
designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I
would like the project to include:
- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and
  pedestrians and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even
  faster
- A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people
  access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists
  an alternative through the dangerous merge
There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan
and Caltrans' complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the
greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA
River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.
Sincerely,
Amy Chatfield
-----
Subject: 131007 1319
From: Mary Belton [mailto:mbelton@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 07, 2013 11:17 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All
As someone who bikes or walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:
- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
- A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge
There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.
Sincerely,
Mary Belton
3454 Waverly Drive #5
LA, CA 90027
-----
Subject: 131007 1320-1
From: Michael Nicholls [mailto:mrmikenicholls@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 07, 2013 11:23 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All

Dear Ms Podesta-

As someone who bikes and walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave be safe for people like me. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through this urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:
- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
- A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,
Mike Nicholls
Ivanhoe School Parent
Silver Lake resident
Local business owner

-----
Subject: 131007 1320-2
From: Miles [mailto:wanuki@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 07, 2013 10:14 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
    mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All

As someone who bikes or walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it
is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me.
Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate
speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project
to include:

- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and
  pedestrians and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even
  faster
- A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people
  access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists
  an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike
plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the
greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA
River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,
Miles Hindman
1518 Talmadge St.
Los Angeles, CA 90027

-----
Subject: 131007 1343
From: Alex Moore [mailto:alex.charlotte@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 07, 2013 1:01 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org;
tom.labonge@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All

As someone who frequently bikes between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it
is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate
speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project
to include:
- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
- A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

Mayor Garcetti campaigned on a bike friendly platform and events such as CicLAvia highlight the desire for a more bike friendly Los Angeles. Simple changes such as a safe biking route between Silverlake and Atwater would increase the number of bikes on the road--leading to increased quality of life for all Angelinos.

Thank you,
Alex Moore,
841 Lucile Ave
Los Angeles 90026

--
alexcmoore.com
www.fantastic-heliotherapy.com/
-----
Subject: 131007 1618
From: J. Nordberg [mailto:look@t.hin.gs]
Sent: Monday, October 07, 2013 2:44 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org

Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All

As someone who bikes and walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:

- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
- A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,

J. Nordberg
Los Angeles, CA 90026

-----
Subject: 131008 0730
From: Kelly Marie Martin [kellym43@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, October 08, 2013 12:43 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All
Good Afternoon
As someone who bikes or walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it
is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me.
Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate
speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project
to include:
   Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
   Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
   Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and
pedestrians and discourage speeding
   No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even
faster
   A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people
access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists
an alternative through the dangerous merge
There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan
and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest
barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This
project can change that and make all travelers benefit.
Sincerely,
Kelly Martin
229 N. Union Ave.,
Los Angeles, CA 90026
-----
Subject: 131008 1324
From: Matt Roberson [mailto:maroberson@live.com]
Sent: Tuesday, October 08, 2013 9:55 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All

As someone who bikes or walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:

- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
- A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,
Matt Roberson
4210 Los Feliz Blvd, LA, CA 90027
-----
Subject: 131009 0814
From: Siobhan Dolan [mailto:siobhan.dolan@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, October 08, 2013 10:28 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; tom.labonge@lacity.org;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All

As someone who bikes out of Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. In Atwater, where I have lived for over 6 years as a homeowner, I only have two ways to get out of my neighborhood on my bike (Fletcher or Glendale). I have a RIGHT to use my bicycle as my transportation therefore I have a RIGHT to be SAFE on my roads.

Everyone's needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:
- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
- A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,
Siobhan Dolan
3112 Madera Ave
Atwater Village, CA 90039
-----
Subject: RE: Glendale Hyperion Bridge Proposal

Dear Tami Podesta,

I hope this finds you well.

Today I’m writing to express my profound disapproval and disappointment in the Glendale/Hyperion Bridge redesign proposal. Turning an already dangerous roadway - where cars speed and pedestrians must be intensely vigilant in light of reckless motorists (reckless in that many have no regard for crosswalks) - into a mini highway where cars are free to speed at an outrageous 55mph is a recipe for disaster. Not only a disaster in terms of lost lives, but also a disaster of missed opportunities - namely the opportunity to move Los Angeles forward with a unique design that embraces ALL ANGELENOS, not merely motorists.

As a patron of the Atwater Village area, I’d like to point out the high levels of foot traffic up and down Glendale Boulevard. Shops, cafes, and even the farmers market on certain days benefit from the sense of community and civic space our sidewalks and outdoor seating creates. Unfortunately, the bridge is monstrous obstacle that stops pedestrians right where they could be making a leisurely uphill trek into nearby Silver Lake. Why not create a bridge redesign that actively seeks a BETTER connection between these two neighborhoods? Instead of further dividing them with a mini highway.

While I understand we must make changes in order to protect our infrastructure from seismic damage, I sincerely hope you won’t sacrifice the future of Los Angeles in order to do it. Individuals in our fair city are increasingly giving up their automotive dependence, in pursuit of healthy and sustainable freedom on bikes or on foot. Please don’t look to the past for already failed "solutions." I strongly urge the Division of Environmental Planning to return to the drawing board and come up with a design that accommodates ALL ANGELENOS.

Thank you for your time,
Erich Bollmann

-----
Subject: 131009 0821-1
From: Kelly Thompson [mailto:kthompson1346@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, October 08, 2013 1:28 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All

Please keep our City moving forward!! Keep it safe, green and progressive.
Not the old Car Centric mindset. As someone who bikes or walks between
Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion
Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone’s needs can be met if the
project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community.
Specifically, I would like the project to include:
Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians
and discourage speeding
No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access
the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an
alternative through the dangerous merge
There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan
and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest
barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This
project can change that and make all travelers benefit.
Sincerely
Kelly Thompson
3916 West Point Place, LA, CA 90065

--
Kelly Thompson
Website - untitled54web.com/ <http://www.untitled54web.com/>
Blog - untitled54.blogspot.com/
Subject: 131009 0822-1
From: Emily Camastra [mailto:emilycamastra@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, October 08, 2013 1:50 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All

Dear Ms. Podesta,

As someone who bikes or walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:
· Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
· Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
· Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
· No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
· A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,

Emily Camastra
3138 Glenmanor Place
Los Angeles CA 90039

-----
Subject: 131009 0822-2
From: Aaron Lawrence [mailto:aaron.lawrence@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, October 08, 2013 2:33 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All

Greetings,

I am submitting my public comment in opposition to the current proposed configuration of the Hyperion Viaduct, as part of the Glendale Boulevard-Hyperion Avenue Complex of Bridges Improvement.

I own a home several blocks from the base of the viaduct in Atwater Village, and I drive or cycle the viaduct daily as part of my commute and when shopping/dining/socializing between Atwater Village and Silver Lake. This viaduct is a critical connection between these neighborhoods--one of only three really connections that cross both the river and the 5 freeway (Fletcher and Los Feliz Blvd. being the others). As both a driver and cyclist, I’ve been looking forward to a project that would finally fix design issues and rampant speeding that make the complex dangerous and difficult to navigate for all road users. But the existing proposal would, in many ways, make matters even worse.

By implementing a design speed of 55 mph, along with freeway design features like mega-sized lanes, banked curves, and a freeway crash barrier, the proposal would encourage even more dangerous speeding while ignoring a decade of community input demanding that the City do something to reduce the dangerous speeds on this bridge. These freeway-like elements have no business being forced onto a critical connection between two sleepy neighborhoods. The proposed design will dump freeway-speed traffic (going 55mph and higher) out into pedestrian-oriented streets made up of single family residences, restaurants, and boutiques. This proposal is totally inconsistent with the designation of Silver Lake and Atwater Village as Pedestrian-Oriented Districts. Rather than engineering the road to conform with the dangerous speeds driven by some drivers, the road should be engineered to calm traffic and slow dangerous drivers down.

By focusing only on how to move cars across the viaduct at the highest possible speed, the proposed design completely neglects and endangers others who want and need to use the bridge. Instead of including a bicycle lane and robust pedestrian accommodations in this major project, the proposal is to include a single sidewalk on only one side of the street, but with no safe way to access that sidewalk for those living on the other side of Glendale/Hyperion Blvd. Pedestrians will have no choice but to walk blocks out of their way or rush across many lanes of high-speed traffic to reach the single sidewalk. As for cyclists, the project documents claim that the proposal is "consistent" with the 2010 bike plan (which calls for a full bike lane on this route) because cyclists can ride on the shoulder
(!!!). I invite the planners of this project to try riding a bike on the shoulder up a steep incline next to 55mph traffic with no bike lane or separation and see if they still feel this way. Because this is one of only three routes connecting the neighborhoods, cyclists are left with no other options (other than some ridiculously circuitous routes--e.g.: http://goo.gl/30DyMv). This will ensure that only the most hardcore committed cyclists (or those without the means to drive) will walk or cycle between these neighboring vibrant pedestrian-oriented areas. Rather than design the bridge for everyone, in accordance with the complete streets requirements and the 2010 bicycle plan, the proposal prioritizes only the automobile (and the reckless speeding automobile instead of responsible drivers content with going the speed limit, at that). This is ridiculous.

It is clear that—if the emphasis is taken off of accommodating the highest speed traffic and instead placed on meeting the needs of all road users—there are many better options for a bridge redesign. Implementing lane widths consistent with a typical city street rather than a freeway and foregoing a freeway crash barrier leaves plenty of room for a wide sidewalk and bike lanes (even buffered/separated bike lanes), while discouraging dangerous driving instead of encouraging more speeding. I implore the City and Caltrans to consider the lane configuration proposed by the LA County Bicycle Coalition, which takes into account the character of the neighborhoods, the 2010 bicycle plan, and the complete streets policy, which makes the bridge accessible to all, which discourages reckless driving, and which does nothing to reduce car capacity. Additionally, I request that any redesign include the following:
- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
- A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge.

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

I should add that I do appreciate the inclusion of the proposed red car pylon footbridge, which will provide those south of Glendale Blvd. in Atwater with convenient recreational access to the LA River Bike Path (though without a complete crosswalk at the base of the bridge, this does not help those north of Glendale Blvd.). And I appreciate the inclusion of the partial crosswalk allowing access to the sidewalk for those north of Glendale Blvd. in Atwater with safer access to the sidewalk (though without a complete crosswalk at the base of the bridge, this does not help those south of Glendale Blvd.). Both of these address real needs, but neither confronts the greater problem that the Hyperion viaduct is the critical connection between Atwater and Silver Lake, and it needs to provide a safe
means of transportation between these neighborhoods for everyone, not just move cars back and forth at the highest possible speeds.

Thank you for the consideration.
Sincerely,
Aaron Lawrence
3138 Glenmanor Pl., Los Angeles, CA 90039

-----
Subject: 131009 0823
From: Danny Cohen [mailto:dco1@dco1.com]
Sent: Tuesday, October 08, 2013 3:13 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: Hyperion-Glendale Bridge
Hello,
I am a frequent driver of the Hyperion Glendale bridge, and would be
delighted to use a renovated bridge that reflects the realities of how
motorists are using it.
However, I am also a frequent cyclist of the Hyperion Glendale bridge who
would be even more delighted to use a bridge safe for humans, not just
cars. Perhaps a bridge with shade, sidewalks and bike lanes so I don’t feel
like I might be struck when I am struggling to get up that incline (I’m
getting better) or switch lanes so I don’t end up going into the freeway.
We need a bridge that reflects the realities that we want for the future,
not a bridge for cars today. I don’t want some mini-freeway shuttling cars
between two islands of communities, but a multi-modal connection allowing
for real humans to move around Los Angeles on a human scale.
Please reconsider the proposed plans for the Hyperion Glendale bridge
because, as citizens, we should be catering to each other as humans, not
cars. Thank you for your time.
Danny Cohen
Los Feliz Resident
-----
Subject: 131009 0826-1
From: Blair Miller [mailto:blairmiller1@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, October 08, 2013 3:36 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All
As someone who lives in Pasadena and works in Los Feliz, and who bikes to work occasionally, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:
   - Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
   - Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
   - Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
   - No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
   - A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge
There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.
Sincerely,
Blair Miller
Subject: 131009 0826-2
From: Haruna Madono [hmadono@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, October 08, 2013 11:15 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All
I live across the bridge from Atwater Village, and I am scared to death
every time I access Hyperion on my bicycle. Not only are the sideways
barely usable, but there is no viable crosswalk to give me access from both
sides of Glendale Avenue. As it stands, the cars race across like it's a
highway, and I am surprised that no one has been killed by now. Please make
the changes necessary so all of us can use it safely.
Best,
Haruna Madono
3120 Rowena Ave
Apt 2
Los Angeles CA 90027
-----
Subject: 131009 0838
From: matthew.mooney.53@my.csun.edu
Sent: Wednesday, October 09, 2013 1:08 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT

Subject: Hyperion bridge viaduct
I am someone who would love to use the Hyperion bridge but I do not for fear of being hit by automobiles that drive way too fast. Please in your proposal include bike lanes on either side of the bridge, wide pedestrian sidewalks on either side of the bridge, a place for bicycles to merge safely with traffic when coming in to Atwater and a complete crosswalk from the south side of Atwater to the bridge. I constructed a motion that passed just last evening to oppose the current proposal for this bridge. I desperately want Los Angeles to build more complete streets and move into the 21st century and remain a global competitive City. I respect your work so please take into consideration my suggestions.

Sincerely,
Matthew Mooney

-----
Subject: 131017 0815
From: Megan Wade [mailto:megan@skylightbooks.com]
Sent: Wednesday, October 09, 2013 12:15 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org; assemblymember.gatto@assembly.ca.gov
Subject: Hyperion Bridge Without Bike Lanes: Both Dangerous and Bad for Economic Development

To those with influence over the decision regarding the redesign of the Hyperion Bridge:

For the past year I have commuted by bike from Montrose to Los Feliz through Glendale. I chose not to use Los Feliz Blvd. for that commute because of the number of large trucks; nor do I use any of the currently marked bike/pedestrian infrastructure because of its complete inconvenience and the amount of time it adds on to my commute. Instead, I have used the Hyperion Avenue bridge, with the belief that one day there would be bike lanes and improved infrastructure and this commute would be much safer.

Now I have learned that new plans call for the bridge to be designed to allow for cars traveling at 55+ miles per hour. You can imagine my shock.

Personally, I am already in the process of moving out of the LA area because it has been so frustrating, in my years here, to try and navigate the city via bike and public transit. Yes, there are changes, but when I hear about 'improvements' like this, I can only feel vindicated in my decision to leave.

Still: I have friends and colleagues who will still be here, and that's why I'm writing. Because I encouraged them to give biking a try and recommended this route, and I would hope that in giving that recommendation I would not be putting them in danger. For their sake, as well as the sake of all the cyclists who in navigating those paths for the first time will think it natural to jump from the sharrows on Rowena to the bike lanes on Glendale in Atwater, do not let the project proceed without new, safer infrastructure for cyclists.

Furthermore, I strongly believe that improved cycling and pedestrian infrastructure on the bridge will be a boon for local business in both Silverlake and Atwater Village. There are currently amenities in both neighborhoods that are inaccessible by foot because of the unsafe conditions on that bridge, that would be within walking distance for residents on one side or the other. I believe that businesses in Atwater would see an increase in the number of visits from Silverlake residents, and those Atwater residents going to Trader Joe's or Gelsons would suddenly be able to do so by bike or foot, lessening the incredible congestion that exists in that area. In this way, I don't think that decisions about the design plan for the Hyperion Bridge should take into consideration only environmental or safety factors; an excellent design could greatly impact
the economic development of these areas long into the future.

As a resident of Montrose, I have seen first hand the positive impacts of a pedestrian-focused design for Honolulu Ave. on our downtown business district. It’s part of what makes Montrose such an amazing place to live, and what allows us to have so many wonderful small businesses. And as an employee of an independent business myself (Skylight Books, in Los Feliz) I certainly hope that you will take the health of such businesses into account when making decisions like this. So much of our business depends on foot traffic; so I truly think it’s a shame, anywhere, when high-speed car traffic destroys the opportunity for independent businesses to succeed.

I believe the LA County Bicycle Coalition and many other groups have put forward alternative designs for the bridge that are not only feasible but will protect the safety of all commuters and truly benefit both of these neighborhoods. I greatly encourage you to consider these designs over the current dangerous and ill-conceived car-focused proposal.

Sincerely,

Megan Wade
3921 1/2 Ocean View Blvd.
Montrose, CA 91020
-----
Subject: 131017 0819
From: Sanchez, Lawrence (CDPH-DDWEM) [mailto:Lawrence.Sanchez@cdph.ca.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, October 09, 2013 2:58 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Subject: Build a Safe Viaduct for All - No Hyperion Freeway - Glendale
Hyperion Complex of Bridge Improvement Project

Dear Tami Podesta, Branch Chief
Division of Environmental Planning
California DOT7

As someone who bikes, walks, drives and rides between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that the Glendale Hyperion Complex of Bridge Improvement Project be made safe for people like me. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. I attended project workshop on 9/25/2013 and was happy to discuss the project with all in attendance. Specifically, I would like the project to include:

1. Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave in accordance with the 2010 Los Angeles Bike Plan
2. Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with way finding signs
3. Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
4. No crash barrier and banked turns maximize bridge real estate for automobiles so people drive faster than necessary for the posted speed limits surrounding streets
5. A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge
6. Crosswalk ramp on both sides that facilitate bicycle traffic entering or exiting sidewalk
7. A crosswalk on the Rowena Ave, Silver Lake end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd., preventing jaywalking and improve pedestrian way finding
8. Minimize grating on the bridge which collects debris and creates a hazard for cyclists

There is enough room on the bridge to accommodate pedestrian & bike traffic better, & slow car traffic down to make it safer & more pleasant for everyone. There’s no point in allowing or encouraging drivers to speed up to freeway speeds to cover the short distance that these bridges span.

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and benefit all travelers.

Sincerely,
Subject: 131017 0821
From: Herb Agner [mailto:herbagner@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, October 08, 2013 10:11 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
    mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: Hyperion Bridge project
Ms Podesta,
I understand from LA County Bicycle Coalition that no bike lane is planned
in plans for the rehabbing of this ancient bridge, and that we need to
lobby you, city govt, etc for a public hearing to discuss. Safe and easily
accessible bike lanes along this corridor are essential, given the rapidly
growing car traffic in Silver Lake and Atwater Village. If we need a public
hearing to convince the powers-that-be of this, then consider this my
"lobbying" for that hearing. Thanks
Herb Agner
------
Subject: 131017 0919-1
From: Susannah Lowber [mailto:susannahlowber@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, October 09, 2013 8:23 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: NO Hyperion Freeway- Build a safe viaduct for all

As someone who bikes or walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. I travel this bridge two to five times a week and it is already scary as a cyclist with the current speed. Everyone's needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:

· Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
· Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
· Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
· No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
· A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,
Susannah Lowber
1326 Douglas St.
LA, CA 90026
-----
Subject: 131017 0919-2
From: ~rajni~ [mailto:rajnianne@yahoo.com]
Sent: Thursday, October 10, 2013 9:09 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All

As someone who bikes or walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Avenue be made safe for people like me. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:

- Bike lanes on Hyperion Avenue
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and to discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
- A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

-----
Subject: 131017 0920-1
From: Rebecca Joyce [mailto:rebeccaejoyce@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, October 10, 2013 8:52 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org;
councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All

As someone who bikes or walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it
is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me.
Rendering Hyperion inaccessible to cyclists forces me and many others to
ride on Los Feliz Blvd, which is far more dangerous than even the current
Hyperion crossing. I also frequent businesses on both sides of the bridge
and know that when traffic flows off the bridge at high speeds it makes for
dangerous crosswalks for several blocks in either direction. Everyone’s
needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through
an urban community.
Specifically, I would like the project to include: Bike lanes on
Hyperion Ave. Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding
signs. Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and
pedestrians and discourage speeding. No crash barrier and banked turns that
will make people drive even faster. A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end
of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of
Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous
merge.
There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan
and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest
barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This
project can change that and make all travelers benefit. I also request a
public hearing on this matter.
Sincerely,
Rebecca Joyce
1724 N Edgemont Street #416
Los Angeles, CA 90027
-----
Subject: 131017 0920-2
From: Gabriela Nuñez [mailto:nunez.gabriela@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, October 10, 2013 1:42 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Subject: tomlabonge@lacity.org, councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org,
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org

As someone who bikes or walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:

- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
- A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,
Gabriela Nunez
1130 Rossmoyne Ave. Glendale, CA 91207
-----
Subject: 131017 0920-3
From: Ben Guzman [mailto:ben.guzman23@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, October 10, 2013 5:01 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All

As someone who bikes or walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:
- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
- A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,

Ben Guzman
Historic Filipino Town

-----
Subject: 131017 0925
From: EsterNLenny@aol.com [mailto:EsterNLenny@aol.com]
Sent: Thursday, October 10, 2013 3:40 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Subject: Please, NO bicycle lanes on the Hyperion Bridge

To Whom It May Concern,

We have lived in the area close to the Hyperion Bridge since 1960 and have used the Hyperion Bridge for most of those years. As such, I am greatly concerned about the safety of everyone using the bridge, including the youth that use it going to and from John Marshall High School.

The discussion about the bicycle lanes on the Hyperion Bridge is important but the demand is demeaning. How can it ever be feasible to narrow the lanes on the bridge for car drivers, who count in the thousands as daily users, to give room to make a bicycle lane for maybe 100 users?

Has thought ever been give to car drivers as well as cyclists? And the flow of traffic? It has been noticed how car drivers slow down for bicyclists in the designated lanes, and this causes the flow of traffic to slow down and even to stop. But often cars have to slow down because so many bicyclists do not adhere to traffic lights nor to stop signs. In other words, what would make cyclists more dependable or safety-minded on the Hyperion Bridge than what has been observed on general roads in Glendale and Atwater Village? There is much to consider when making sure that safety is the first concern.

In addition, I don't understand how safe bicycle access on to and off of the bridge can be achieved. Two lanes need to be crossed to get on and off the bridge, which would make it VERY unsafe for both bicyclists and motorists.

This sounds like the tail wagging the dog, with the cyclists demanding change from the decision-makers and forcing their will on the neighboring communities. And this should not happen.

Thank you,

Evy and Jim Todd
-----
-----
-----
Subject: 131017 0934-2
From: longlegged.guy@gmail.com [mailto:longlegged.guy@gmail.com] On Behalf Of Aaron Sosnick
Sent: Thursday, October 10, 2013 5:31 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All

As someone who frequently bikes between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, I call on you to ensure that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for all.

Bike lanes were called for in the 2010 LA Bicycle Plan. It’s outrageous that rehabilitation plans for this complex totally ignore this plan.

Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:
- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
- A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,
Aaron Sosnick
2243 East Live Oak Drive
Subject: 131017 0939  
From: Alex Rixey [mailto:alexrixey@gmail.com]  
Sent: Thursday, October 10, 2013 5:46 PM  
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT  
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org  
Subject: Hyperion Avenue - Build a Safe Viaduct for All

As someone who travels between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Avenue be made safe for people like me. I regularly use the bridge both as a pedestrian and motorist, and would like to be able to bike across as well.

When training for the L.A. Marathon, I regularly cross the Hyperion bridge on foot en route from my home in Franklin Hills to the L.A. River Bike Path and Griffith Park beyond. In the bridge's current auto-oriented configuration, the sidewalk ends abruptly on the Atwater Village side in the middle of four lanes of fast-moving traffic, and requires me to cross at an unmarked location, creating an unsafe condition both for me and for motorists on Glendale and Hyperion. As a marathoner-in-training, I am able to make the sprint to the other side; it would be impossible for someone moving at comfortable or reduced walking speed or in a wheelchair to cross.

I also regularly patronize restaurants and businesses on Glendale Boulevard in Atwater village, and regularly travel to my gym just across the border in Glendale. I am an avid cyclist and would like to visit these businesses by bike: the short two miles from my home to Atwater Village should be a quick and pleasant bike ride. I regularly commute to Downtown on city streets and ride recreationally on PCH and Mulholland drive, but I do not feel safe on Hyperion Avenue. The unsafe biking environment leaves me no choice but to drive or risk serious injury or death. This results in my making additional vehicle trips that create congestion and pollution in my neighborhood.

I understand the need for motorists to cross the bridge. Even with better walking and biking facilities, I would continue to make some trips to Atwater Village and Glendale by car. However, safe walking and biking facilities would make it possible to walk, jog, and bike to Atwater Village, saving me money and improving my health while improving safety, reducing traffic congestion and reducing emissions for everyone in the community. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:

- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge. There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and benefit all travelers.

Sincerely,

Alex Rixey
1426 Talmadge Street
Los Angeles, CA 90027
Council District 4

-----
Subject: 131017 1029
Attachments: comment cards sept 25 mtg.pdf; _Certification_.htm
From: michael macdonald [mailto:michaels.macdonald@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, October 10, 2013 5:53 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
    mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe River Crossing for All Users

Ms. Podesta,
I write as a resident with great concern for the current plans to
reconfigure the Hyperion/Glendale viaduct crossing between Silverlake and
Atwater Village. The plans as presented appear to be out of sync with the
community character and intended use of this connection, as well as with
the City’s Bicycle Master Plan and modern urban roadway design standards.

Specifically, I would like the project to include:
- Protected bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and
  pedestrians and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier or banked turns that will encourage vehicles to drive
  even faster
- A complete crosswalk on the Atwater Village end of the viaduct to let
  people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give
  bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge.

The incorporation of a river crossing from the L.A. River Bike Path is not
sufficient to accommodate bicycle or pedestrians to commute between
Silverlake and Atwater Village. There is no reason for this project to not
be consistent with the bike plan, Caltrans complete streets policy, and
Federal Highway Administration routine accommodation regulations. The
viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the
5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and to the benefit
of all road users.

Sincerely,

Michael MacDonald
Subject: 131017 1049
From: michael culhane [mailto:michael_culhane@mac.com]
Sent: Thursday, October 10, 2013 7:31 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
    mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: Hyperion-Glendale complex of bridges over the 5 Freeway and LA
River connecting Silver Lake to Atwater Village
Dear Ms. Tami Podesta, Mr. LaBong, Councilmember Farell, and Mayor Garcetti,
I am concerned about the plans for the Hyperion-Glendale complex of bridges
over the 5 Freeway and LA River connecting Silver Lake to Atwater Village.
They are a death trap for any Bike trying to use them. PLEASE make sure
that a bike lane becomes part of the plan for each of them. Bike are the
future of LA and bike deaths will slow that progress.
Sincerely,
Michael Culhane
Subject: 131017 1055-1
From: Bill Clare [mailto:bill_clare@hotmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, October 10, 2013 9:07 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: Hyperion Bridge-bike lanes and sidewalks

Dear all,

I recently heard about the proposed changes to the Hyperion Bridge and was shocked by the plan. I lived in Atwater Village for a time and used to walk up the bridge to get to Trader Joe's. I was amazed at how unsafe it was for pedestrians. I also bike along it to get into Hollywood as there are not many alternate routes to get over there. Every time I ride over that bridge I fear for my life. I figured with a renovation on the way, the city would take the opportunity to make the bridge a way to bring the communities of Silver Lake, Edendale and Atwater together as well as connecting existing and planned bike paths. Instead you've planned to build the smallest freeway ever. Now is the time to bring the Hyperion Bridge back to it's former glory and let it help bring communities back together as well as add to the LA River beautification project.

Here is what the project should include:

- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
- A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,

Bill Clare
-----
Hello,

As a pedestrian who routinely crosses the Glendale-Hyperion Bridge on foot, I am very concerned with the proposal to retrofit the span. When I first heard the news there was a plan to upgrade the bridge, I was excited by the idea that maybe the bridge would become a safer, more pleasant span to cross on foot or bike. Then I saw the details of the plan. The plan expands the roadway to freeway standards (accommodating motorists who routinely drive over the speed limit at 55 mph) instead of calming the traffic along the road, and enforcing current speed limits (which would make the crossing safer for pedestrians and cyclists). This is a grave mistake and one I urge you to change. We have an opportunity to correct 50 years of auto oriented planning principles in Los Angeles and this plan, although well intentioned, only continues these mistakes and furthers our traffic problems. Removing a pedestrian sidewalk on the eastside and making no room for bikes in exchange for road expansion, higher speeds and freeway style road barriers is not the way to improve life for our community. I urge you to rethink the elements of the plan that take away from pedestrians to facilitate speedy motorists. 35 mph for this road is appropriate and by this sound clip, many of my neighbors think so too.

https://soundcloud.com/hyperionpubliccomment/what-is-the-design-speed-of

Thank you for your time,

Matt Diaz
-----
Subject: 131017 1055-3
From: Olivia Offutt [mailto:ooffutt@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, October 10, 2013 9:47 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All

As someone who bikes or walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:

- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
- A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,

Olivia Offutt
3400 Poly Vista
Pomona, CA 91768
-----
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All

As someone who bikes or walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:

- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
- A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,

Lawrence Rogow
Chairman

5670 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 1300
Los Angeles, CA 90036

(323) 904.4090 direct line / (323) 965.5411 fax
rogow@loop.com
-----
Subject: 131017 1057
From: SkiDaily@aol.com [mailto:SkiDaily@aol.com]
Sent: Friday, October 11, 2013 7:45 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway

Tell me it is NOT true that you are designing "improvements" to the
Hyperion Bridge over the L.A. River/I-5 Freeway without considering
and accommodating ALL users (cars, bicycles and walkers).

Tell me it is NOT true that you are designing "improvements" to the
Hyperion Bridge and ignoring the 2010 L.A. City Bicycle Plan which
designates the Hyperion Bridge for BIKE LANES.

What exactly was the purpose of having spent all the time and money to
develop a BIKE PLAN, if it is not going to be followed?

SHAME on you all for allowing this proposal to even be considered ... let
alone get this far.

Andy Miliotis, 10 year CCC Participant - since 2004 - and more until we
find a cure ...
600 S. Curson Avenue
#325
Los Angeles, CA 90036
(818) 384-5290 cell
Please join me in supporting the Arthritis Foundation in its efforts to
find a cure for "arthritis" and related diseases. Each year since 2004, I
have bicycled from San Francisco to L. A. as a way to honor my 100 year
old Mother who passed away on August 13th and had been suffering with
arthritis since age 28 and to raise money to help find a cure for the
40,000,000 Americans and 300,000 children (yes, this is not only an "old
person's" disease) with some form of Arthritis.
Visit www.californiacoastclassic.org for more info. Be sure to view the
"Camp Esperanza video". I have set a personal goal of raising
$20,000. Please help me reach this goal by DONATING
on line at our secure web site at http://afcabikeclassic.kintera.org/andy or
send a check to me payable to the "Arthritis Foundation". Thank you so
much for your generosity and support. Working together, I know we can make
a difference. Next ride takes place 9/28 - 10/5/13.

-----
Subject: 131017 1058
From: Rachel Bennett [mailto:rachelacbennett@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, October 11, 2013 9:04 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
    mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Consider public health, equity, and safety
    for all!

As a public health professional, urban planner, and someone who bikes or
walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical
that Hyperion Ave. be made safe ALL people. Everyone's needs can be met if
the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban
community. PLEASE CONSIDER PUBLIC HEALTH AND EQUITY IN THIS IMPORTANT
PROJECT! Specifically, I would like the project to include:
- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and
  pedestrians and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even
  faster
- A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people
  access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists
  an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike
plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the
greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA
River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit. Thank
you very much for your attention.

Sincerely,

Rachel Bennett
3360 Hamilton Way, Los Angeles, CA 90026

-----
Subject: 131017 1106-2
From: Melody Brocious [mailto:melodybrocious@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, October 11, 2013 10:13 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Subject: Build a Safe Viaduct for All - No Hyperion Freeway - Glendale
Hyperion Complex of Bridge Improvement Project

Dear Tami Podesta, Branch Chief
Division of Environmental Planning
California DOT7

As someone who bikes, walks, drives and rides between Silver Lake and
Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that the Glendale Hyperion
Complex of Bridge Improvement Project be made safe for people like me.
Everyone's needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate
speeds through an urban community. I attended project workshop on 9/25/2013
and was happy to discuss the project with all in attendance. Specifically,
I would like the project to include:

1. Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave in accordance with the 2010 Los Angeles Bike
Plan
2. Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with way finding signs
3. Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and
pedestrians and discourage speeding
4. No crash barrier and banked turns maximize bridge real estate for
automobiles so people drive faster than necessary for the posted speed
limits surrounding streets
5. A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people
access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists
an alternative through the dangerous merge
6. Crosswalk ramp on both sides that facilitate bicycle traffic entering or
exciting sidewalk
7. A crosswalk on the Rowena Ave, Silver Lake end of the viaduct to let
people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd., preventing
jaywalking and improve pedestrian way finding
8. Minimize grating on the bridge which collects debris and creates a
hazard for cyclists

There is enough room on the bridge to accommodate pedestrian & bike traffic
better, & slow car traffic down to make it safer & more pleasant for
everyone. There's no point in allowing or encouraging drivers to speed up
to freeway speeds to cover the short distance that these bridges span.
There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan
and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest
barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This
project can change that and benefit all travelers.

Sincerely,
Melody Brocious 900 east 1st street LA CA 90012
-----
Subject: 131017 1106-3
From: Tricia Robbins [mailto:tricia.d.robbins@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, October 11, 2013 10:17 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All

As someone who bikes and walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me.

Hyperion / Glendale is wide enough that it can be designed to accommodate pedestrians, bicyclists', and motorists needs at speeds appropriate for an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:

- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks on both sides of Hyperion / Glendale and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and to discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
- A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the Los Angeles bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,
Tricia Robbins Kasson
1952 Rodney Dr.
Los Angeles, CA 90027
tricia.d.robbins@gmail.com
(323) 552-3231
-----
Subject: 131017 1106-4 (Referenced as 131108 0855 in the Letter Comments Database)
From: daveedkapoor@gmail.com [mailto:daveedkapoor@gmail.com] On Behalf Of Daveed Kapoor
Sent: Friday, October 11, 2013 10:34 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Subject: Glendale Hyperion Bridge

I am writing to express my concern over the proposed retrofit of the Glendale Hyperion Bridge. I do not support the proposal. This bridge is a vital connection between Silverlake and Atwater Village, currently is a dangerous bridge to walk, bike or drive across & the proposed retrofit will make it even less safe for all users.

I dont support the median in the center or eliminating the sidewalk on one side - this is not historically compatible with the original bridge and it is a downgrade in terms of safety and quality of place.

I am appalled that there will be no bike lanes on the bridge - bike lanes were promised on this bridge as part of the bike plan, it is essential per Caltrans Complete Streets Policy (DD-64-R1) to provide for the mobility needs of bicyclists and pedestrians.

The proposed new ped/bike bridge on the river path does replace the function of bike lanes or sidewalks on the bridge itself. This new proposed ped/bike bridge does not connect directly to Glendale or Hyperion, in order to access this new bridge a user would have to take a dangerous circuitous path illustrated in the attached map sketch. Also there already is the Sunnynook Ped/Bike bridge just 1000 to the north so there is no real added function with this new bridge.

I urge the Department of Transportation to require this proposed bridge modernization project to be re-designed to accommodate all users. Bike and Ped access must be maintained and modernized.

Thank you.

daveed kapoor 323 252 8510 california architect C32812
-----
Subject: 131017 1107
From: easwaran@gmail.com [mailto:easwaran@gmail.com] On Behalf Of Kenny Easwaran
Sent: Friday, October 11, 2013 10:33 AM
To: councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org; Podesta, Tami L@DOT; tom.labonge@lacity.org
Subject: Hyperion Ave

I'm sure you're getting plenty of messages about the importance of the Hyperion Ave viaduct for cyclists and pedestrians wanting to cross the LA river, and the 5 freeway. But you should also note that no matter how many bridges you build across the river and freeway, it's still quite difficult to get from the neighborhoods of Silver Lake and Los Feliz down to Riverside Dr. The ridge line of the hills is just as much a barrier as the freeway and the river. Glendale Blvd is not yet usable by cyclists and pedestrians, and Los Feliz Blvd is nearly as bad. Hyperion is the best chance for a straight route, connecting to the bike lanes on Griffith Park Ave, and the neighborhood bike route on St. George St.
There is plenty of space on the bridge for 8 feet width of protected cycletracks next to the protected sidewalk, if the traffic lanes are 11 feet wide instead of 12 and 14. If the worry is that cars are going too fast for 11 feet to be adequate safety, then we need design features that psychologically encourage drivers to proceed at a safe speed, rather than design features that encourage them to speed up even more.
From my house just off Fountain Ave, at the foot of Hyperion Ave, I am much more likely to bike the three miles into Hollywood, or the five miles into Downtown, than the two miles into Atwater, because the bridge is scary, and no better alternatives exist to crossing the three barriers of the ridgeline, the freeway, and the river.
Please make this bridge safe and usable for all!
Kenny Easwaran
-----
Subject: 131017 1109-1
From: bergstressers@sbcglobal.net [mailto:bergstressers@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Friday, October 11, 2013 12:10 PM
To: councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org;
Podesta, Tami L@DOT; tom.labonge@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway!

Councilmembers O-Farrell, LaBonge, Mayor Garcetti and Ms. Podesta -

As someone who bikes and walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me.

Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community.

Specifically, I would like the project to include:
- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
- A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy! The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,

Judy Bergstresser
1945 Meridian Ave.
South Pasadena, CA 91030
-----
Subject: 131017 1109-2
From: James Todd [mailto:james@uxd.com]
Sent: Friday, October 11, 2013 11:29 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Subject: Glendale Blvd. - Hyperion Ave. Complex of Bridges Improvement Project

Dear Ms. Podesta,

When I heard of this project many years ago, I was very apprehensive as to what would become of the historical bridge. I know it needed earthquake retrofitting, but at what cost?

I see all of the fine work the engineers through diligence and community input have accomplished with their plans, very impressive.

To see now at the eleventh hour, how a group of purported outsiders seem to be throwing a wrench in the project is disgusting. All of this work to be put in jeopardy for the addition of a bike path? This doesn’t sit well with me.

Growing up in the area (Elysian Heights) and having lived in Glendale for a number of years before returning to Elysian Heights, I have travelled this bridge complex in one aspect or other since as long as I can remember, often several times in a day. I can tell you from common experience, this is no sane place for a bike path. It is simply too dangerous and to make it somewhat safe, well there goes the whole project in my opinion:

1. Narrowing the lanes would do nothing but make it more dangerous for both motorists and cyclists.
2. Removing the median barriers would make it less safe for drives as well (imagine driving on the I-5 without a divider).
3. The cost is simply not worth reworking or scrapping the time, energy and money already invested in this project.

And finally:

4. How many of these bicyclists have ever or would ever use this?

I see a simple solution in widening the pedestrian crossing over the river using the existing Red Car piers. This would not only be a cheaper solution, but a much safer one at that and a chance to repurpose part of old Los Angeles. If this is not an option financially, cyclists can be instructed to walk their bicycles across the path ensuring the safety of pedestrians. This has been done for many years in Venice Beach as cyclists must walk through the vendor lines section of the boardwalk or take the alternate bike path closer to the water.

I hope you consider the opinion of a local resident.
Regards,

James Todd
Elysian Heights resident

-----
Subject: 131017 1110-1
From: Marianne Vogel Bender [mailto:mariannebender12@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, October 11, 2013 11:13 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: Tom; Mayor; Ofarrell
Subject: IMPORTANT!!!!Hyperion Freeway - Build a SAFE Viaduct for All

As someone who walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:

- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
- A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,
Marianne Bender
3214 Perlita ave la ca 90039

Marianne Vogel Bender
PRODUCER/DIRECTOR
Los Angeles, CA
m 215.262.8892
mavtv@roadrunner.com
Bendercreativegroup.com
-----
Subject: 131017 1111
From: Evy Todd [mailto:evy747@yahoo.com]
Sent: Friday, October 11, 2013 2:21 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Subject: NO Bike Lanes on Hyperion Bridge - SO VERY UNSAFE!

10/10/13

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN;
I was extremely concerned and dismayed to hear of possible alterations to
the renovation plans for the Hyperion Bridge.
The Bridge does NOT need bike lanes, forcing it to become narrower and
possibly removing the center divider.
While I applaud their efforts in most cases, and acknowledge their right to
speak of their desires, I don’t appreciate the bike lane advocates not
granting me the same courtesy, in their apparent unwillingness to see other
points of view in return.
There are certain realities in life. Dealing with the finite, physical
dimensions of a historical bridge is one of them.
Another reality is safety. Unfortunately, on this topic, I know of which I
speak.
I went to John Marshall High School in the ’70s and there were constant
stories of accidents on the Bridge including head-on collisions.
In the ’80s, I and a friend came upon the site of an accident on the
Bridge, late one night. A motorcyclist had been forced onto the side and
was down. A semi-truck had stopped to help but his radio wasn’t working.
We ran home, called 9-1-1, grabbed aluminum foil (to act as a reflector for
cars) and a blanket. We got back and did what we could until help
arrived. However, before it did, the motorcyclist literally died in my
hands. This is not the kind of thing that one forgets.
A center divider on the Bridge is most assuredly needed!
I have heard that the bike lane advocates suggest making lanes smaller and
that that will slow traffic speeds down. No. No it won’t!
Has any one of them driven the Pasadena (Arroyo Seco) freeway lately? It
has the narrowest lanes of any stretch of freeway in the greater Los
Angeles area, and yet people speed merrily along, breaking the speed limit,
every day.
These plans have been developed over YEARS. To come in at the 11th hour and
expect to have their desires met is unrealistic and smacks of entitlement.

For the safety of all, please leave the lanes the same width, add a center
divider, and do NOT add bike lanes to the bridge. In this case, THE
NEEDS OF THE FEW DO NOT OUTWEIGH THE SAFETY NEEDS OF THE MANY!
Thank you for your time!
Evy Todd
-----
Subject: 131017 1115
From: Judy Korin [mailto:judy@seesawstudios.com]
Sent: Friday, October 11, 2013 2:42 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway -- Build a Safe Viaduct for ALL!!

Dear Ms Podesta, Council Members and Mayor Garcetti,
As someone who has had their office at 2959 Glendale Blvd, the last
building in Atwater before the Hyperion bridge, and as someone who bikes
AND walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, I can attest to the
importance of this critical link across the LA River between our
neighborhoods. I have observed Marshall High School students walking and
crossing perilously at both sides of the bridge, while cars come hurtling
down the Boulevard at freeway speeds without regard for pedestrians or
cyclists.

It is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like
me, but especially for our high school students. Everyone’s needs can be
met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban
community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:
- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and
  pedestrians and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even
  faster
- A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let
  people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd and give
  bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan
and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest
barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This
project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,
Judy Korin
3828 Valleybrink Rd
Los Angeles, CA 90039

--
Judy Korin
Creative/Director/Founder
Seesaw Studios
tel: 323.646.7747
e: judy@seesawstudios.com
www.seesawstudios.com
  balancing content and branding
-----
Subject: 131017 1130
From: Wes High [mailto:weshigh@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, October 11, 2013 2:43 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
    mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: VisionHyperion!-No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All

I'm a resident of CD13 and think that the current plants for the retrofit of the Hyperion viaduct are a bad idea and will hurt the livability of all the communities surrounding it. There is no reason that the bridge should be designed for 55mph auto travel.

This bridge needs to have bike lanes, as well as great pedestrian access(wide side walks, cross walks etc.) This bridge connects to very walkable and bike heavy neighborhoods. Its a waste of infrastructure to design this bridge to increase auto traffic speeds for .5 miles, where that high speed traffic will then dump into pedestrian heavy areas. That is just asking for people to get run down and killed. I would like the project to include:

·       Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
·       Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
·       Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
·       No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
·       A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

CD13 Resident
Wesley High
1425 Lucile Ave
Los Angeles, CA 90026
----
Subject: 131017 1132-1
From: Allison Amon [mailto:aamon@chelsea.com]
Sent: Friday, October 11, 2013 3:00 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org; Paul Franceschi
Subject: Hyperion in Atwater

Dear Tami,

I am a long time Silverlake resident (20 years) with two children and a husband who all are avid bicyclists and walkers. I am very concerned about the upcoming project that would turn yet another Silverlake street into a high speed freeway.

I am writing to you about the proposed project that would rehabilitate the Hyperion- Glendale bridges over the 5 freeway and the LA River. I am unclear and unhappy that the project does not include the bicycle lanes that were planed for in the 2010 plan. Please consider changing the current plan to include them.

Specifically, I would like the project to include:

· Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
· Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
· Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
· No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
· A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,

Allison Amon
2388 Kenilworth Ave
Los Angeles, CA 90039

-----
Subject: 131017 1132-2
From: Alice Rutherford [mailto:alice.rutherford@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, October 11, 2013 2:52 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All

I've recently moved to Rowena Avenue in Los Feliz after living in Echo Park for 8 years. As someone who now bikes and walks frequently between that area and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. I drive my car across that bridge frequently as well but I know that everyone's needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:
- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
- A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

I'm really looking forward to better bike and pedestrian infrastructure in my new neighborhood. Please help this become a reality!
Sincerely,
Alice Rutherford
3358 Rowena Ave #1
Los Angeles, CA 90027

Alice Rutherford
ILLUSTRATION & DESIGN
Los Angeles, CA
alicerutherford.com <http://www.alicerutherford.com/>
Subject: 131017 1133-1
From: stephenmarshallbox@gmail.com [mailto:stephenmarshallbox@gmail.com] On Behalf Of Stephen Box
Sent: Friday, October 11, 2013 11:37 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: Rachel Horst
Subject: Glendale Blvd-Hyperion Ave Bridge Comments

Tami,

I understand that the deadline for comments on the Hyperion-Glendale Bridge is today.

I offer these comments and request the opportunity to contribute additional comments in the future.

1) Those in charge of this project will be exceeding their authority if they restrict access to one mode while allowing access to other modes during the construction project. If motor vehicles are permitted during construction, then pedestrians and cyclists must also be permitted. The State of California has been very clear in the CAMUTCD on the many options available for accommodating all modes during construction, and also very specific on behavior that is prohibited, including engineered conflict and mode restrictions.

2) The bridge, as proposed, is inconsistent with LA’s 2010 Bike Plan, which specifies bike lanes. The Initial Study says that it is consistent but fails to demonstrate that consistency. The Bike Plan calls for Bike Lanes and the Initial Study has no Bike Lanes. They are inconsistent.

3) The Initial Study includes inconsistencies such as referring to a widened sidewalk but being unable to specify if it is 8' or 7'. Both numbers are used.

4) Optimum capacity would be reached with speeds of 30-35 so increasing the speed of traffic with enhancements that favor motor vehicle speeds are not improvements, but actually defects that work against pedestrian safety, cyclist safety, and motorist safety. In addition, it results in a loss of efficiency for all modes.

5) Removing a sidewalk and offering in its place a crosswalk supported with a flashing beacon is no solution at all. Flashing beacons are no match for speeding traffic that requires sufficient distance to safely stop. This is simply engineered conflict.

6) At best, the accommodations during construction and the resulting infrastructure for pedestrians and cyclists appear to be afterthoughts, not a commitment to multi-modal and certainly not an improvement.

Thanks for the opportunity to comment and to point out that to proceed at
this point would be to exceed your authority.

Stephen
Stephen

Stephen Box
Director of Outreach and Communication
Senior Project Coordinator
Department of Neighborhood Empowerment
200 N. Spring Street, Suite 2005
Los Angeles, CA 90012
Downtown Office: (213) 978-1551
Downtown Fax: (213) 978-1751

Website <http://EmpowerLA.org> | Facebook <http://facebook.com/EmpowerLA>
| Twitter <http://twitter.com/EmpowerLA> |
| YouTube<http://youtube.com/EmpowerLA> |
| Newsletter<http://archive.constantcontact.com/fs005/1105232878764/archive/1109985657054.html>

Register now <https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/NCBudgetDay2013> for
the October 26 Neighborhood Council Budget Day
Empower Yourself. Empower Your Community. Empower LA.
-----
Subject: 131017 1133-2
From: Caleb [mailto:anago55@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Friday, October 11, 2013 3:35 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.com; mayor.garcetti@lacity.com
Subject: Hyperion Avenue Project

As someone who bikes or walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:

- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
- A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,

Caleb R. Nelson
2929 Waverly Dr. 110
Los Angeles, CA. 90039
-----
Subject: 131017 1134-1
From: casey caplowe [mailto:casey@goodinc.com]
Sent: Friday, October 11, 2013 3:36 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All

Hi,
As someone who bikes and walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:

- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
- A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,
Casey Caplowe
1447 Avon Terrace
LA, CA 90026
---
Subject: 131017 1134-2
From: Kimberly Greenhut [mailto:kimproduces@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, October 11, 2013 3:22 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All

As someone who bikes between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. I also bike regularly from my home in Los Feliz to the LA River. Currently, I have to use Los Feliz Blvd, which I despise due to the heavy traffic and very busy intersection at Los Feliz and Riverside. I would love an alternative.

Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:

- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
- A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

I would also like to add that putting a major thoroughfare in a neighborhood disrupts the cohesion of the community. Let’s make L.A. a more community friendly and livable city by building infrastructure that serves everyone.

Sincerely,
Kimberly Greenhut
4448 Melbourne Ave.
Los Angeles, CA 90027
415-260-6879
-----
Subject: 131017 1243-2
From: Mary Abler [mailto:mary.abler@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, October 11, 2013 3:39 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All!

Hello!
As someone who bikes and walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. I volunteer at a food/art space in Atwater and live in Silver Lake. When I bike home at 11 PM, after my shift, my coworker insists on following me, slowly, in his car, convinced that Hyperion is completely unsafe for me to bike on that late at night. Of course, I have bike lights and I travel at a safe speed, but he is right!
Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:
· Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
· Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
· Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
· No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
· A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge
There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.
Sincerely,
Mary Abler
1720 N Dillon St, 90026
-----
Subject: 131017 1244  
From: Bradley Cleveland [mailto:bfcleveland@gmail.com]  
Sent: Friday, October 11, 2013 3:40 PM  
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT  
Cc: mayor.garcetti@lacity.org  
Subject: Hyperion Viaduct  

Ms Podesta,  

I’m a frequent biker on the streets of LA, and I’m writing to urge you to design the Hyperion Viaduct so it is safe for people who bike or walk between Silver Lake and Atwater Village. Specifically, I would like the project to include:  
· Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.  
· Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs  
· Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding  
· No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster  
· A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge.  
Please ensure this project to consistent with the LA bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The changes listed above will transform the viaduct into a safe bike and pedestrian route across the 5 Freeway and the LA River.  

Sincerely,  
Bradley Cleveland  
1907 1/2 Whitley Av, LA 90068  
-----
Subject: 131017 1245-1
From: Joe Andrews [mailto:andrews@earthlink.net]
Sent: Friday, October 11, 2013 3:42 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: Rehabilitation of Hyperion Bridge

Ms. Podesta:

This email requests that in any plan to rehabilitate the Hyperion Bridge, that you give consideration to bikes, walkers, and even dog-walkers, and not just to automobiles. The current plan fails to do so, and in doing so, is part of the problem, not the solution, to making Los Angeles an even better place to live. Also, it is not clear that the plan properly factors in Hyperion Avenue’s history of carnage – it was not that long ago that the stop light was placed on Hyperion in front of Trader Joe’s, and only after at least one person had been killed at that intersection.

I live in the Franklin Hills area, and very often use the Hyperion Bridge between Silver Lade and Atwater Village. Many Sunday mornings, walking the dog, I take the stairs from Riverside Drive next to the Hyperion Bridge that end on the Silver Lake side of the bridge. I try to ride my bicycle in the area as well.

Please make Hyperion Avenue safe for all of us – not just cars, but the bikers and walkers as well. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:
- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Speed limits consistent with city driving, not freeway driving;
- Well-marked crosswalks;
- Sufficient space for multi-use, including safe use by bicyclists and walkers (sufficient walk-ways, bike lanes, etc)
- A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the existing bike plan and Caltrans’ complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

I have copied Tom Labonge and others, because Tom is not only a bicycler (leading trips in his district) but also a dedicated walker and hiker. Tom is a strong supporter of his constituents and of their quality of life. Help us on this one, Tom.

Sincerely,
Joe Andrews
3871 Franklin Ave.
Los Angeles, CA 90027
-----
Subject: 131017 1245-2
From: Joe Hogg [mailto:joseph.hogg@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, October 11, 2013 4:13 PM
To: Podesta, Tami @DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: Build a Safe Viaduct from Silver Lake to Atwater on Hyperion for all users of public roads.

As someone who bikes and walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me and all members of the public. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through this urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:

- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with way-finding signs

- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and to discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
- A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

This project should be consistent with the LA’s bike plan and Caltrans’ complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe pedestrian and bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and benefit all travelers if the recommendations outlined above are considered and implemented.

Sincerely,
Joe Hogg
2467 Hidalgo Avenue
Los Angeles, CA 90039
-----
Subject: 131017 1246
From: William Campbell [mailto:wildbell@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, October 11, 2013 4:51 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: I’m Hyper Over Hyperion

As both a life-long cyclist in Los Angeles and a 10-year resident of Silver Lake, the Hyperion Viaduct has been a regular connector on bike routes to and from Atwater Village, Elysian Valley Glendale, Burbank, and the San Fernando Valley. It’s certainly not the safest place to ride or walk as it is, but I manage.

From what I hear now plans are being proposed to make it even less manageable, and it is inconceivable that any upgrade to such a vital link to so many communities seem designed to make it even less of a safe place to walk and ride.

It is completely hypocritical that after the implementation of a "road diet" on a section of nearby Rowena now the bridge is in danger of being turned into what amounts to be an environment that is hostile to pedestrians and cyclists.

I encourage you to promptly demand the plans be revisited and revised so that they are inclusive to all modes traveling over and under the viaduct and not exclusive, with consideration being made for the following:

- Bike lanes on Hyperion Avenue
- Wider sidewalks and marked crosswalks with wayfinding signage
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
- A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to be inconsistent with the city’s bike masterplan and Caltrans' "Complete Streets" policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the Los Angeles River. Making it less safe is not the answer. This project shouldn’t change the bridge to benefit motorists to the detriment of cyclists and pedestrians. It should change the bridge to be of benefit all modes of transportation.

Sincerely,
William Campbell
840 N. Occidental Blvd
Los Angeles, CA 90026

-----
Subject: 131017 1304
From: Gilbert G. Gutierrez Jr. [mailto:gilbergg@usc.edu]
Sent: Friday, October 11, 2013 4:55 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: coram.paribus@gmail.com; tom.labonge@lacity.org;
councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: Hyperion Bridge

Respectfully:

I am a cyclist. I am also a community member (live in Koreatown, work in University Village, play in DTLA and Hollywood). I am a tax payer, voter and, most importantly, a father, brother, and son. I do not ride to Atwater Village or Eagle Rock or any other Los Angeles neighborhood north of the river due to the poor infrastructure. What do I mean by poor? I mean no separation from auto traffic, no painted bike lanes, little to no signage, really no meaningful consideration whatsoever for anyone other than the motorist. I am writing this brief note to express my dismay with the current plans for the Hyperion Bridge. The bridge could be a key link between Los Feliz, Silver Lake and the aforementioned neighborhoods.

I do not want freeway style median barriers on the bridge. I do not want to be shooed off onto some isolated bike-ped bridge. I do not want cars to be sped up, but rather slowed down. It is sad and frustrating because I should not have to plead for safety nor think of it as a ‘want’. This project needs to be totally rethought or rejected.

Let me just go ahead and reach for the stars: ideally, there would be a physical barrier ie K-rails placed on either side of the bridge between the wide sidewalks and the traffic lanes to cordon off the protected bike lanes crossing the river. This is likely not going to happen. Why not? Because it is perceived to be highly politically risky and would take real leadership. Should politics trump safety? Even Type II painted bike lanes, as many other advocates are calling for, are not part of the plan as presented. Type II bike lanes across the river should be the bare minimum. They should be a no-brainer slam dunk.

Widening travel lanes only encourages speeding by motorists and with the bike-ped bridge being built in such a non-obvious manner to anyone traveling on Hyperion by bike, cyclists will continue riding over the bridge. Only after this project, the bridge will be more dangerous to them.

Please, please, please rethink this project with the needs of cyclists and pedestrians also in mind and do NOT build this project as was presented at the community meeting on September 25, 2013. Thank you.

--

Gilbert G. Gutierrez, Jr.
Senior Library Assistant, Acquisitions
USC Libraries  UVI-A
Subject: 131017 1305
From: HEALYDESIGN@aol.com [HEALYDESIGN@aol.com]
Sent: Saturday, October 12, 2013 12:12 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Subject: Re: Hyperion Bridge redesign
Hello Ms. Podesta

I have been a resident of this area for 30 years and use the bridge often. Where the bridge ends, east bound, is a signal at Glen Feliz. There has always been a bottle neck there as cars turn either left to enter Atwater Village or make a U turn to go west from the north bound 5 freeway, Glendale Bl exit (one can only turn east from that exit ramp). One left hand turn lane is dedicated for all this traffic and the lane is always backed up into one of the lanes to its right, stopping that lane of traffic as well. Drivers are required to wait through two or even three lights, at times, to make the turn. This is not just a rush hour concern, it happens throughout the day.

One lane dedicated for U turns and another for left turns would help but the way the bridge ends on the east and melds into Glendale Bl. doesn’t leave room to do that now. The eastern portion of the bridge needs to be redesigned to allow for a better flow of traffic.

I sincerely hope this issue will be address by the engineers as the bridge is redesigned.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment about the bridge issues facing the people living in this community.

Susan Healy

-----
Subject: 131017 1307-1
From: Aaron Kuehn [aaron@aarline.info]
Sent: Saturday, October 12, 2013 1:37 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: Glendale-Hyperion Viaduct / Bridge - Misguided Plans
Dear Ms. Podesta,
I was a bicyclist, motorist, and pedestrian in LA for 20 years, and I created landmark bicycle safety campaigns for the City of LA, and worked hard to pass the current bicycle plan so that future changes to the street scape will result in a more livable city. I traveled back and forth on the Glendale-Hyperion Viaduct / Bridge many times. It is a beautiful historic span connecting two of the most vibrant and walkable communities in the region. The view as you descend the bridge into Atwater is breathtaking and unique, and should be a joyful experience for all users.
Instead, it is currently a horrific gauntlet run for cyclists and pedestrians, and even motorists have a very hard time safely crossing the many lanes of divergent traffic. It is my understanding that several motorists have died on this bridge in the past decade. Business owners on the Atwater side tell stories of frequent high-speed collisions. As a cyclist, I have been subjected to more harassment from motorists on this bridge than anywhere else in LA, and I fear for my life every time I ride up the ramps of this bridge. As a pedestrian, I am perplexed how to even get across.
The LA traffic engineers’ solution to raise the speed of traffic, ignoring the longtime pleas of the community to slow the lethal mess down is insulting and foolish. This flagrant irresponsibility of LA traffic engineers is a principle reason I moved my business and family this summer to a different city.
The city where we live now is building a very similar replacement high-traffic viaduct / bridge. This bridge, however, will feature in each direction, 12’ wide shared-use sidewalks, a bicycle lane, and a single motorized travel lane ( Read more about it here: http://www.sellwoodbridge.org/?p=project-area ). Forward-thinking design that responds to community input is more difficult, but completely worth it. LA officials need to help create a city that people want to continue living in, and that doesn’t kill them. It is imperative that any changes to this bridge calm/slow the existing reckless traffic, add the bicycle lanes called for in the bicycle plan, add sufficient side walks, and engage the community in a more meaningful and responsive way. This is all completely do-able, and will result in a safer and more effective connection between these stellar communities.
Thank you,
Aaron Kuehn
<http://twitter.com/aaronkuehn>Aaron Kuehn
<http://aaronkuehn.com>
Subject: 131017 1307-2
From: M. Chambliss [ragweedpress@yahoo.com]
Sent: Saturday, October 12, 2013 1:38 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: Objections to Hyperion Freeway System - Viaduct Must Be Safe For ALL Users
Dear Ms. Podesta,
I have lived in Atwater Village since 1990, and each day, I commute both ways over the bridge from Atwater Village to Silverlake. On the weekends, I sometimes walk into Silverlake to shop and go to the gym. Crossing the street from Glendale Boulevard to the bridge is, at best, a risky procedure for a walker. I would also love to ride my bicycle across the bridge, but frankly, under the current conditions, I am afraid to.
Based on my daily observations of traffic, as a car driver, pedestrian, and bicycle rider, I feel that it is an absolute necessity for public safety and the Atwater Village and Silverlake communities, that both the bridge and Hyperion Avenue/Glendale Boulevard be made safe for me and everyone in my community. I do not see this happening if the current project’s design goes forward, without first being modified to respect and accommodate the current makeup and traveling needs of my community.
Here are the items that I feel should be changed/incorporated regarding the current project design:
- Bike lanes going both ways across the bridge to/from Atwater Village, and on Hyperion Avenue
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
- A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge
In addition, I fully agree with the statement that there is no reason for this project to be inconsistent with the bike plan and Caltrans "complete streets” policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.
With kindest regards,
Marty Chambliss
3862 Valleybrink Road
Los Angeles, CA  90039
(323) 793-0885
-----
Subject: 131017 1308
From: Ray de Mesa [ray@raydemesa.com]
Sent: Saturday, October 12, 2013 6:36 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
    mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All

Greetings:
As someone who bikes or walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Avenue be made safe for people like me. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:

   Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
   Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
   Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
   No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster

A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,
Ray de Mesa
-----
Subject: 131017 1309-1
From: Kitty Norton [kittynorton01@gmail.com]
Sent: Saturday, October 12, 2013 7:55 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway! A safe viaduct for bikes/pedestrians
As someone who bikes or walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:
- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
- A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,
Kitty Norton
1917 Rodney Drive
Los Angeles, CA 90027
--
Kitty Norton
Video Editor
Website: KittastrophyProne.com<http://www.kittastrophyprone.com/>
-----
Subject: 131017 1309-2
From: Netty Carr [dishy512@icloud.com]
Sent: Saturday, October 12, 2013 3:42 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: mayor.garcetti@lacity.org; Mitch O’farrell; tom.labonge@lacity.org;
Wenn Chyn; ana.guerrero@lacity.org; Mary Rodriguez; Daniel.Halden@lacity.org;
Luis Lopez; Sandra Caravella; Ann Lawson
Subject: Hyperion Bridge Project
To whom it may concern:
Friends of Atwater Village (FAV) would like to express our sincere thanks
to the design team that has been working on the retrofit and restoration of
our local landmark, the Hyperion Bridge HCM #164.
The bridge retrofit & restoration project was first brought to Atwater
Village residents back in 2004. Since then we have seen many changes to the
plan. Mr. Wally Stokes had said it best at one of the early community
meetings, "No one knows their neighborhood better than the people who live
there." No truer words have been spoken.
FAV, had many suggestions for this project, first and foremost was the
protection of all historical elements of the bridge. We also advocated for
pedestrian safety, the realignment of the Interstate 5 freeway off-ramp and
proposed a pedestrian / bike bridge over the Los Angeles River on the old
Red Car pylons. Amazingly all of these things have been incorporated in the
plan.
Over the years we have witnessed firsthand a collaboration between the
government agencies and local stakeholders to improve the historic bridge
and meet the new seismic requirements. Working together we achieved great
results. Thanks for giving the community stakeholders a seat at the table.
Now pedestrians and bicyclists alike will have a safe way to cross Glendale
Blvd and access the Hyperion Bridge stairs to continue their commute to the
Silver Lake and Los Feliz communities. The 5 freeway offramp realignment
will help alleviate the congestion at the Glenfeliz Blvd turnaround which
will in turn keep the traffic from backing up on the bridge.
Lastly, we give our wholehearted thanks to our new Council Member Mitch
O’Farrell for sharing our vision, conveying our safety concerns, working
with the design team to find a solution and helping to secure the funding.
Wenn Chen, Linda Moore and Wally Stokes also deserve special recognition
for taking that extra step to work with the community members. We
appreciate all their due diligence and hard work.
We look forward to seeing a beautifully restored Hyperion Bridge.
Sincerely,
Netty Carr, Sandra Caravella, Ann Lawson & Luis Lopez
Board, Friends of Atwater Village
3371 Glendale Blvd unit #110
Los Angeles, CA 90039
323-913-2999
-----
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All - Bicycles, Pedestrians and Motor Vehicles

Good Morning Ms. Podesta, Council Member Labonge, Council Member O'Farrell and Mayor Garcetti,

Thank you for what you have done to work with the entire Northeast Los Angeles Community to establish the bicycle lanes along York Blvd in Highland Park, Colorado Blvd. in Eagle Rock and Spring St in Downtown Los Angeles. I travel these routes regularly.

As a 49 year old and therefore 49 year member of the Silver Lake Community I am writing to request that you reconsider the current plans for the Hyperion Avenue and its absence of Sidewalks for Pedestrians and Separated Bicycle Lanes for Bicyclists, Kids on Scooters and responsible Skateboarders.

As a kid, especially an older tween and teenager, I rode my bicycle on this road to get from Silver Lake to Atwater Village and on to Eagle Rock. As an adult, I'd like to do the same and continue to bring my children on this route for a leisurely Saturday or Sunday activity. Or a ride during the week to the Farmers Market. Or to Costco for groceries. Or to connect to the Class I LA River Bike and Pedestrian Lane. Or to Tam O'Shanter Inn for Prime Rib, Yorkshire Pudding, Creamed Corn and a light salad after a day of physical activity biking and walking about this great city of ours. I would like to be able to use Zero Pollution, slow and safe, 100% Healthy Physical Activity means to travel throughout Northeast Los Angeles in addition to driving around the city in an automobile.

I commute from one Los Angeles City Community / Neighborhood (Silver Lake) to several other Los Angeles Communities / Neighborhoods (Atwater, Highland Park, Glassell Park, Eagle Rock) and onto adjacent cities as well: South Pasadena, Pasadena, Alhambra, Glendale etc.

I am not merely a bicyclist and pedestrian, I also drive an automobile on a daily basis as part of my employment as a pharmaceutical sales representative. This is a safety initiative that will help calm traffic and reduce accidents which will more consistently improve traffic flow, ease frustration and prevent road rage.

It will lower the stress level and raise the awareness of each of us to the other users of this major thoroughfare. I think of this bridge and roadway with its beautiful vistas of the Glendale Foothills and San Gabriel Mountains much like the view from the 1st St and 4st Bridges that cross over to East LA during the 7 CicLAvia events. Please rethink and reconsider what kind of Los Angeles we want to live in.

One that is a "Freeway" even in residential neighborhoods and thoroughfares? Or one that combines safe and sane vehicular (motorized or not) traffic movement with a pleasant, natural transportation corridor.
One that appreciates the beauty and not mere functionality of this bridge route and allows transportation users to appreciate its historical engineering and architecture. I'm pretty sure it was built during the WPA era of great infrastructure?

As someone who bikes or walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:

- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster

A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge.

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Thank you for all you do to make Los Angeles a global 22nd Century City that is the envy of the world with our multi-modal transportation means throughout the city.

Sincerely,

Andy Au

I have lived in Eagle Rock 90041, Silver Lake 90039, attended Micheltorena Elementary School and Thomas Starr King Junior High School before moving to Eagle Rock Junior/Senior High School for graduation in 2982.

I then attended and graduated from the University of California at Davis where a bicycle was my primary means of transportation for 4 years. Whereupon I returned to Los Angeles, CA and lived in Eagle Rock.

--

Andy Au
323-344-8795  home / office
-----
Subject: 131017 1311
From: Eli Sentman [elis000@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 14, 2013 6:00 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All

Tami,

I live in Atwater Village with my wife and infant daughter. I was recently informed of the Caltrans plan to modify the Hyperion Bridge to accommodate cars traveling at 55 mph. I have lived in Atwater for almost five years and enjoy being able to walk over the Hyperion Bridge to shop at the stores on the other side as well as hike up to Griffith Park and to walk around Silver Lake Reservoir. In essence, this plan cuts off Atwater from the neighborhoods of Silver Lake and Los Feliz. That bridge is the quickest path to the other side. If anything, there needs to be enforcement of the posted 35 mph speed limit. High school students walk to Marshall HS every day over the bridge and bicyclists have to contend with speeding cars. I have seen many accidents on the bridge because of reckless drivers. If you alter the bridge to encourage high speeds like 55 mph, drivers will exceed those speeds. It is just the nature of LA drivers to drive fast, so you’re going to see cars traveling at up to 70 mph. I would suggest maybe putting in a flashing pedestrian warning light and a crosswalk at the base of the bridge in Atwater so people can cross the street from one side of the LA River to the next. The city is trying to encourage people to use the River, so why not make it more pedestrian friendly and all around safer for people who live in the area?

Sincerely,
Eli Sentman
Atwater Village Resident
-----
Subject: 131017 1327

From: Karen Barnett [mailto:karen@urbanaid.com]
Sent: Thursday, October 10, 2013 5:39 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: Karen Barnett
Subject:* Re.: Glendale-hyperion Complex of Bridges Comment Card****

date: 10.10.13

Karen Barnett

2971 Sunnynook Drive

Los Angeles CA 90039

- There are no sound readings to the North and South of Glendale Blvd. in Atwater Village. (i.e. perpendicular to bridge or using 5 freeway directions) Homes are located next to the project and along the LA River. Before the project begins sound readings should be taken. Long term, not 15 minutes, for an average. There's a constant higher than average level of noise in Atwater Village. Currently we have no way to show any increase in volume due the project which will effect our community for a minimum of 3 years.

- Sound mitigation - "sound barrier" fabric should be used within and around construction site(s)

- Stairs at bridge (after 5 N. entrance) better lighting should be considered. Possibly reconfigured with access not hidden from sidewalk.

- Bike/Pedestrian bridge - widen as much as possible to mitigate tensions between walkers and cyclists a known issue along the bike path.****

- Bike/Pedistrian bridge - this should end at path in Atwater Village. It appeared to end beyond it on the image at community meeting ****

- Create path under bridge (Atwater Village side) for walkers and cyclists which mimics bike path along other side. This would allow people to access the other side of Glendale Blvd without running or riding across. Further more it would increase the use and access for the newly created Bike/Pedistrian bridge.****

Thank you,

Karen Barnett
Subject: 131018 1949
Attachments: image002.jpg; _Certification_.txt
From: Ross Hirsch [Ross.Hirsch@doj.ca.gov]
Sent: Friday, October 18, 2013 8:36 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT; tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All
Dear Mayor Garcetti, Councilmember LaBonge, Councilmember O’Farrell, and Ms. Podesta,
Please let me apologize in advance for not writing before the October 11th requested date for feedback, but a serious bike collision on that Friday prevented me from emailing on the date requested. It could have ended my life, but I’m glad it didn’t, so I feel compelled to plead for a more bike-friendly plan for Hyperion. Last Friday, a car driving in Glendale at relatively slow speed simply didn’t see me (although I was wearing a neon green jacket, brightly colored helmet and riding safely in the proper lane position). The impact sent me flying through the air, whereupon my helmeted head crashed on the road leaving me unconscious for some ten minutes—before I was taken to the ER, where I had to make that dreaded call to my wife: “Honey, I’m ok, but I was taken to the emergency room because I was hit by a car.” Bad road design makes this scenario all too common. Please let’s not make that the future for Hyperion.
I, and many others I see regularly on the LA River Bike Path and streets adjacent to the Hyperion Bridge, bike to work daily through Glendale, Los Angeles, and particularly just the area where the new Hyperion bridge is planned. Currently, that area is terrifying, unwelcoming, and needlessly dangerous. High car speeds, insufficient signage, bad design. But the area is a major corridor for bike commuters traveling between downtown Los Angeles, Silverlake, Glendale, Atwater Village, Burbank, Elysian Valley, Pasadena, etc. many of whom for which there is no alternative route but to travel to/over/around the bridge. Please take these bikers into consideration. I like arriving to work safely in the morning and again home in the evenings. My choice to bike to work shouldn’t equate to an extreme sport where I feel I’m putting my life at risk each day.
The new bike/ped bridge connecting the LA River path to Hyperion on the old Red Car pylons sounds like a nice bit of infrastructure, as long it can accommodate bike traffic and pedestrians comfortably. If it is too cumbersome or improperly designed for either user group (particularly cyclists whether they be recreational or commuters like myself), it will simply be ignored for alternative routes (even if they pose greater danger and/or cause car traffic to slow down) or cause unnecessary friction between well-meaning neighbors. Nobody wants that as a desired result.
My neighbors also ask to please make this a better area for those of us that live in the two adjacent areas (Silverlake, Atwater Village/Glendale). We would like to enjoy our neighborhoods without feeling that there is a dangerous impenetrable barrier separating the two area. Me and my wife and our two young sons should be able to comfortably bike from the Atwater Farmer’s Market over to Silverlake for breakfast without feeling like we are taking our life in our hands just to do that.
For the project to be successful and a positive neighborhood asset, the project must include:

1. A safe connection for cyclists between the Hyperion/Glendale streets (1) over the bridge, and (2) connecting to the LA River Bike Path so they can avoid the heavy car traffic constantly jockeying to enter/exit the 5 freeway.
2. A seamless route for cyclists that does not force cyclists to merge into heavy traffic, alter their routes in any considerable manner, or dismount to avoid obstacles. Just this type of bike infrastructure exists throughout the world. There is no reason a world-class city like Los Angeles should be without this human-centered infrastructure.
3. Buffered/colored bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
4. Aggressive signage to motorists that bikes and pedestrians are present.
5. Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs.
6. Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding.
7. No crash barrier and banked turns that could result in people driving even faster or more dangerously.
8. A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd.

I would like this project to be consistent with the bike plan, Caltrans complete streets policy, and harmonious to the humans that use this street each and every day to walk, bike for recreation, bike to work, bike to run errands, etc. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Thank you,
Ross Hirsch

Ross H. Hirsch
Deputy Attorney General
Office of the Attorney General
300 S. Spring Street, Suite 1702
Los Angeles, CA 90013
p: (213) 897-6325
f: (213) 897-2802
ross.hirsch@doj.ca.gov

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This communication with its contents may contain confidential and/or legally privileged information. It is solely for the use of the intended recipient(s). Unauthorized interception, review, use or disclosure is prohibited and may violate applicable laws including the Electronic Communications Privacy Act. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender and destroy all copies of the communication.
Subject: 131021 1012-1
From: Grant Deans [mailto:grantdeans@gmail.com]
Sent: Saturday, October 19, 2013 10:17 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT; tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All
Dear Ms. Podesta, Councilmember LaBonge, Councilmember O’Farrell, and Mayor Garcetti,
As someone who bikes or walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:
- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
- A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,
David Deans
Los Angeles, CA
-----
Subject: 131021 1012-2
From: Joel Krajewski [mailto:joelkrajewski@gmail.com]
Sent: Saturday, October 19, 2013 10:28 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT; tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All

Dear Ms. Podesta, Councilmember LaBonge, Councilmember O'Farrell, and Mayor Garcetti,
As someone who bikes between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone's needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:
- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
- A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,
Joel Krajewski
829 N. Harper Ave.
Los Angeles, CA 90046
-----
Subject: 131022 0939
From: Tim Barber [mailto:tbarber@timbarberltd.com]
Sent: Tuesday, October 22, 2013 7:11 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT; tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Cc: Krajewski, Joel A (4220)
Subject: Please don’t make it worse

Dear Ms. Podesta, Councilmember LaBonge, Councilmember O’Farrell, and Mayor Garcetti,
I bike between Silver Lake and Atwater Village. Traveling across the 5 Freeway and the LA River is
already unsafe for me. An expanded “freeway-speed” viaduct would make my passage impossible.
But even more important than my bike access is the inevitable ruin of a neighborhood already
teetering in the balance. This area could be part of the thriving communities it connects, with
small businesses, residences, schools and (someday, god willing) the restored LA river. Or it could
degenerate into a hemmed-in barrier to any living thing.
It is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone’s needs can
be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically,
I would like the project to include:
   Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
   Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
   Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage
speeding
   No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
   A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk
from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge
There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete
streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access between these
communities. Please don’t make it worse.
Yours,
Charles T. Barber
829 N. Harper Ave.
Los Angeles, CA 90046
-----
Subject: 131022 1323
From: Josie Lanuza [mailto:fivef0oter@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, October 22, 2013 1:20 PM
To: Podesta, Tami @DOT; tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All
Dear Ms. Podesta, Councilmember LaBonge, Councilmember O'Farrell, and Mayor Garcetti,
As someone who bikes and walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical
that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone's needs can be met if the project is
designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the
project to include:
Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage
speeding
No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from
both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge
There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete
streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5
Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.
Sincerely,
Josie Lanuza
995 Figueroa Terrace, #109
Los Angeles, CA
90012
-----
Subject: 131023 0853
From: Nina Eliasoph [mailto:eliasoph@usc.edu]
Sent: Tuesday, October 22, 2013 6:54 PM
To: Podesta, Tami @DOT; tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org

Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - stop climate change, obesity, anti-social streets
Dear Ms. Podesta, Councilmember LaBonge, Councilmember O’Farrell, and Mayor Garcetti,
As someone who bikes or walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village (Mr. LaBonge, you have seen us on our bikes and on foot, with kids, riding around Los Feliz and Silverlake!), it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:
- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
- A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge.

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,
Nina Eliasoph, Leo Eliasoph, Paul Lichterman, and Olivia Lichterman
Nina Eliasoph
Associate Professor and Vice Chair
Department of Sociology
Stanley and Hazel Hall Building
851 Downey Way
University of Southern California
Los Angeles, CA 90089-1059
Fax: (213) 740-3535
Tel.: cell: (323) 333-5899
Home: (323) 667-2430
-----
Subject: 131024 1819
From: Mason Funk [masonfunk@mac.com]
Sent: Thursday, October 24, 2013 11:07 PM
To: Podesta, Tami @DOT; tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Cc: info@la-bike.org
Subject: Hyperion Bridge rehab
Dear Ms. Podesta, Councilmember LaBonge, Councilmember O’Farrell, and Mayor Garcetti,
I am an avid runner, and one of my favorite routes takes me from Silver Lake, down across the Hyperion Bridge into Atwater Village, and back to the Reservoir via Fletcher & Glendale Blvd. I have made that run countless times -- and it's a small miracle I am still alive. That bridge is a disaster waiting to happen for pedestrians. The sidewalks are narrow and the traffic speed is extreme. It is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone's needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:
- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge. There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.
Sincerely,
Mason Funk
3022 Windsor Ave.
Los Angeles, CA 90039
-----
Subject: 131024 1820
From: Steven Guerry [steven.guerry@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, October 24, 2013 11:36 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT; tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All
Dear Ms. Podesta, Councilmember LaBonge, Councilmember O’Farrell, and Mayor Garcetti,
As someone who bikes or walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:
   - Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
   - Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
   - Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
   - No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
   - A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge
There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.
Sincerely,
Steven Guerry
1800 N. New Hampshire Ave #135
Los Angeles, CA 90027
-----
Subject: 131025 0843
From: Michael Allen [mailto:ratiocn8@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, October 24, 2013 8:33 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT; tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org
Subject: Hyperion bridge
Dear Mayor Garcetti, Councilmember LaBonge, Councilmember O'Farrell, and Ms. Podesta,
The Hyperion Ave. connection between Silver Lake and Atwater needs to be made safe for pedestrians and bicyclists. Specifically, I would like the project to include:

- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier nor banked turns, which will make people drive even faster
A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge
There is no reason for this project not to be consistent with the bike plan and the Caltrans complete streets policy.

Sincerely,
MIKE ALLEN
853 Coronado Dr., Glendale, CA
-----
Subject: 131028 0927
From: Richard Dean [mailto:rdean@mac.com]
Sent: Saturday, October 26, 2013 2:13 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Subject: Hyperion Bridge - Speed Limit
Hello
I cannot make the public hearing on the proposed bridge improvements but I wanted to add my voice to those concerned about the speeds on the bridge.
The engineer on the project and others have cited the current average speed on the bridge as 55 mph. The proposed approach effectively abdicates any responsibility the city and engineers have to stop this reckless situation.
The residential and small business stretch of road between San Fernando and Rowena is already treated as a mini highway with people driving on the shoulders, running through right turn only lanes and speeding 20+ mph above the speed limit. It's unclear why those involved would both further enable this dangerous situation and abdicate any responsibility to address it.
I support most of the proposed changes but they MUST be accompanied by an agreement on maintenance of the 35mph speed limit and a promise of aggressive enforcement. I wouldn’t mind speed cameras there if LAPD continues to refuse to enforce the speed limit.
So far those involved in this planning have declined to make any comments in this area. Please help convince people like me by making positive comments about speed control plans.
Thank you
Richard Dean
3426 Madera Ave
Los Angeles (Atwater Village), CA
-----
Subject: 131028 0928-1
From: Jirair Tossounian [mailto:jirair@gmail.com]
Sent: Saturday, October 26, 2013 6:22 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Subject: Glendale Hyperion Viaduct Improvement Project Comment
please add me to the mailing list
-----
Subject: 131028 0928-2
From: Molly Ortiz [mailto:molly.ortiz@gmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, October 27, 2013 4:43 PM
To: Podesta, Tami @DOT; tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All
Dear Ms. Podesta, Councilmember LaBonge, Councilmember O’Farrell, and Mayor Garcetti,
As someone who bikes between Silver Lake and Atwater Village on a weekly basis, it is absolutely
critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone’s needs can be met if the
project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like
the project to include:
- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage
  speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
- A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from
  both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge
There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete
streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5
Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.
Sincerely,
Molly Ortiz
877 1/2 N Hoover St. 90029
-----
Subject: 131028 1425
From: HYERAN LEE [mailto:hyeranlee@ucla.edu]
Sent: Monday, October 28, 2013 1:22 PM
To: Podesta, Tami @DOT; tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: NO Hyperion FREEWAY - DONT KILL ME
Dear Ms. Podesta, Councilmember LaBonge, Councilmember O’Farrell, and Mayor Garcetti,
As someone who bikes or walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:
  - Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
  - Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
  - Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding (ex: recent “complete street” renovation on Colorado Blvd. Eagle Rock)
  - No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
  - A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge
There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make ALL TRAVELERS, not only drivers, benefit.
Sincerely,
Concerned citizen, cyclist, and pedestrian
Hyeran Lee
2547 W Ave 30
Los Angeles CA 90065
-----
Subject: 131028 1426
From: Tawny Barin [mailto:tawny.barin@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 28, 2013 1:46 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT; tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Cc: info@la-bike.org
Subject: Hyperion Freeway
Dear Ms. Podesta, Councilmember LaBonge, Councilmember O'Farrell, and Mayor Garcetti,
As someone who frequently bikes and runs between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is
absolutely critical that Hyperion Avenue bridge be made safe for all who traverse the area -
whether it be by car, bike or foot. Everyone's needs can be met if the project is designed for
appropriate speeds through an urban community.
Specifically, I would like the project to include:
   Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
   Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
   Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage
   speeding
   No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
   A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from
both sides of Glendale Boulevard and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge.
There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete
streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5
Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.
Best,
Tawny Barin
220 E Broadway #411
Glendale, CA 91205
--
Tawny Barin
http://pages.teamintraining.org/los/leonadiv14/tawny
http://twitter.com/scrawnylion
-----
Subject: 131028 1628
From: JJ Hoffman [mailto:lariverride@la-bike.org]
Sent: Monday, October 28, 2013 4:09 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT; tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: Hyperion
Dear Ms. Podesta, Councilmember LaBonge, Councilmember O’Farrell, and Mayor Garcetti,
As someone who bikes between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone's needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:

- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
- A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,

--
JJ Hoffman
Events and Development Director
323-839-6414 (cell)
-----
Subject: 131029 0918
From: Marty Bracciotti [mailto:martyjoe@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Monday, October 28, 2013 6:02 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Subject: Hyperion Bridge: Opposition to Bike Lanes

Tami,

As a long time resident of Silverlake and South Glendale (Adams Hill), I want to share my views on plans for the Hyperion bridge.

I am also a bicycle rider and member of the Los Angeles County Bicycle Coalition, but contrary to the vocal bike lobby who are mostly outsiders, I am totally against narrowing the 4 lanes so that 2 bike lanes can be added to the Hyperion Bridge. As a biker, I wouldn't ride them anyway as I would consider them to be unsafe. Instead, I prefer to walk my bike on the sidewalk of the Hyperion Bridge where it is safe and don't understand why bike riders wouldn't do that too.

The Hyperion Bridge is an important means to connect Silverlake, Atwater Village, and Glendale. Los Feliz is the only other connector and that is choked with traffic, let's not shrink the Hyperion Bridge and make traffic even worse. Traffic coming to the Hyperion Bridge from Silverlake is already choked. If Caltrans reduces the lanes or otherwise slows the flow of traffic on the Hyperion Bridge, we all lose.

I am for adding a k rail between opposing traffic lanes on the Hyperion Bridge - this is long overdue, and would also like to see a k rail between cars and the sidewalk on that bridge. Please feel free to add bike lanes either over the Glendale Blvd bridge or better yet, over the pylons of the defunct Red Car rail line - that's the absolute best alternative.

As for the Glendale Blvd bridge, something must be done to make it safer when exiting the north 5 freeway offramp to Glendale Blvd. That is a scary merge, especially since there are 2 lanes that must turn right onto Glendale Blvd from the offramp.

Thank you for your consideration.

Marty Bracciotti
318 Roads End Street
Glendale, CA 91205
(213) 247-2294
martyjoe@sbcglobal.net
Subject: 131029 0919-2
From: Krista Nicole [mailto:passionforwords@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 28, 2013 7:39 PM
To: Podesta, Tami @DOT; tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org

Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct FOR ALL
Dear Ms. Podesta, Councilmember LaBonge, Councilmember O’Farrell, and Mayor Garcetti,

I have crossed the Hyperion Bridge countless times, both by car and by bicycle. I have resided in the communities of Los Feliz, Glendale and Highland Park. I have friends and family spread throughout these neighborhoods and those adjacent. The bridge has been a valuable direct passageway for years, connecting me to my community and granting me critical access to numerous businesses and destinations.

I ask that you take into account the safety and access of Hyperion Bridge. I ask that you consider the needs of all who depend on the connection Hyperion provides between the communities east and west of it.

As someone who bikes or walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:

- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs.
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding.
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster.

A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge. There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and provide a way for all travelers to benefit.

Sincerely,
Krista Carlson
6179 Myosotis St., Highland Park, 90042
(818) 522-4347

----
Subject: 131029 0919-3
From: Andrew Welker [mailto:welkersemail@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 28, 2013 7:49 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT; tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All

Dear Ms. Podesta, Councilmember LaBonge, Councilmember O’Farrell, and Mayor Garcetti,
As someone who bikes or walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical
that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is
designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the
project to include:
   · Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
   · Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
   · Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage
     speeding
   · No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
   · A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk
     from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge
There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete
streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5
Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.
Sincerely,
Andrew Welker
322 Sonora ave
Glendale, ca 91201
-----
Subject: 131029 0920-1  
From: Paul Burke [mailto:pjburke@pacbell.net]  
Sent: Monday, October 28, 2013 11:14 PM  
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT; tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org  
Subject: Hyperion Bridge Redesign  
Dear Ms. Podesta, Councilmember LaBonge, Councilmember O'Farrell, and Mayor Garcetti,  
I live in Glendale but I like to visit Silver Lake, where I used to live. Rarely do I ride my bike across the Hyperion bridge, because  
  there is no bike lane  
  you need to cut across traffic (southbound) to reach the bridge  
  if you commit to the sidewalk you are stuck because of the curb  
  there is hardly enough room for pedestrians on the sidewalk let alone bikes  
It is my understanding that the city plans to address these shortcomings by redesigning the bridge to accommodate speedy motorists. I would like to lend my voice to the many concerned Angelenos and Glendale neighbors who urge you to reconsider. Please redesign the bridge to welcome bikers and walkers who do Los Angeles a favor by forgoing their automobiles.  
Sincerely,  
Paul Burke  
817 Palm Dr.  
Glendale, CA  
-----
Subject: 131029 0920-2
From: jim alejandre [mailto:jalejand@usc.edu]
Sent: Monday, October 28, 2013 11:07 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All

Dear Ms. Podesta, Councilmember LaBonge, Councilmember O’Farrell, and Mayor Garcetti,

As someone who bikes or walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:

- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
- A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

There is no reason to make this segment a high speed artery.

Sincerely,

Jim Alejandre
1224 South Hudson Ave
Los Angeles California 90019

------
Subject: 131029 1029 (Referenced as 131029 1029 in Letter Comments Database)
Attachments: 2013 Oaks letter Hyperion.pdf; _Certification_.txt
From: Gerry [mailto:gerryhans51@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, October 29, 2013 10:22 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: Tom LaBonge; Councilmember.O'Farrell@lacity.gov; Mayor Garcetti; jeanne.min@lacity.org;
christine peters; Mary Rodriguez; Carolyn Ramsay; Daniel Halden
Subject: Comment, Hyperion Ave Bridge redesign
Attached Oaks letter regarding Glendale-Hyperion bridge complex.
Thank you,
Oaks HOA
Subject: 131029 1259
From: jacqueline Kerr [mailto:jacquekerr@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, October 29, 2013 12:36 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Subject: Fwd: Delivery Status Notification (Failure)
1. In "modernizing" the Bridge for auto speeds of 55 mph capability, all of the proposed safety measures are negated.
2. This is a dangerous stretch of pavement - do whatever possible to slow down traffic.
3. The speeds used by southbound motorists to climb that hill become dangerous at the top - just as a downward slope begins. I use that Bridge all the time - and no matter how careful I try to be, when reaching the top I've become a dangerous motorists.
Many thanks for addressing the problems of this wonderful, old landmark...
good to have it around for other generations.
Jacqueline Kerr
-----
Subject: 131029 1607
Attachments: 2013-10-24 Glendale Hyperion Bridge Project.pdf; _Certification.htm
From: Hector Huezo <h.l.huezo@gmail.com>
Date: Mon, Oct 28, 2013 at 4:43 PM
Subject: Glendale Blvd - Hyperion Ave Bridge Project
To: wenn.chyn@lacity.org

Hello Mr. Chyn,
I would like to submit the following letter on behalf of the Alliance of River Communities- We are Los Angeles’s regional alliance of East and Northeast Area Neighborhood Councils.
At a regularly scheduled meeting last week, our alliance decided to support a plan that would creat multi-modal transportation a priority of this bridge project. I would like to ask that you please include our letter into the public record as part of the comments regarding this project. Thank you. Please confirm that you have received this email.
Thank you Mr. Chyn.
-Hector Huezo
ARC-Los Angeles
--
Hector L. Huezo
562.485.7329
H.L.Huezo@GMail.com
-----
Subject: 131030 1042
From: doug@zuumsocial.com [mailto:doug@zuumsocial.com] On Behalf Of Doug Schumacher
Sent: Tuesday, October 29, 2013 9:45 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Subject: The need for better bicycle accommodations on the glendale-hyperion bridge

I saw this posted on LA Eastsider, and read the linked page with this email for comment submission.

I honestly couldn't believe this bridge would even be considered to be built without, not adequate, but great support for cycling. Anyone who drives around LA knows that our traffic situation is unbearable. Metro is helping, but isn't near enough.

Cycling is one possible, reasonably affordable solution (relative to more freeways and metro lines), but people are hesitant to bike in LA because they don't feel safe. This has to be addressed, and this bridge is exactly the kind of place that we need progressive thinking in support of cycling. Also, Atwater is a lovely place, but it's currently not a safe place to bike to from echo park. That's sad, as it's only a few miles away.

Thank you
Doug Schumacher
Echo Park
-----
Subject: 131030 1116
From: Juliana Telleria [mailto:pumpkinfay@hotmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, October 30, 2013 11:11 AM
To: Podesta, Tami @DOT; tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All
Dear Ms. Podesta, Councilmember LaBonge, Councilmember O’Farrell, and Mayor Garcetti,
As someone who bikes or walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:

- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
- A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River.
This project can positively change Hyperion Ave. for bicyclists, pedestrians, and automobile travelers alike.

Juliana Telleria
-----
Subject: 131030 1259
From: Dan Riley [mailto:dprski33@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, October 30, 2013 12:41 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT; tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Cc: info@la-bike.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All
Dear Ms. Podesta, Councilmember LaBonge, Councilmember O’Farrell, and Mayor Garcetti,
As someone who bikes or walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:
- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
- A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,
Dan Riley
645 W 9th St, #200
Los Angeles, CA 90015

--

___________________________
Dictated but not read.
-----
Subject: 131030 1306
From: Richard Meade [mailto:richardmeade@att.net]
Sent: Wednesday, October 30, 2013 1:01 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Subject: Regarding the Hyperion Bridge project....
To Whom it may concern,

I have read that a small group of cyclists have decided to try and delay if not kill this project. I would personally like to see the percentage numbers of cyclists vs automobiles that use the Hyperion bridge on any given day. Are these the same cyclists who ride through Hollywood by the hundreds, running red lights and preventing people from crossing the streets when they have the right to cross?

Maybe its time to require multi-geared bicycles to be licensed. I pay a vehicle license fee for the privilege of using the road so it is certainly not unreasonable to require the same for cyclists. Fees collected could be used to add bike lanes that would improve safety for all. Also, cyclists who do not obey the laws of the road could be identified by their license number the same as a car.

The Hyperion Bridge project should not be delayed or highjacked by a small group of cyclists who want automobiles off the city streets.

Sincerely,

Richard A. Meade
-----
Subject: 131030 1314
From: Mari Miller [mailto:mari.miller@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, October 30, 2013 1:08 PM
To: Podesta, Tami @DOT; tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All
Dear Ms. Podesta, Councilmember LaBonge, Councilmember O’Farrell, and Mayor Garcetti,
As someone who bikes or walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:

- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
- A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,
Mari Miller
809 East Acacia Avenue Unit F
Glendale, CA 91205
(818) 414-3264
-----
Subject: 131030 1319
From: Tokunow Susumu [mailto:susumu101@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, October 30, 2013 1:18 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Subject: Bke paths
All the bike riders like myself, that try to exit the bike path along the LA river to Hyperion Ave.,
must get off their bikes and carry it up a long flight of steps, and then enter very dangerous,
speeding, bridge traffic.
Definitely not bike friendly.
Regretfully - Alvin Susumu Tokunow
-----
Subject: 131030 1422
From: T Scott Keiner [mailto:scottkeiner@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, October 30, 2013 2:10 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Subject: LACBC Bicycle Plan for Glendale/Hyperion Bridge

Dear Tami:

I’m writing to express my support for LACBC’s modified plan for the Glendale/Hyperion Bridge. As someone who commutes and runs errands on my bicycle in the area, a dedicated bike path on the bridge would be of great benefit to me and provide a critical connection between Silver Lake and Atwater Village communities. Currently the only options for bicyclists crossing between the two neighborhoods are braving high speed traffic on Los Feliz or the Glendale/Hyperion bridge. Neither option is safe, both contain blind spots, and both put bicyclists in the path of vehicles entering and exiting the 5 freeway at high speeds. A bike path on the bridge would solve many of these problems and provide a critical and safe connection between two communities.

Thank you for your time and consideration,
Scott Keiner
Subject: 131030 1554
From: James Edward Schuck [mailto:james@jamesschuck.com]
Sent: Wednesday, October 30, 2013 3:35 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Subject: The Bridge Debate

In its current configuration, that bridge is a freeway linking two streets that is in need of a "calming" of some kind. Traffic roars down that hill, discouraging all but the bravest pedestrians and bicycles have not even been considered. I would not ride a bike over that bridge if my life depended upon it. It is a link between Atwater and Echo, and as such, the proposed "Red Car" bridge proposal is a waste because it goes nowhere. People use the larger bridge as a gateway between two communities.

Scrap the Red Car Bridge and put more people access (bike and foot) on the Hyperion Bridge and incorporate some means to reduce the speed of auto traffic.

James Edward Schuck

www.jamesschuck.com
310.663.3074
Subject: 131031 0855-2
From: scottb@roadbikecity.com [mailto:scottb@roadbikecity.com]
Sent: Wednesday, October 30, 2013 10:18 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT; tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: Bike Lanes on Hyperion Ave.
Dear Ms. Podesta, Councilmember LaBonge, Councilmember O’Farrell, and Mayor Garcetti,
As someone who bikes or walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:
  Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
  Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
  Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
  No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
  A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge
There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River.
This project can positively change Hyperion Ave. for bicyclists, pedestrians, and automobile travelers alike.
Thank you,
Scott Blumenthal
-----
Subject: 131031 0856
From: Andee Brauer [mailto:aibrauer@yahoo.com]
Sent: Thursday, October 31, 2013 5:22 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; tom.labonge@lacity.org; Wenn.Chyn@lacity.org; mary.d.rodriguez@lacity.org; Daniel.Halden@lacity.org; ana.guerrero@lacity.org; board@atwaterchamber.org
Subject: Hyperion Bridge Retrofit

As a homeowner and business owner in Atwater, I believe that a "road diet" on Hyperion's main bridge to accommodate more bicycle lanes would substantially change traffic flow to Glendale Blvd so as to inconvenience both clients trying to reach my business and friends/family trying to reach my residence.

Furthermore, during evening rush hour it serve would to congest Hyperion south of Trader Joe's/Gelson's even more severely than it is already. Please do NOT make the traffic worse on Glendale.

Thank you,
Andrea Brauer
3235 Hollydale Dr
Los Angeles, Ca 90039
-----
Subject: 131031 0858
From: Margaret Jensen [mailto:joshuagrammy@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Thursday, October 31, 2013 8:23 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
tom.labonge@lacity.org; Wenn.Chyn@lacity.org; mary.d.rodriguez@lacity.org;
Daniel.Halden@lacity.org; ana.guerrero@lacity.org; board@atwaterchamber.org
Subject: Hyperion Bridge
Having lived in Atwater Village for more than 50 years, I oppose any changes to the current plan to
upgrade and retrofit the Hyperion Bridge. Although I supported bicycle use along the Los Angeles
River and the bicycle bridge over Los Feliz, I cannot support the proposal that would limit vehicle
traffic between Silverlake and Atwater Village. Please do not change the current plan!
Sincerely,
M. Grace Weisenstein
----
Subject: 131031 0859
From: cecelia sonsini [mailto:restaurantbooks@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, October 31, 2013 7:30 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; tom.labonge@lacity.org; Wenn.Chyn@lacity.org; mary.d.rodriguez@lacity.org; Daniel.Halden@lacity.org; ana.guerrero@lacity.org; board@atwaterchamber.org
Subject: Hyperion Bridge
Living near the intersection of Fletcher and Rowena, I go into Atwater on a daily basis and use the Hyperion bridge to get back and forth. Taking away one lane for bicyclists would be horrible for those of us who drive. Just look at how the loss of one lane in each direction on Rowena between Glendale and Hyperion backs up traffic at rush hours (both morning and evening).
The most frustrating part of having lost those lanes is that I rarely even see a bicyclist in the bike lane, so, to me, the bike lane is a complete waste of space.
Please don’t do the same thing to the Hyperion Bridge!!
Thank you
--
Cecelia Sonsini
-----
Subject: 131031 1056
From: Pamela Burgess [mailto:pamela@pamelaburgess.com]
Sent: Thursday, October 31, 2013 10:27 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Subject: Comment: Glendale/Hyperion Complex of Bridges Project

Hi Tami--
I am a resident of Atwater Village.
I am in favor of approving the Glendale/Hyperion Complex project as designed and presented.
I am NOT in favor of redesigning the current project to create more space for bikes or another bike lane.
The surrounding communities and businesses want to move forward with this project now. We do not want to drag this out for several more months bc of an 11th-hour appeal by those who were not engaged in the lengthy design process.
Thank you.

PB
Pamela Burgess
3799 Valleybrink Road
Los Angeles, Ca 90039
323-807-4456
pamela@pamelaburgess.com<mailto:pamela@pamelaburgess.com>
pamelaburgess.com<http://pamelaburgess.com>
-----
Subject: 131031 1057
From: john gutierrez [mailto:nejohng@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, October 31, 2013 10:36 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Subject: Hyperion Bridge
To Whom It May Concern
I am a Native Angeleno for the passed 68 years and have been a resident of Atwater Village for the
passed 20 years. The proposed changes to the Hyperion Bridge are important to me because I use
it daily. In its current condition it is very dangerous to navigate by bicycles. The pedestrian
walkways are too narrow for bike rider and there are no bike lanes on the roadway. Changing the
bridge to one lane in both directions make a lot of sense because vehicular traffic on the bridge is
always light. Another issue for bicyclist is north bound riders leaving the bridge to Glendale blvd.
with car from the 5 Fwy North Glendale exit. Some type of pedestrian caution light should be
added. The same should be installed to the South side for pedestrian and cyclist trying to access
the Hyperion Bridge. Thank You John Gutierrez 213 272-5464
-----
Subject: 131031 1242
From: RLC [mailto:rlcronce@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Thursday, October 31, 2013 11:27 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Subject: Glendale/Hyperion Bridge Project
Please adopt the recommendations made at the Oct. 27th safety meeting. Adding a 4’ shoulder for 
use by bicyclists and narrowing the car lanes is fine. I would prefer larger car lanes, but I’m fine 
with room for bicyclists even tho I find them annoying in traffic. 
Let’s move forward and get this refurb started sooner than later. Overall it’s a great improvement 
to what is there now!
Ronald Cronce
3460 Atwater Ave
Los Angeles, CA 90039
(Atwater Village)
-----
Subject: 131031 1553-1
From: Patrick Cleary [mailto:p_cleary@yahoo.com]
Sent: Thursday, October 31, 2013 2:04 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Subject: Comment on Proposed Glendale Boulevard-Hyperion Avenue Complex of Bridges Improvement
Dear Tami:
I'm a resident of Atwater, and a commuter to an office on the Miracle Mile. Sometimes I drive to work, and sometimes I bike. I use the Hyperion Bridge nearly every day. Because of the twists in the road, I think it would be a good idea to reduce the lanes to one in each direction. No one should be switching lanes in that small stretch anyways. Cars drive too fast because there is no intersection.
Let me go through a detailed description of how I cross the bridge via bicycle. I take a left at Glenfeliz, hoping the car behind me doesn't take up the third lane on Glendale Blvd., bike on the shoulder up until it narrows to nothing, then wait until the coast is clear and I can pedal onto the striped triangle separating the underpass/freeway on-ramp road and the elevated bridge. I walk my bike up to the sidewalk, and if there are no pedestrians on the sidewalk, ride it to start of the ramp up to Waverly, dismount, and walk it up to the top. Then I ride down the access road, stop at the stop sign, look both ways, and proceed along the shoulder to Rowena. I take Hyperion and then Fountain all the way to Vine, the next bike route, before heading south.
Coming home, I ride along Hyperion, and after crossing Rowena, I wait until the line of cars has gone ahead, and then pedal hard in low gear, hoping no rogue car comes barreling down behind me as I take up the right lane. The pot holes make it dicey because of the speed I gather. Then I have to signal and get over as soon as the merge lanes from the Glendale off-ramp join the bridge traffic.
Where is the design for a bike lane going Northeast to Atwater? The narrow bike path being proposed in the current plan is only suitable for bicycling into Silver Lake. Bicyclists need a lane in either direction.
I like the design put forward by Tomas O'Grady's group. The current plan does not do enough to make a safe path for cyclers and walkers. In my opinion, single lanes for cars will prevent future injuries and deaths.
thanks,
Patrick Cleary
Atwater Village/District 13
-----
Subject: 131104 1014-1
From: Nishith Dhandha [mailto:nishifus@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, November 01, 2013 1:03 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Subject: EIR - Glendale-Hyperion Bridge Comments
EIR - Glendale-Hyperion Bridge Comments -
My concerns, briefly stated, are as follows:
1- Bicycle Connectivity: We have a existing bike lane starting on Rowena/Hyperion, yet the bridge
doesn’t provide a bicycle lane connection to that street and the rest of the network. It is a missed
opportunity.
2- Pedestrian Linkage: The undersized proposed 4-foot sidewalk @ Waverly, isn't wide enough to
allow 2 people to walk side by side from Silverlake to Atwater. This will discourage pedestrian
traffic along the bridge and either side of it. Min. width should be 6'.
3. Safety for Non-motor Vehicular Traffic: Although the bridge connects two very pedestrian
neighborhoods, the bridge is designed to move cars along it at disproportionately high speeds
relative to bikes and peds. It discourages pedestrian activity along the corridor and is an
impediment to the Mayor Garcetti's objective to start a "Great Streets" initiative along Glendale
Blvd. and Hyperion St.
Although the aesthetics of the new bridge are wonderful, it is a completely missed opportunity in
terms of multi-modal functionality, pedestrian safety and connectivity. Please do not allow a
project with such promise to fall so flat.
We cannot allow a bridge that will exist long into the future (100 years) to be designed for a
transportation paradigm that is old and outdated. Streets are no longer just for cars and this
project needs to be adjusted to fit into the new pedestrian, multi-modal transportation paradigm.
Streets are civic spaces and should be safe and accessible for all.

Thank you,
Nishith Dhandha
1955 Taft Ave.
Los Angeles, CA  90068
323-313-6409<tel:323-313-6409>
-----
Subject: Hyperion/Glendale Viaduct

I just heard about the restoration and renovations to the Hyperion/Glendale Viaduct. First of all, thank you for providing an investment in the bridge and a dedication to enhancing the riverpathway! I saw the video and explanation at http://www.glendalehyperion.com/ and it looks like you’re taking a very responsible stance to improving this bridge - Thank you.

The only concern that I have is that I didn’t see any mention of bicycle lanes in either direction. Limiting transport across the bridge to cars and pedestrians seems restrictive to alternative transportation (especially with such a nice path to the RiverPathWay)

I use the glen/hyp bridge regularly and it’s already a pretty hairy experience biking across without lanes (or even share the road signs).

Would you please consider including bicycle lanes in the renovations to this bridge?

Thank you for your service and your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Quinn Franklin
3191 Casitas Ave, Los Angeles, CA 90039

e: eskimoquinn07@hotmail.com

p: (920) 539-2695

-----
Subject: 131104 1014-3
From: Catherine Dent [mailto:cd@catherinedent.com]
Sent: Friday, November 01, 2013 2:47 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT

Subject:
I am a resident of Atwater Village,
I support the EnrichLA/Sodder alternate proposal for the bridge renovation.
Thank you for your time and effort
Catherine Dent

Catherine Dent
http://www.imdb.com/name/nm0219748/
Subject: Hyperion-Glendale bridge -- please make it safe for all

Dear Ms. Podesta, Councilmember LaBonge, Councilmember O'Farrell, and Mayor Garcetti,

As someone who has lived two blocks from the Hyperion-Glendale bridge for nearly 12 years, I can't tell you just how important it is to me and others in the neighborhood that it remain accessible for all. There are few ways to traverse the river and freeways in one shot, and none of them are comfortable for cyclists or pedestrians. The idea that we would sink so much money into improvements only to ensure that pedestrians might not have easy access to the newly proposed sidewalks or cyclists would not be able to use the bridge safely for the next 100 years seems ludicrous to me. I have to traverse it several times a week as it is, and it currently feels like I take my life into my hands each time I do.

Making the bridge faster also makes little logical sense. In the 12 years I have lived here, I have never once seen the bridge backed up with traffic. I cannot understand the purpose of encouraging cars to speed through faster than they already do only to be brought to a neighborhood pace a half mile later.

I support the LACBC's call for narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and the nixing of crash barriers and banked turns discourage speeding. I'd also like to see enhanced sidewalks on both sides of the bridge or, if that is not possible, signalized crosswalks that make it possible for those on the south side of the bridge to access it just as easily as those on the north.

The bridge is special for connecting communities and for giving you amazing views of the city, the river, and the mountains all at once. It deserves to be treated as a neighborhood and community asset to be enjoyed and safely traversed by all.

Below, I paste an excerpt of what my experience is in traversing the bridge now that I recently wrote for Streetsblog (http://la.streetsblog.org/2013/10/23/advocates-push-for-a-more-livable-death-bridge-the-glendale-hyperion-bridge-saga-continues/). Regardless of the design implemented, I will continue to need to traverse that bridge, as I imagine other cyclists will. Making room for all will mean that I won't have to put myself in anyone's way when I do, and that should make everyone happy.

* * * *

'I've lived a couple of blocks from the bridge for the past 12 years and, in theory, I am deeply in love with it.

As I stroll across it into Atwater Village, I love to stop and gawk at the river, gaze at the hills of Griffith Park and the Verdugos, or marvel at just how many cars are packed onto the 5 freeway and wonder out loud where all these people could possibly be going.

Then, I get to the end of the narrow walkway and I am dumped out of my dream state onto the tiny Peninsula of Pedestrian Despair (pictured below), protected from the cars whizzing by at 40+ mph on either side by only a few white lines, and I have to begin calculating how fast I can dash across two lanes to the safety of the far sidewalk.

At heavy traffic times, I often think to myself that I am grateful that I have no children or pets that might be saddened if I were to be flattened while playing this real-life version of Frogger.

When I bike the bridge to get to a doctor's appointment or the post-office or the artwalk or one of the many places I need to get to on a regular basis, the situation feels even more dire.

So dire, in fact, that I have learned to time my rides down the hill into Atwater to the light at Hyperion and Rowena. Meaning, I wait until eastbound cars are stopped at a red on Hyperion to give myself a head start.
"They’ll see me this way,” I tell myself as I move into the middle of the lane, take a deep breath and hold it for the duration of my sprint down the hill. As someone who has been on a bike for 20 years and endured insane conditions (like being sexually assaulted while in motion), it takes a lot for me to admit terror. But the jaunt down the bridge manages to get me every time.

The road is in miserable condition - strewn with asphalt chunks, pebbles, cracks, uneven patches, and potholes. And, I've got cars coming up behind me at high speeds as well as cars that I can't see yet, but which will be coming up on my right at equally high speeds and trying to merge into my lane as I reach the end of the bridge. And, the whole time, I am entirely aware that whomever is behind me on the bridge is desperate to get past me because I am in the middle of the lane. I know that’s where I have to be because of the poor conditions, the curves which make it harder for drivers to see me, and the fact that I need to give myself a buffer from traffic merging from my right, but to a driver who has never biked the area, I probably seem more like an entitled miscreant.

Sometimes, I nearly give myself whiplash trying to look over both my shoulders. Other times, I stare straight ahead and continue holding my breath, figuring that if I’m going to die, it is probably best if don’t see it coming.

Riding back up the hill is equally as challenging.

Once you master riding in the middle of four lanes of traffic as you dash toward the bridge from the light at Glenhurst/Glenfeliz (accessing the bridge requires you to be in one of the two center lanes) and get comfortable with cars making last-minute, unsignaled lane changes right in front of you or nearly clipping your back tire, you are greeted by terrible conditions. The westbound asphalt is like cobblestone in sections (and not in a good way) and the curves and high walls along the bridge mean that drivers coming up fast from below can’t see you (and you can’t see them) as you slowly slog up the hill.

So, once again, I usually find myself taking up a lot of the lane for visibility purposes. And, while I’d like to think drivers are sympathetic because it is a long hill, I’m pretty sure that they hate me because they don’t have any understanding of why I have to ride positioned as I do.

It is at these moments that I think about raising my fist to the sky and melodramatically invoking a pox upon city officials and engineers on behalf of drivers, cyclists, and pedestrians alike, but I’m usually too busy trying not to die."

+++ +
Best regards,
sahra

--

Sahra Sulaiman
Communities Editor for Boyle Heights and South LA, LA Streetsblog
Documentary Photographer/Researcher
M.A., A.B.D. International Relations, USC
-----
Subject: 131105 0846
From: Margaret Jensen [mailto:joshuagrammy@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Monday, November 04, 2013 11:01 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; tom.labonge@lacity.org;
mary.d.rodriguez@lacity.org; wenn.chyn@lacity.org; marie.rumsey@lacity.org;
Daniel.Halden@lacity.org; favboard@friendsofatwatervillage.org
Subject: Hyperion Bridge realignment
The Hyperion Bridge proposed realignment serves the needs of both the Silverlake and Atwater Village communities. I urge you to proceed to implement the proposal without any changes.
Sincerely,
Margaret Jensen and Grace Weisenstein
-----
Subject: 131105 0849
From: E. Casson [mailto:ecasson@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 05, 2013 7:42 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT; +councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; +tom.labonge@lacity.org;
+mary.d.rodriguez@lacity.org; +wenn.chyn@lacity.org; +marie.rumsey@lacity.org;
+Daniel.Halden@lacity.org; +favboard@friendsofatwatervillage.org
Subject: HYPERION VIADUCT RESTORATION & RETROFIT PROJECT
I live in Atwater. I used to think I was a new resident but I've lived here for 22 years. I've been in
the area for 33 years. During all this time I've loved looking at this bridge/viaduct. Of course I've
also loved driving over it too! Friends of Atwater Village does a fabulous job of representing
Atwater Village needs. I have looked over the plans and want to join FAV in urging the speedy
improvements for the bridge/viaduct.
Edward Casson
3301 Garden Ave.
90039
-----
Subject: 131105 1256
From: Mark Mallare [mailto:nachimark@outlook.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 05, 2013 11:33 AM
To: Podesta, Tami @DOT; tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion highway--Complete & Great Streets for All
Dear Ms. Podesta, Councilmember LaBonge, Councilmember O’Farrell, and Mayor Garcetti,
As someone who bikes or walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:
- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
- A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,
Mark Mallare
3248 Cattaraugus Ave
LA, CA 90034
-----
Subject: 131105 1427
From: David Thorne [mailto:david.thrn@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 05, 2013 1:57 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT; tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe viaduct for all

Dear Ms. Podesta, Councilmember LaBonge, Councilmember O’Farrell, and Mayor Garcetti,
As someone who bikes or walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:

- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster

A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit. It would be a disservice to the communities on both sides of the bridge, and a rejection of idea of LA as a forward-thinking city, if the Caltrans/BOE plan is implemented in its present form.

Sincerely,
David Thorne
david.thrn@gmail.com<mailto:david.thrn@gmail.com>

-----
Subject: 131106 0856
From: Karen Knapp [mailto:karen@atwatervillage.org]
Sent: Tuesday, November 05, 2013 3:43 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT; +councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; +tom.labonge@lacity.org;
+mary.d.rodriguez@lacity.org; +wenn.chyn@lacity.org; +marie.rumsey@lacity.org;
+Daniel.Halden@lacity.org; +favboard@friendsofatwatervillage.org
Subject: HYPERION VIADUCT RESTORATION & RETROFIT PROJECT
I think the current plan is the most productive and practical. While I understand that bicyclists
would like their own pathway across the bridge, I believe they can share the pedestrian path very
successfully, or use the widened car lane.
I would also like to reiterate the concern of many that the speed limit stay at 35 miles an hour, and
find ways of enforcing that speed.

Karen Knapp
Atwater Village Neighborhood Council
Central Atwater Representative
-----
Subject: 131106 0857
From: Julia Meltzer [mailto:julia@clockshop.org]
Sent: Tuesday, November 05, 2013 7:13 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All

Dear Ms. Podesta, Councilmember LaBonge, Councilmember O'Farrell, and Mayor Garcetti,
I walk and bike between Silver Lake and Atwater Village every day, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. I have a daughter who also walks with me and each time we cross the bridge and come to the end it is perilous. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:

- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
- A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Thank you for your consideration!
best,
Julia Meltzer
Clockshop<http://www.clockshop.org>
c: 323-633-9689
o: 323-522-6014
-----
Subject: Opposing the Current Design of the Glendale/Hyperion Bridge

Division of Environmental Planning -California Dept. of Transportation District 7
100 S. Main St.
Los Angeles, CA 90012

RE: Opposing the Current Design of the Glendale/Hyperion Bridge

Dear Ms. Podesta,

I am writing as the chair of the Green Committee of the Los Feliz Neighborhood Council. I was pleased to hear that the city is planning to retrofit the Glendale/Hyperion bridge to make it safer from earthquake damage. We are lucky to live in a city and a country that takes pro-active measures to avoid catastrophes due to unsafe structures.

I, as many others on the committee are cyclists and believe that our roads in Los Feliz and the surrounding area should be safe to ride on. Our sidewalks should be wide enough for people to walk without fear of speeding vehicles. The Glendale-Hyperion bridge is a perfect example of a structure that fails in both regards. While we are excited at the prospects of what the bridge could be we are disappointed with the current plans to retrofit and expand the bridge.

The proposal speaks about the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU). This excerpt taken from the summary points out the importance of planning and designing for bicycle and pedestrian use.

SAFETEA-LU addresses the many challenges facing our transportation system today - challenges such as improving safety, reducing traffic congestion, improving efficiency in freight movement, increasing intermodal connectivity, and protecting the environment - as well as laying the groundwork for addressing future challenges. SAFETEA-LU promotes more efficient and effective Federal surface transportation programs by focusing on transportation issues of national significance, while giving State and local transportation decision makers more flexibility for solving transportation problems in their communities.

In the Glendale Boulevard-Hyperion Avenue Complex of Bridges Improvement Project; Initial Study with Proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration/Environmental Assessment and Programmatic Section 4(f) Evaluation prepared on August 23rd there is virtually no mention of bike paths besides the shared pedestrian path on the red car bridge. The required widths of the lanes, sidewalks and shoulders would easily leave room for a bike lane on either side and sidewalks if the bridge were not built as a four-lane defacto freeway.

According to the initial study in section 1.2.2.2 in the curb-to-curb widths section they clearly state the regulatory measurements (width) needed to build the bridge at.

Under American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) design standards, a minimum curb-to-curb width of 56 feet is required to remove the deficiency related to deck geometry. This includes 12-foot inner lanes, 14-foot curb lanes (12-foot travel lane and 2-foot shoulder), and a 4-foot median along Hyperion Avenue.

The Northbound Glendale Boulevard Bridge and the Southbound Glendale Boulevard Bridge (both over the Los Angeles River) have two 12-foot-wide travel lanes each, and these bridges do not meet AASHTO standards.

The project would improve a functionally obsolete bridge that traverses a major freeway (I-5) and the Los Angeles River, as well as seismically strengthen the viaduct complex to meet current seismic standards.

(continued)
If you were to create a bridge with one lane of traffic going in each direction and then increasing the shoulder to create a bike lane to 4 feet on either side you will effectively reach 56’. These are critical measurements, which could be reconfigured to include one lane going in each direction on the bridge and including a bike lane and sidewalk safe for all. Traffic studies as referred to in the PROPOSAL say the road can easily accommodate, at rush hour, the amount of cars going over that bridge with one lane going in either direction.

We have the opportunity to create a 21st century multi-modal friendly bridge. Why not create that and address all the stated design issues on page I-5 of the initial study document?

As someone who bikes or walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:
- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Lower the designed speed limit to 35mph
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with way finding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
- A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to be inconsistent with the 2010 bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. Please consider this as you move forward with this project. I would like confirmation that you received and read this letter. Thank you for your time.

Respectfully,

Adam Meltzer
Chair of the Los Feliz Neighborhood Council Green Committee

CC:
Tami Podesta, tami.podesta@dot.ca.gov
Councilmember LaBonge, tom.labonge@lacity.org
Councilmember O'Farrell, councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org
Mayor Garcetti

Members of the Green Committee that support this letter are:
Katy Robinson (Co-Chair of the GC)
Adam Meltzer (Co-Chair of the GC)
Don Ward
Indu Subalya
Alyson Schill
Rick Ziegler
Gabriela Sosa
Duke Graham
Andy Lenigan
Jen Almiron
Bonnie Carter
Michael Samulon

Stay strong and look forward,

Adam Meltzer,
Subject: 131107 0928
From: Paul Romero [paul_romero818@yahoo.com]
Sent: Saturday, October 05, 2013 1:27 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Subject:

Dear Caltrans and BOE

I am writing you today about the Hyperion bridge you guys are planning to do work on in Atwater Village. I read an article saying you want to post a 55mph zone and I most say that is ABSOLUTELY DANGEROUS! I went to John Marshall High School and walking on that narrow side walk with cars flying by just inches away then having to cross the street at the bottom of the bridge, wait for it's safe to cross. I think it's a accident waiting to happen and I would hate to see young students having to go thru that.

Then theirs the case of bikes going thru their. It's would be unsafe and unreasonable for cars to be going that fast when their are bicyclist going thru their. Just think about what would happen.

There's a guy riding his bike, car is already at 55mph and all of a sudden he has to slow down/slam on the breaks. The driver might hit the guy then by that time since he's going so fast he would just go into the freeway and get away or he might stop causing the car behind him to hit him.

I just see so many bad things that could happen if you put the speed at 55mph and I hope you guys come the sense that this idea is not the best for this street.

Sincerely,
Paul Joshua Romero
Hello ...

Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All

We bike all over the LA area. We need safe streets.

As someone who bikes or walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:

* Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
* Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
* Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
* No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
* A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Please consider carefully. Bicycle routes and/or lanes improve communities!

Sincerely,

nancy & richard
we noho weedeens

Cycle & Recycle
Mini IPad
Subject: 131107 0933-1
From: Shannon ORourke [shannonorourke@me.com]
Sent: Friday, October 04, 2013 10:30 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; tom.labonge@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway – Build a Safe Viaduct for All

As someone who bikes or walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone's needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:

* Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
* Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
* Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
* No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
* A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,

Shannon O’Rourke
2101 Hollyvista Avenue
Los Angeles, CA  90027
Subject: 131107 0933-2
From: David P. Dapper [dpdapper@me.com]
Sent: Saturday, October 05, 2013 10:32 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; tom.labonge@lacity.org; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All

Dear Ms. Podesta,

As someone who bikes or walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone's needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, the project should include:

* Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
* Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
* Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
* No crash barrier and banked turns that will only encourage people to drive even faster
* A full-width crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans' complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,

David P. Dapper
1155 South Grand Avenue
#1411
Los Angeles, CA 90015
Subject: 131107 1023
Dear Tami Podesta --
Thank you very much for this opportunity to comment on the proposed Hyperion Bridge renovation.
Today is actually my son's 9th birthday and his wish was that we walk to school. We live in Atwater Village but he goes to school at Franklin Elementary in Los Feliz, so to walk to school is a bit of a challenge. It's not that far -- a little more than a mile -- but to do it requires crossing what he and his 8 year old friend refer to as the "Death Bridge."
Well, I'd like to report that we made the trip this morning -- and we survived!! It was a terrifying experience crossing the bridge. The sidewalks are far too narrow, there is no cross walk in Atwater that enables you to get to the sidewalk on the bridge, and the cars go by so fast that if one person happened to be sending a text message and swerved even a few feet out of their lane we would have all been goners. That quick and easy -- See you later!
I bring this up to say -- I know that the new bridge renovation is going to happen one way or another. And I look forward to it because anything will be better than what is there now. But I beg you to please consider making this a community destination -- and not just a way for cars to speed through our neighborhood. This is a neighborhood! Many people in Atwater would love to walk to Silver Lake/Los Feliz, and vice versa -- but they can't do so because the bridge is not engineered with pedestrians in mind.
I have taken a long hard look at the EnrichLA/Sodder alternate bridge renovation design and what I really love about it is that it is making the bridge a community destination. The LA River is SO beautiful in this area, and yet there is no way to get to it safely from the bridge. No way to stop and enjoy it from the bridge. This is a once in a lifetime opportunity to transform this bridge into something we can all really be proud of and enjoy -- not just whiz over at 40 mph. Let's please take the time to consider all options and really do this right!!
Thank you so much for your consideration.
Greg Brouwer
3767 Edenhurst Ave.
Atwater Village, 90039

On Friday, October 25, 2013 8:51 AM, "Podesta, Tami L@DOT" <tami.podesta@dot.ca.gov> wrote:
Dear Mr. Brouwer:

The comment period for the Glendale Blvd. Hyperion Ave. Complex of Bridges Improvement Project environmental document has been extended to November 7, 2013, so you still have time to submit your comment.

Please see the project website for more information:

http://www.glendalehyperion.com/

Tami Podesta
Senior Environmental Planner
213-897-0309

Department of Transportation
Division of Environmental Planning
100 South Main Street, Ste. 100
Los Angeles, CA 90012

From: Greg Brouwer [mailto:gbrouw@yahoo.com]
Sent: Thursday, October 24, 2013 10:40 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Subject: bridge comments?

Hi Tami -- is it too late to comment on the proposed Hyperion-Glendale bridge construction? Thanks!

====================
Subject: 131107 1242

From: Christine Anthony [mailto:canthony2@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Wednesday, November 06, 2013 10:01 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: gene gilbert
Subject: Glendale-Hyperion bridges project.

Ms. Podesta,
As a resident of Atwater Village, the community at north end of this span, my comment is to get on with it. The proposal to build a bridge that will accommodate traffic at higher than posted speeds addresses the reality of what the traffic will do. It will become necessary for our community to put in place a lower speed limit through the business district and we should fight for that and then for the authorities to enforce it.
That there is a dedicated pedestrian and bicycle bridge to be constructed over pylons just downriver from the G-H span solves concerns about accommodation for those forms of traffic. As all the add-ons to this earthquake upgrade to a dangerous structure slow the design and implementation process, before you know it the whole thing will get knocked down in just that earthquake.
Thank you,
Christine Anthony
4064 Perlita Ave.
Los Angeles, CA 90039
ph 323 376 6463

-----
Dear Ms. Podesta,

I am a Silver Lake resident currently residing in Atwater Village while our Silver Lake home is being repaired after a fire. In the last year, my family and I have spend a lot of time crossing the Hyperion Bridge, and we are concerned that the proposed renovations to the Hyperion Bridge are moving in the wrong direction, as it were, since it will make the bridge even less pedestrian- and cyclist-friendly than it already is. (I have walked across the bridge a few times - the sidewalk is frighteningly narrow! I also see many school kids walking across that bridge and cyclists contending with cars speeding over a blind hill) and create a further separation of these two neighborhoods.

I would urge you to consider the alternative proposal made by Los Angeles Walks, which would transform the bridge into a multi-modal thoroughfare, used by cars, buses, bicycles and pedestrians alike. It will be more in keeping with the history of our neighborhoods (which used to be multi-modal) and more in line with future developments happening in these neighborhoods, particularly the revitalization of the LA River that could being more people across the bridge - ideally pedestrians and cyclists. Los Angeles is a City that will succeed in the future by depending less on cars - look at the success of CicLAvia!

It would truly enhance all of our neighborhoods to make this key route one that is more hospitable and safe for all community members.

Thank you for your consideration.

Meher McArthur  
Silver Lake/Atwater Village Resident  
Los Feliz Ledger contributor "Keen to be Green" column  
Asian Art Curator, Author and Educator  
(323) 459-7791  
-----
Subject: Re: bridge comments?

Dear Tami Podesta --

Thank you very much for this opportunity to comment on the proposed Hyperion Bridge renovation.

Today is actually my son's 9th birthday and his wish was that we walk to school. We live in Atwater Village but he goes to school at Franklin Elementary in Los Feliz, so to walk to school is a bit of a challenge. It's not that far -- a little more than a mile -- but to do it requires crossing what he and his 8 year old friend refer to as the "Death Bridge."

Well, I'd like to report that we made the trip this morning -- and we survived!! It was a terrifying experience crossing the bridge. The sidewalks are far too narrow, there is no cross walk in Atwater that enables you to get to the sidewalk on the bridge, and the cars go by so fast that if one person happened to be sending a text message and swerved even a few feet out of their lane we would have all been goners. That quick and easy -- See you later!

I bring this up to say -- I know that the new bridge renovation is going to happen one way or another. And I look forward to it because anything will be better than what is there now. But I beg you to please consider making this a community destination -- and not just a way for cars to speed through our neighborhood. This is a neighborhood! Many people in Atwater would love to walk to Silver Lake/Los Feliz, and vice versa -- but they can't do so because the bridge is not engineered with pedestrians in mind.

I have taken a long hard look at the EnrichLA/Sodder alternate bridge renovation design and what I really love about it is that it is making the bridge a community destination. The LA River is SO beautiful in this area, and yet there is no way to get to it safely from the bridge. No way to stop and enjoy it from the bridge. This is a once in a lifetime opportunity to transform this bridge into something we can all really be proud of and enjoy -- not just whiz over at 40 mph. Let’s please take the time to consider all options and really do this right!!

Thank you so much for your consideration.

Greg Brouwer
3767 Edenhurst Ave.
Atwater Village, 90039
The comment period for the Glendale Blvd. Hyperion Ave. Complex of Bridges Improvement Project environmental document has been extended to November 7, 2013, so you still have time to submit your comment.

Please see the project website for more information:

http://www.glendalehyperion.com/

Tami Podesta
Senior Environmental Planner
213-897-0309

Department of Transportation
Division of Environmental Planning
100 South Main Street, Ste. 100
Los Angeles, CA 90012

From: Greg Brouwer [mailto:gbrouw@yahoo.com]
Sent: Thursday, October 24, 2013 10:40 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Subject: bridge comments?

Hi Tami -- is it too late to comment on the proposed Hyperion-Glendale bridge construction? Thanks!

-----
Subject: 131107 1301-2

From: Sascha Rice [mailto:sascha@sascharice.com]
Sent: Thursday, November 07, 2013 10:35 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT; tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Cc: info@la-bike.org; Joe Mellis
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All

Dear Ms. Podesta, Councilmember LaBonge, Councilmember O’Farrell, and Mayor Garcetti,

I live, work, exercise, shop, and raise my children in Silverlake. I travel between Atwater and Silverlake everyday, often many times a day.

I am writing because it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Avenue be made safe for people like me and my children.
And as leaders in the community, you have an amazing opportunity to take this modest action and make extraordinary change.

Connecting our wonderful city hubs with accessible and safe transportation-ways is a priority for me and this will do wonders to make Los Angeles a leader in urban development.

We walk our daughter to Ivanhoe school every morning and in the afternoon and on weekends our son and daughter ride the neighborhood on their bikes. This is the way children grow and how they learn to navigate their city. This kind of human experience is what makes this area so highly valued.

Atwater Village has become a beautiful vibrant destination, but I am too frightened to allow my family to walk or ride bikes over the bridge. When a friend was killed by a bus on her bicycle, I stopped riding in the city. I teach my children bicycle safety, but I need you to provide better safety conditions. Like the change around the reservoir, addressing the Hyperion safety hazard will do wonders to creating a safer community.

I can choose to drive because it is unsafe, but what about my children? How are they supposed to get around safely? They are quite capable of walking or riding their bikes, but it is up to our city leaders to make it safe. Making our city safe for kids (who can not drive) is your responsibility.

Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban pedestrian community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:
* Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
* Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
* Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
* No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
* A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge
* Beautification with plants to bring drivers into the human space

It is your responsibility to make this project consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle and pedestrian access.
across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make satisfy driver’s needs as well. The safety of your constituents is your responsibility. Please don’t characterize this as a "fridge bicycle movement." This is about safety for all.

I understand working these considerations into action will extend the project’s completion horizon and it will be absolutely worth it.

Sincerely,

Sascha
2645 Ivanhoe Drive Los Angeles CA 90039

Sascha Rice
Director | Writer | Producer
To learn more about Sascha's EMMY NOMINATED feature go to:
www.patbrowndocumentary.com<http://www.patbrowndocumentary.com>
MyCaliforniaNow.com<http://mycalifornianow.com/>

-----
Subject: 131107 1301-3

From: Catherine Jurca [mailto:cathjurca@gmail.com] On Behalf Of Catherine Jurca
Sent: Thursday, November 07, 2013 11:07 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Subject: Hyperion Bridge project

Dear Ms. Podesta:

I am writing to object to the proposed redesign of the Hyperion Bridge. I drive across that bridge all the time to get from Glendale Blvd. to Los Feliz, and back again, and even I think it's a terrible idea not to include bike lanes and better pedestrian access. The project must take into account the safety of these two groups as well and make it a resource for all users. This plan is a major step backward in thinking about the transportation future of our city. It's a disaster that I hope your agency will remedy.

Best wishes,

Catherine Jurca

-----
Subject: 131107 1303-1

From: jennie.chamberlain@gmail.com [mailto:jennie.chamberlain@gmail.com] On Behalf Of Jennie Chamberlain
Sent: Thursday, November 07, 2013 11:33 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Subject: Glendale-Hyperion Complex of Bridges Improvement Project

Hello,
I’m writing to you as a long term resident of Los Feliz and Silver Lake.

I appreciate all of the hard work that has gone into trying to improve this bridge but I have several concerns regarding pedestrian and bike access and safety over the bridge.

Just to clear the air, I’m not sure why this is being painted in the media as a recent bike activists issue. For as long as I can remember, over a decade, community members like myself have been continually voicing our concerns for pedestrian and bike safety, for the desire to improve walkability and a sense of community in Los Feliz, Silver Lake and the adjoining Atwater neighborhoods. This desire has only grown stronger over the years. It is sad for me to hear that some folks think that because they have been working on this project for 9 years, it is simply OK to ignore other voices, of which there are many within the communities, who have as of yet not even been invited to the table.

I am frankly quite discouraged by all of the rhetoric of livable streets with a lack of follow through to make areas safe for pedestrians and cyclists.

On many occasions, starting back when my children were 4 (they are 8 now) they have asked to walk or bike over the bridge to their favorite papusa restaurant. Without a car this trip is simply reckless. And with children it would negligent.

To say that the bike path over the river will suffice does nothing to connect the neighborhoods. Trust me as I say I have carried there and my bikes up and down the stairs (the location a serial rapist chooses to use every few years or so to isolate his victims) that it is not simple or easy or straightforward. And then you still need to cross Riverside. All this while many services are along Glendale/Brand, not just up on Los Feliz Blvd.

There are a number of occasions when I would have to pack up my pajama clad children and load them into the car to pick up my husband who biked back from work in Eagle Rock at the Atwater side of the bridge simply because he felt it was too dangerous to cross. After hearing the public testimony of many hit and run victims I am now glad he did.

I was heartened to hear that the impact study of construction on the bridge, with 2 lanes of traffic closed, indicated that there would still easily be enough room to handle the volume of cars. So please do not provide unnecessarily fast and more lanes than are necessary for cars. I hope DOT will take this under careful consideration, reduce the number of car lanes and give space over to pedestrians and bikes so that they too will have safe passage.

I challenge you to close lanes to car and actually count pedestrian and bike users who travel over the bridge. As you see, currently they are uncountable - the bridge is simply too unsafe for most people to even attempt, even though they would gladly walk or take their bikes across.
I am also gravely concerned that if the bridge is designed for greater speeds rather than a drastic reduction in speed we will continue to have pedestrian accidents. Most of the harm done by cars speeding over the bridge (in lanes more plentiful and wider than is needed) is on the communities flanking the bridge. These zones, which are heavily trafficked by pedestrians, and would be even moreso if the bridge were slowed down, are under attack by cars speeding off the bridge. It makes no sense to speed this short stretch up and have cars fly into otherwise congested areas. We have had to many cyclist and pedestrian accidents (and deaths) in the neighborhood already.

I implore you to make the bridge and other passageways in our neighborhoods safe for pedestrians, cyclists, children and old people, for the many who regularly use non car transportation to work. This is not only a healthy thing to do for the community, it is a necessity. Many Angelenos, many Silver Lake residents, many Atwater residents have only one car per family or no car. They rely on you to make these roads safe.

As a neighborhood we have shown over and over again our commitment to walking. Ivanhoe school regularly has 80% of its students walking, biking or scooting at least a portion of the way to school - even without sidewalks on many of the neighborhood streets. Many more would like to ride their bikes to King Middle School and Marshal. Please take this into consideration. Make the neighborhood safer.

Thank You,
Jennie Chamberlain
310 770-6051

-----
Subject:  131107 1303-2

From: Brandon Harvey [mailto:sandover@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, November 07, 2013 12:52 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Subject: Comment on the Glendale Boulevard-Hyperion Avenue Complex of Bridges Improvement

Hi, I’d like to make a brief comment on the project.

As someone who lives in the area (and who rides a bike to work), I strongly support making any new infrastructure we build as friendly as possible toward cyclists and pedestrians. Curb lanes should be broad; bike lanes should be there when they make sense; otherwise bike "sharrows" should be painted in the lanes; sidewalks should be broad, smooth, and shaded by trees; it should be possible to cross roads safely; and so forth. This project represents a great opportunity to better connect two great neighborhoods. I strongly feel that we should get it right and not continue to make the mistake of over-privileging automobile traffic.

Thank you!

Brandon Harvey
1751 Lucretia Ave.
Los Angeles, CA  90026

-----
Subject: 131107 1305-1

From: Daniel Chamberlain [mailto:daniel.chamberlain@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, November 07, 2013 12:16 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Subject: Public comment on glendale-hyperion bridge

Hello,
I'm writing to you as a long term resident of Los Feliz and Silver Lake.

I appreciate all of the hard work that has gone into trying to improve this bridge but I have several concerns regarding pedestrian and bike access and safety over the bridge. As a regular user of the bridge I can tell you that it is already used by cars to travel over 50 mph between Atwater and Silver Lake. I would gladly trade a few MPH of that speed (which is already 15 MPH over the posted speed limit, observed by nobody) for the inclusion of pedestrian walkways wide enough for the dozens of high school kids that use it everyday and the inclusion of protected bike lanes for cyclists moving across the city or coming up from the lovely river path. As it stands right now, traffic comes barreling off the bridge into slow traffic in Atwater or into stand-still traffic in front of the Silver Lake Trader Joes. This traffic needs no encouragement to go faster, and in fact the overall safety of these neighborhoods, of pedestrians, of cyclists, of employees, and of drivers would be best supported by taking measures to slow the traffic over the bridge.

I am also gravely concerned that if the bridge is designed for greater speeds rather than a drastic reduction in speed we will continue to have pedestrian accidents. Most of the harm done by cars speeding over the bridge (in lanes more plentiful and wider than is needed) is on the communities flanking the bridge. These zones, which are heavily trafficked by pedestrians, and would be even moreso if the bridge were slowed down, are under attack by cars speeding off the bridge. It makes no sense to speed this short stretch up and have cars fly into otherwise congested areas. We have had to many cyclist and pedestrian accidents (and deaths) in the neighborhood already.

As a neighborhood we have shown over and over again our commitment to walking. Ivanhoe school regularly has 80% of its students walking, biking or scooting at least a portion of the way to school - even without sidewalks on many of the neighborhood streets. Many more would like to ride their bikes to King Middle School and Marshall. Please take this into consideration. Make the neighborhood safer.

Allowing for safe, family-friendly connections between Silver Lake and Atwater will benefit both neighborhoods, and the city as a whole. Businesses will be revitalized as the neighborhoods would be better connected, and we would be getting closer to having a healthy, living, sustainable city.

Please alter the design to include deliberate and meaningful provisions for the many citizens who would prefer to walk or bike over the bridge. There is more than enough space on the bridge for a lane of cars each way, an emergency lane if needed, and safer spaces for bikes and pedestrians.

Daniel Chamberlain

-----
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All

Dear Ms. Podesta, Councilmember LaBonge, Councilmember O'Farrell, and Mayor Garcetti,

As someone who bikes between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone's needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:

* Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
* Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
* Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
* No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
* A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,
Michael Shifflett
327 Welcome St
LA, 90026

--
Michael Shifflett
Dilettante
c. 213.359.1591
e. doctor@thedilettantes.net<mailto:doctor@thedilettantes.net>

-----
Subject: 131107 1306-1

From: Paul Berolzheimer [mailto:zerodbspl@yahoo.com]
Sent: Thursday, November 07, 2013 12:07 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Subject: Glendale-Hyperion Complex of Bridges Improvement Project Comment Card

Paul Berolzheimer
1411 Marion Drive
Glendale, CA 91205
zerodbspl@yahoo.com<mailto:zerodbspl@yahoo.com>
818-331-8514

I've been a homeowner and resident of Adams Hill of 21 years, and all that time have considered Atwater and Silverlake to be part of my extended neighborhood. I patronize the cafes & restaurants & grocery stores there frequently, and worked for the better part of 4 years in a building right at the foot of the bridge, on the Atwater side. I've always thought that the Hyperion Bridge complex has a tremendous amount of wasted potential- it's situated wonderfully for views of the river and the city, but with it's high solid walls, high speed traffic, and narrow sidewalks, it's impossible to enjoy those views. I believe we have an opportunity now to change the bridge from something that's unpleasant and dangerous into something beautiful and enjoyable, a destination, and to improve it's functionality for a borad set of users at the same time. I'd like to see wides sidewalks on both sides, bike lanes, park benches, and a single lane for car traffic each direction. I also think a crosswalk in the middle of the bridge would be helpful- it would allow pedestrians and sightseers to enjoy views up and down the river, and would have a traffic calming effect as well. It currently takes only 30-40 seconds to cross the bridge at the current posted speed limit; no one will lose any significant time if we slow traffic on the bridge for a few hundred feet. We're only talking about a few seconds of driver's time, in exchange for a huge improvement in the quality of life in this area.

-----
Subject: 131107 1306-2

From: Jeannie Olander [mailto:jeannieolander@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, November 07, 2013 12:56 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; marie.rumsey@lacity.org; Mitch.Ofarrell@lacity.org;
christine.peters@lacity.org; eric.garcetti@lacity.org; john.brady@lacity.org
Subject: Hyperion Bridge

Tami Podesta & Hyperion Bridge Team,

I am concerned that the Hyperion Bridge design has not incorporated the critical need for bike lanes on the bridge or a safe pedestrian crossing at the junction of Hyperion Avenue and Glendale Blvd. Many constituents in the adjacent neighborhoods rely solely on walking and biking as part of their primary, daily commute. If the Hyperion Bridge is designed to solely move cars quickly with no thought to the risk to pedestrians and bicyclists, then there will be tragic accidents.

Some folks choose to bike and walk, but others do not have a choice. Please understand how this bridge will affect the daily lives of those people living and working in these neighborhoods. Please put yourselves in their shoes. We need to design infrastructure that considers the vast percentage of our population that don’t have cars to drive.

Thank you for your time and attention to this urgent matter.

Jeannie Olander
323.620.1487

-----
Dear Tami

I am a member of the groups Vision Hyperion, Midnight Ridazz and Angelenos for a Great Hyperion Bridge as well as several other emerging citizen action groups.

I would like to submit my concerns regarding the proposal for the Hyperion Glendale Bridge Complex.

I appreciate the thought of a citizen advisory board, however ground zero for that board must include BOTH sidewalks AND bike lanes the length of the bridge in order to mitigate my concerns.

The current proposed plan creates a danger by removing the sidewalk on the south side as well as the banked roads and engineered speed designed for high speed.

Removing the sidewalk would create a hazard for me as a cyclist since many people will likely use the shoulder or bike lane if not provided an ADA compliant space and in particular this danger will be present at night.

Many people use bike lanes as their side walk for running and walking and this would create a danger.

The presence of crash barricades would create an emergency vehicle hazard in the event of a major collision.

The IAES document itself afirms that a road diet is feasible for the bridge with no additional impact on peak hour traffic. Page 103

attached are diagrams regarding my concerns including a diagram that would mitigate my concerns.

removing the sidewalk is a NON negotiable.

thanks

-don ward
stake holder.
Subject: 131107 1306-4

From: Jeannie Olander [mailto:jeannieolander@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, November 07, 2013 12:56 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; marie.rumsey@lacity.org; Mitch.Ofarrell@lacity.org;
christine.peters@lacity.org; eric.garcetti@lacity.org; john.brady@lacity.org
Subject: Hyperion Bridge

Tami Podesta & Hyperion Bridge Team,

I am concerned that the Hyperion Bridge design has not incorporated the critical need for bike lanes on the bridge or a safe pedestrian crossing at the junction of Hyperion Avenue and Glendale Blvd. Many constituents in the adjacent neighborhoods rely solely on walking and biking as part of their primary, daily commute. If the Hyperion Bridge is designed to solely move cars quickly with no thought to the risk to pedestrians and bicyclists, then there will be tragic accidents.

Some folks choose to bike and walk, but others do not have a choice. Please understand how this bridge will affect the daily lives of those people living and working in these neighborhoods. Please put yourselves in their shoes. We need to design infrastructure that considers the vast percentage of our population that don’t have cars to drive.

Thank you for your time and attention to this urgent matter.

Jeannie Olander
323.620.1487

-----
Subject: Public comment concerning Glendale Boulevard-Hyperion Avenue Complex of Bridges Improvement Project.

to: Tami Podesta, Branch Chief
Division of Environmental Planning
California Department of Transportation District 7
100 South Main St, Los Angeles, CA 90012

Good morning, please absorb and incorporate the following in all future public projects. The Hyperion Bridge Project needs to be redesigned. The Redesign of all future public works projects need to embrace a new and progressive set of criteria. First: Water must be treated as a resource to be slowed and kept on site, instead of moving into the ocean as fast as possible. Two: Paved road ways must be designed to embrace as many different uses as possible. The term complete streets in all of its many aspects must become an excepted term of art.

In keeping with the above two part design colloquium the Hyperion design project needs an extensive and complete reassessment. Beginning at Rowena heading northerly on Hyperion Ave., transform the 60 feet currently of utilized as four lanes of automotive, light trucks, and buses into one lane north and down hill with two lanes south and up hill. This will accommodate; three 11 foot lanes for automobiles, two 6 foot bicycle lanes, two 3 foot separations to be placed between the cars and bicycle/pedestrian space and two 4 foot pedestrian sidewalks. These new pedestrian and bicycle accommodations will require shade trees, permeable pavement, water catchments and road separation from the fast automotive traffic. The water catchments are to be designed to absorb all rain, at rates; of up to 4 inches in one week, 12 inches in one month or a potential 50 inches in one year. The absorption area will be the entire 100 feet of city right of way and any other current feed areas that can not be adsorbed and kept in the grounds where those rains fall.

The entire length of Hyperion from Rowena to Glendale Blvd and all other roads connected with this project must be constructed to accommodate cars, bicycles and pedestrians, water and plantings must also be considered from the above standard. Any existing regulation countermanding these design criteria will need to be reviewed for life safety concerns. City municipal code and zoning requirements can be granted variances and modifications as necessary.

There are already several state water conservation requirements that require similar conservation strategies on private property. We are asking to apply those standards to this and all future public works projects. AB 1358 is germane here. As are several other recently enacted legislative directives. Please come to understand that the base line design criteria needs to be, how will our grate grand children's grate grand children be affected by our actions today?

thank you
good diggin'

jim

-----
Subject: 131107 1307-2
Attachments: signature.asc; _Certification_.txt

From: Robert "Fixer" Smith [mailto:fixer@livenation.com]
Sent: Thursday, November 07, 2013 11:51 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Subject: Comments on Glendale Boulevard-Hyperion Avenue Complex of Bridges Improvement

I am an Atwater Village resident and former Atwater Village Neighborhood Council member and co-chair. I wanted to take this opportunity to weigh in on the 2005 plans for this bridge project and the possibilities of a newly revised plan.

The character and make-up of this neighborhood has changed dramatically since 2005, as has the City and its Plans and Ordinances. It would be ludicrous to take a plan that is so old and outdated and try to make such a major, lasting change to the neighborhood. It would not take much time or effort to consider the changes being proposed to keep this project in alignment with the overall transportation goals of the City while also IMPROVING the bridge and surrounding area for people using all forms of transportation.

The trends seem to be a movement towards less single person automobile transportation, not more. We need our core infrastructure to reflect that trend.

Thanks for your consideration.

--
Robert Smith | Post Production Manager
(:: +1.323.207.6484 | +1.323.769.4789 fax | x44993 internal LN
8:: fixer@livenation.com | AIM: bigdaddyfix
*:: 7060 Hollywood Blvd, 2nd Floor, | Hollywood, CA, | 90028
Subject: 131107 1310 (Referenced as 131004 1421-1 in the E-mail Database)

From: Ezra Horne [mailto:ezrahorne@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, November 07, 2013 12:51 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT; Tom LaBonge; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All

Dear Ms. Podesta, Councilmember LaBonge, Councilmember O'Farrell, and Mayor Garcetti,
As someone who bikes or walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical
that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is
designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the
project to include:
* Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
* Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
* Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage
  speeding
* No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
* A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk
  from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge
There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete
streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5
Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.
Sincerely,
Ezra Horne
3944 1/2 Marathon St
Los Angeles, CA 90029

-----
Subject: 131107 1326

From: Fabienne Bouville [mailto:fbouvil@yahoo.com]
Sent: Thursday, November 07, 2013 12:39 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Subject: Hyperion bridge

Hello,
As a resident of atwater village, I would like to express my support to integrate a bike path and pedestrian access to the hyperion bridge project. I feel it is also important to preserve its historic and original design for the sake of our neighborhood’s identity.
Thank you very much,
Fabienne Bouville
3837 Brunswick ave
Los Angeles, CA 90039

-----
Subject: 131107 1327

From: Mitch Suskin [mailto:msuskin@kamosuskin.com]
Sent: Thursday, November 07, 2013 7:05 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT; tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Cc: info@la-bike.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway! Build a SAFE Viaduct for ALL

Dear Ms. Podesta, Councilmember LaBonge, Councilmember O’Farrell, and Mayor Garcelli:

As someone who bikes and walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is critical that
Hyperion Ave be made safe for pedestrians and bicyclists. Everyone’s needs can be met if the
project is designed for appropriate speeds through our urban community. Project must include:

Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave
Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
Narrower traffic lanes to provide space for cyclists and pedestrians
A complete crosswalk on Atwater end of viaduct to let people access sidewalk from both sides of
Glendale Blvd. and give cyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge.

There’s NO reason this project cannot be consistent with bike plan and Caltrans streets policy.
The viaduct is currently dangerous and the greatest barrier to safe access across the I-5 Freeway
and the Los Angeles River. This project must change that and make all travelers safer.

Thanks very much,

Mitch Suskin
4380 Lemp Ave
Los Angeles, CA
Subject: 131107 1403

From: Ryan Snyder [mailto:ryan@rsa.cc]
Sent: Wednesday, November 06, 2013 8:18 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Subject: Hyperion Bridge

Hello Tami

I just wanted to state my desire to see a design of the Hyperion bridge that is much more pedestrian and bicycle-friendly. In this era of global warming it makes little sense to spend public money to simply move cars faster.

Thanks!

Ryan Snyder
Ryan Snyder Associates
10501 Wilshire Boulevard, #1910
Los Angeles, California USA 90024
Tel: 310-475-3895

-----
Subject:  131107 1418

From: Doris Del Castillo [mailto:dorisdelc@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Thursday, November 07, 2013 1:58 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Subject: Hyperion Bridge Renovation

Dear Ms. Podesta,
I am the mother of 3 children ages 8, 6, and 3 and our family has lived in Silver lake for 4 years now.

We live on Panorama Terrace and often walk, as a family, to Trader Joe’s, Pinkberry, and local restaurants. We would love to walk across the Hyperion Bridge into Atwater Village as a family as well but it is not safe. A few times I have done that walk by myself and always get nervous at the end when I have to dash across 2 lanes of traffic, I could not imagine shepherding 3 little people across (and then have to do it again on the return!)

I urge you, in renovating the bridge, to proceed with the option that best supports pedestrians in the neighborhood. If more people were encouraged to explore our neighborhood and Atwater Village on foot both local businesses and our sense of community would benefit.

Sincerely,
Doris Del Castillo
Los Angeles, 90039
323-663-0853

-----
Subject: 131107 1421 (Referenced as 131107 1303-1 in the E-mail Database)

From: jennie.chamberlain@gmail.com [mailto:jennie.chamberlain@gmail.com] On Behalf Of Jennie Chamberlain
Sent: Thursday, November 07, 2013 2:01 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Subject: Re: Glendale-Hyperion Complex of Bridges Improvement Project

One more thing....

At the Public Hearing for the Hyperion Glendale bridge, many people used these words to characterize the bridge and their experience using it -

TOO FAST
TOO DANGEROUS
TOO LOUD
TAKING YOUR LIFE IN YOUR HANDS
RECKLESS DRIVING
A DEATH BRIDGE
HEAD-ON COLLISIONS
SPEEDING OFF THE BRIDGE INTO CONGESTED NEIGHBORHOODS
DANGEROUS FOR CARS, BIKES AND PEDESTRIANS
NOT SAFE

No one talked about the need to speed up their commute. No one talked about the need to preserve car lanes. This is in stark contrast to discussions about other roads such as Rowena, which has successfully undergone a "road diet."

Please listen to the people. Please make this bridge safe for all forms of transportation. Stop creating a bridge that is faster than is needed and faster than is safe. The community is relying on your leadership.

Thank You,
Jennie Chamberlain

On Thu, Nov 7, 2013 at 11:32 AM, Jennie Chamberlain <jennie.chamberlain@post.harvard.edu<mailto:jennie.chamberlain@post.harvard.edu>> wrote:
Hello,
I'm writing to you as a long term resident of Los Feliz and Silver Lake.

I appreciate all of the hard work that has gone into trying to improve this bridge but I have several concerns regarding pedestrian and bike access and safety over the bridge.

Just to clear the air, I'm not sure why this is being painted in the media as a recent bike activists issue. For as long as I can remember, over a decade, community members like myself have been continually voicing our concerns for pedestrian and bike safety, for the desire to improve walkability and a sense of community in Los Feliz, Silver Lake and the adjoining Atwater neighborhoods. This desire has only grown stronger over the years. It is sad for me to hear that some folks think that because they have been working on this project for 9 years, it is simply OK to
ignore other voices, of which there are many within the communities, who have as of yet not even been invited to the table.

I am frankly quite discouraged by all of the rhetoric of livable streets with a lack of follow through to make areas safe for pedestrians and cyclists.

On many occasions, starting back when my children were 4 (they are 8 now) they have asked to walk or bike over the bridge to their favorite papusa restaurant. Without a car this trip is simply reckless. And with children it would negligent.

To say that the bike path over the river will suffice does nothing to connect the neighborhoods. Trust me as I say I have carried there and my bikes up and down the stairs (the location a serial rapist chooses to use every few years or so to isolate his victims) that it is not simple or easy or straightforward. And then you still need to cross Riverside. All this while many services are along Glendale/Brand, not just up on Los Feliz Blvd.

There are a number of occasions when I would have to pack up my pajama clad children and load them into the car to pick up my husband who biked back from work in Eagle Rock at the Atwater side of the bridge simply because he felt it was too dangerous to cross. After hearing the public testimony of many hit and run victims I am now glad he did.

I was heartened to hear that the impact study of construction on the bridge, with 2 lanes of traffic closed, indicated that there would still easily be enough room to handle the volume of cars. So please do not provide unnecessarily fast and more lanes than are necessary for cars. I hope DOT will take this under careful consideration, reduce the number of car lanes and give space over to pedestrians and bikes so that they too will have safe passage.

I challenge you to close lanes to car and actually count pedestrian and bike users who travel over the bridge. As you see, currently they are uncountable - the bridge is simply too unsafe for most people to even attempt, even though they would gladly walk or take their bikes across.

I am also gravely concerned that if the bridge is designed for greater speeds rather than a drastic reduction in speed we will continue to have pedestrian accidents. Most of the harm done by cars speeding over the bridge (in lanes more plentiful and wider than is needed) is on the communities flanking the bridge. These zones, which are heavily trafficked by pedestrians, and would be even moreso if the bridge were slowed down, are under attack by cars speeding off the bridge. It makes no sense to speed this short stretch up and have cars fly into otherwise congested areas. We have had to many cyclist and pedestrian accidents (and deaths) in the neighborhood already.

I implore you to make the bridge and other passageways in our neighborhoods safe for pedestrians, cyclists, children and old people, for the many who regularly use non car transportation to work. This is not only a healthy thing to do for the community, it is a necessity. Many Angelenos, many Silver Lake residents, many Atwater residents have only one car per family or no car. They rely on you to make these roads safe.

As a neighborhood we have shown over and over again our commitment to walking. Ivanhoe school regularly has 80% of its students walking, biking or scooting at least a portion of the way to school - even without sidewalks on many of the neighborhood streets. Many more would like to ride their bikes to King Middle School and Marshal. Please take this into consideration. Make the neighborhood safer.
Thank You,
Jennie Chamberlain
310 770-6051
Subject: 131107 1550

From: Diane Edwardson [mailto:diane.edwardson@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, November 07, 2013 3:17 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; councilmember.labonge@lacity.org
Subject: Glendale Boulevard-Hyperion Avenue Complex of Bridges Improvement

I do not think you need to cater to the bike riders on the Glendale Hyperion Bridge project. Frankly I'm sick & tired of losing motorized traffic lanes to bikes. In this case, there are a number of alternative bridges being constructed to cross the river - including one on the old bridge footings adjacent to the Hyperion Bridge. This is a major commuter corridor.

It's safer for everyone involved to just get the bikes onto an alternative route. As it is the bike riders.

A great deal of attention was paid to preserving & restoring the historic character of the bridge complex. Don't screw it up.

--
Diane Edwardson
2642 Corralitas Dirve
Los Angeles CA 90039
(323) 666-1392
diane.edwardson@gmail.com<mailto:diane.edwardson@gmail.com>

-----
Subject: 131107 1553-1

From: Craig Collins [mailto:craig.collins@silverlakereservoirs.org]
Sent: Thursday, November 07, 2013 3:24 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: Eric Bruins
Subject: Please file this as a comment to the Hyperion Bridge Retrofit documents

The following is a comment on the proposed Hyperion/Glendale Bridge Seismic Retrofit Project. Please submit this with project documents:

This project contains many essential and highly desirable features, including historic restoration of bridge elements, some needed bicycle and pedestrian improvements, and realignment of critically deficient traffic patterns. It is always refreshing to see comprehensive solutions to complex transportation retrofit projects.

However, key flaws in the design are glaringly lacking in basic connectivity. After all, a bridge is the most important structure to provide connections, so its inadequacy threatens the entire project to fail its most important function.

The project fails to contemplate the village nexus of Silver Lake and of Atwater, which are rapidly becoming more pedestrian and bicycle oriented communities. Directing high-speed traffic into these already congested zones is unneeded and creates greater safety conflict between different travel modes.

It is also important to understand that recent changes in California statutes on LOS (Level of Service) standards allow flexibility to meet modern multi-modal transportation goals. Thus, although the prioritization of rapid auto travel might have been relevant when this project began ten years ago, they are no longer necessary or sufficient for modern planning goals. Moreover, inappropriate prioritizing of automotive travel at the expense of basic connectivity and access for bicycle and pedestrian use exposes the project to potential legal action under CEQA and long-term liability for basic safety inadequacy.

Here are primary issues that need to be addressed, and important opportunities to explore fully:

1). Engineering of the Hyperion bridge with banked turns, wider traffic lanes, concrete divider, and 55 mph speed standard is inappropriate and a poor use of funds. Costs of this unneeded enhancement should be redirected to improving other important elements.

Key failure is lack of the most basic bicycle access, at both the west and east end of the bridge complex. Although bicycle access to the LA River path is improved, the critical need is for safe bicycle access between the communities of Atwater and Silver Lake. There is simply no safe way for bicyclists to continue in the direction of travel. Not only is there no adequate lane on the bridge, bicycle travelers at each end are dumped into high speed automotive traffic.

This places the project in non-compliance with the Bicycle Plan. Alternative proposals have already surfaced with a more comprehensive approach. These include new bicycle ramps, wider bike lanes and sidewalks, and narrower or fewer traffic lanes to support safe bicycle and pedestrian travel.
2.) The eastern Hyperion/Glendale merge is challenging for bicycle and pedestrian access and safety. However, it can be solved with a forward-looking view towards maximizing the village appeal of both Atwater and Silver Lake neighborhoods. Reengineering this critical issue is necessary.

3.) The project fails to assess the congestion of traffic from north/east bound Hyperion and Glendale to the I-5 North ramp. This causes significant congestion at the Valleybrink intersection and requires all freeway-bound traffic to U-turn.

Earlier plans for the project included creation of a left turn from Glendale Blvd. North to the I-5 North ramp. This involved repurposing the unneeded Glendale Southbound U-turn under the Hyperion bridge, into a signalized approach for Glendale Northbound traffic to conveniently access the I-5 North ramp. This element eliminates the need for Glendale traffic to use the congested U-turn at Valleybrink to access the I-5 North ramp, thus substantially reducing traffic that must make the Valleybrink U-turn.

4.) An unmet opportunity is to create a pedestrian plaza adjacent to the Pedestrian/Bike Bridge over the Los Angeles River on the Red Car Pilings, using the existing floodwater channeling abutments. This can be accomplished with open-air steel grating as used on many bridges, to maintain daylight on the river, and can be raised above the height of the abutments as needed for flood control.

We have seen no plans for the new bridge. It is essential that it be in character with the adjacent Hyperion/Glendale structure, and with adequate width for both pedestrian and bicycle use.

There is still opportunity for this project to achieve its potential, and to avoid unneeded legal delay that can only increase costs. Sensible fine-tuning of the engineering can result in a bridge project the entire city can be proud of and that will well serve the next century's needs.

Thank you,

Craig Collins

NB: this is provided as a personal comment and is not the official position of Silver Lake Reservoirs Conservancy.

Craig Collins
President
[craig.collins@silverlakereservoirs.org](mailto:craig.collins@silverlakereservoirs.org)

www.SilverLakeReservoirs.org
Silver Lake Reservoirs Conservancy
P.O. Box 39735, Los Angeles CA 90039

-----
Subject: 131107 1553-2

From: Maeve McQuillan [mailto:maeveq@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, November 07, 2013 3:38 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Subject: Hyperion Bridge

Dear Ms. Podesta,

I am a Silverlake resident with two small kids. I urge you to consider the alternative proposal suggested by LA walks for the Hyperion Bridge renovation. Their proposal would allow the bridge to be used for multi-modal purposes. It would be advantageous to communities on both sides of the bridge, which currently are only safely accessible via car. I have crossed that bridge on foot and it is awful. Right now LA is at a turning point, more and more people are moving away from the car as the sole means of transportation, and it would be amazing if the Hyperion Bridge could play a part in this exciting change. We need to be forward thinking and continue the spirit of revitalization that is being exemplified in the LA River clean up and transformation.

Sincerely,

Maeve McQuillan

-----
Hi Tami,

I believe the City's design for the Hyperion Bridge is not conducive to building a community. It includes little traffic calming measures and will result in 55MPH traffic feeding into residential Silver Lake and Atwater. Please consider lowering the allowed or designed speed and removing the crash barriers.

The bridge is dangerous for pedestrians and it does not promote the City's goal to encourage alternative transportation. Please include safe lanes for both pedestrians and cyclists. The community doesn't want more accidents, injuries, or lives lost.

Thanks for your time,

Jennifer

Los Feliz Resident
Green Space Los Feliz Organizer
Subject: Hyperion Public Comment

Dear Tami

I am a member of the groups Vision Hyperion, Midnight Ridazz and Angelenos for a Great Hyperion Bridge as well as several other emerging citizen action groups.

I would like to submit my concerns regarding the proposal for the Hyperion Glendale Bridge Complex regarding the CRASH BARRICADES and access to emergency vehicles:

Imagine a scenario like this... with 55MPH speeds the level of crashes will be more severe..... What if it's big enough to clog the lanes? what if a panicked 911 caller can't get their bearings and gives the wrong coordinates? EMS vehicles would need to reroute quite a distance to correct since the freeway crash barricades will prevent them from simply crossing over to the opposite direction of travel.

please see attached image for a visualization.

-----
November 7, 2013

Ms. Tami Podesta, Branch Chief
Division of Environmental Planning
California Dept of Transportation District 7
100 S Main St, Los Angeles, CA 90012

Re: Glendale Boulevard-Hyperion Ave Bridges Improvement Project

Dear Ms. Podesta:

I want to begin by saying that the town hall meeting on October 28th for the Hyperion bridge redesign was civil, engaging, well organized, and a remarkable show of a new civic engagement in this city. Thank you. As a result of your hard work to give everyone a seat at the table, we see that you have received a number of very well thought out designs. We ask you and the city family look at all of these designs and consider the best ideas from each. They all have excellent methods of improving this design. As a public service we have created our own proposal.

We believe the “City” design on the table is a freeway over the river. It includes little traffic calming measures and will result in 55MPH traffic feeding into residential Silver Lake and Atwater. We ask that you lower the allowed or designed speed, remove the crash barriers and that you include generous and safe lanes for both pedestrians and cyclists.

We believe that given the renaissance of the LA River and given that the city leadership is asking the federal government to help finance an improved river, this bridge design should encourage lingering at the crossing and certainly should allow easy and safe travel by foot and bike.

Our proposal attached shows bike and pedestrian lanes. Our proposal additionally shows an expanded boardwalk park built on the old piers to actually make the bridge a destination as
opposed to just a crossing. This would be an expansion of your very smart proposal to install a non-car bridge on the old red car piers.

Finally given that your proposal states that the bridge can easily handle rush hour with one lane each way versus two and given that you will be eliminating all 5-North Silver Lake bound traffic (the cars will no longer have to u-turn and ride over the bridge), there seems to be a good argument to go further than our proposal and reduce this to a one car-lane bridge each way thereby giving plenty of room for very comfortable bike and pedestrian lanes.

Very sincerely,

Tomas O'Grady
Executive Director

www.enrichla.org <http://www.enrichla.org/>

323 387 3866

ewwwebheaderelongatedcr <http://enrichla.org/blog/>

-----
Subject: 131107 1612

From: emiliana dore [mailto:emdore@yahoo.com]
Sent: Thursday, November 07, 2013 3:58 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Subject: BETTER HYPERION BRIDGE DESIGN

Dear Ms. Podesta;

I have been a resident of Atwater Village for the past 15 years. I am writing to urge you to please consider a more bike and pedestrian-friendly bridge design for the Hyperion Bridge. The city has done so much in recent years to enhance and improve the LA River. Additionally, our Atwater community has grown significantly over the past ten years. There are so many wonderful, inviting restaurants and shops along Glendale Boulevard. We have truly become a village.

The updates to the Hyperion Bridge present a great opportunity to make our city even more inviting. Please consider an alternative proposal that embraces all that Los Angeles can be.

Thank you for your time,

Emiliana Dore

-----
Subject: 131107 1613

From: Will Wright [mailto:will@aialosangeles.org]
Sent: Thursday, November 07, 2013 4:03 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: Marie (E-mail); christine.peters@lacity.org; Eric Garcetti; john.brady@lacity.org
Subject: Comments on Glendale Boulevard-Hyperion Avenue Complex of Bridges Improvement Project

Ms. Podesta:

Please make Hyperion safer for people. Please emphasize it's placemaking opportunity by configuring the street to best serve people, rather can automobile traffic only.

I am concerned that the proposed design for the Hyperion Ave viaduct will not be safe and inviting for pedestrians and cyclists.

We suggest improvements to the design to create a bridge that is safe for all users. Los Angeles Walks is a pedestrian advocacy organization dedicated to promoting walking and pedestrian infrastructure in Los Angeles, educating Angelenos and local policymakers concerning the rights and needs of pedestrians of all abilities, and fostering the development of safe and vibrant environments for all pedestrians. We view the viaduct as an important link between two walkable Los Angeles communities – Los Feliz/Silver Lake and Atwater where linkages are very limited due to the Los Angeles River and Interstate 5.

It is therefore extremely problematic that the proposed project is designed to freeway standards at 55 miles per hour, with a crash barrier and wide vehicle lanes that tend to encourage fast driving. These design standards are not appropriate in urban settings and would disadvantage pedestrians and cyclists and be a safety hazard for all users. Fortunately, modifications to the distribution and width of facilities on the right of way can significantly improve the viaduct as a complete street and provide a vital community connection.

very truly yours,

Will Wright, Hon. AIA|LA
Director, Government and Public Affairs

AIA Los Angeles

3780 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 800

Los Angeles, CA 90010

213.639.0764  office

310.309.9580  mobile

213.639.0767  fax

will

@aialosangeles.org <mailto:will@aialosangeles.org>

www.aialosangeles.org <http://www.aialosangeles.org/>

Subscribe to the AIA|LA Newsletter <http://tinyurl.com/dxpcwbu>

-----
Subject: 131108 0846

From: Kryste Kurlander [mailto:k2@ktb.net]
Sent: Thursday, November 07, 2013 4:24 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Subject: HYPERION BRIDGE

We believe the “City” design on the table is a freeway over the river. It includes little traffic calming measures and will result in 55MPH traffic feeding into residential Silver Lake and Atwater Village. We ask that you lower the allowed or designed speed, remove the crash barriers and that you include generous and safe lanes for both pedestrians and cyclists. Thank you for your consideration.

Kryste

-----
Subject: 131108 0847-1 (Referenced as 131106 1545-1 in Letter Comments Database)

From: Karin Flores [mailto:kflores@folar.org]
Sent: Thursday, November 07, 2013 5:07 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: info@la-bike.org; leweye@gmail.com
Subject: COMMENT: Glendale Boulevard-Hyperion Avenue Complex of Bridges Improvement

November 7, 2013

Tami Podesta, Branch Chief
Division of Environmental Planning
California Department of Transportation District 7
100 South Main St, Los Angeles, CA 90012

RE: Glendale Boulevard-Hyperion Avenue Complex of Bridges Improvement

Dear Ms. Podesta,

Friends of the Los Angeles River, a non-profit organization, has advocated on behalf of the river since 1986, and here we offer our comments for the above project.

We have learned that Councilmember O'Farrell would like to create an advisory board for the design of the bridge, and Friends of the Los Angeles River would like to be invited to participate on this board.

We notice that you do not reference under "related projects" the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers document, "Los Angeles River Ecosystem Restoration Integrated Feasibility Study". If Alternative 16 or 20 is chosen, this will reconfigure the west bank of the river north of the bridge, which could potentially impact your detention/infiltration basin in Sunnynook River Park.

FoLAR would like to see pedestrian continuity created on the east bank of the river under the bridge complex. We have been told verbally that it is feasible to cut a horizontal walkway into the
trapezoidal bank, but that funds are not available for this element in the current project budget. We hope to achieve this pedestrian connection in the future.

The community has expressed in both recent meetings the desire to make this bridge a river destination, with much more room for bicyclists and pedestrians, and more safety protection through separation of these pathways from car lanes. The idea of creating lookout stopping places has also been suggested, and it seems very appropriate, considering the current wildlife and the large-scale plans for increased river habitat quality.

Lastly, the current dimensions for the pedestrian facility on the Red Car piers should be widened, so that bicyclists and pedestrians can each have a lane, preventing clashes between the users. An engineer at the community meeting explained that the piers provide enough room to expand this pathway, although it would be a challenge to the project budget. If it cannot be expanded in this phase, perhaps it can be designed to allow for a future expansion.

Sincerely,

Lewis MacAdams
Co-Founder and President
Friends of the Los Angeles River
570 West Avenue 26, Suite 250
Los Angeles, CA 90065
Tel: (323) 223-0585
www.folar.org
Subject: 131108 0847-2

From: Kathryn Savage [mailto:kmsavage@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, November 07, 2013 4:50 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: Keep Sidewalks on Both Sides of Hyperion Bridge

When I walk across Hyperion Bridge to visit friends in Silver Lake, I do not feel that the City of L.A. cares about my safety.

I do not feel safe walking on the north side stairways. They lead to homeless encampments and the stairways are dark and secluded. Even in a group, my friends and I don't feel safe taking the north side stairways.

To walk across the bridge on the south side, we have to brave a dangerously narrow sidewalk. I choose to walk on the south side because I see it as the lesser of two evils, so to speak. But we need to have sidewalks on both sides of the bridge.

Hyperion currently moves cars at the expense of safe access for pedestrians, making it an undesirable place for those in our community who would make it safer. That is why there is no safe way to walk across Hyperion Bridge, especially to walk across it alone at night.

It is imperative that there be a sidewalk on both the north and south sides. Do not remove the south side sidewalk. Taking away the current south side sidewalk does not make walking across the bridge safer. In order to make walking across the bridge safer, we need wide sidewalks on both sides.

I would also like to voice a concern that many in the community have expressed about emergency vehicles not being able to get through to a car collision if cars are backed up and there is a median crash barrier.

Sincerely,
Kathryn Savage

-----
Subject: 131108 0847-3

From: Robert Del Campo [mailto:delcampos@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Thursday, November 07, 2013 4:56 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Subject: RE HYPERION BRIDGE

I've lived in Silverlake for more than 40 years, and would it be wonderful, to walk or bike over the Hyperion bridge to Atwater village SAFELY! I attempted a walk two weeks ago over this lovely bridge to the post office in Atwater and managed to arrive, but it was difficult and dangerous. There are portions a pedestrian must walk on sidewalk that is only 18” wide, next to speeding traffic. Riding a bicycle would be phenomenal! PLEASE, PLEASE, PLEASE make the bridge safe for pedestrians, bicyclists, and automobiles, so we may COEXIST with Love, slower speeds, and Happiness!
Thank you, Robert del Campo..213-880-2612

Sent from my iPhone

-----
Subject: 131108 0847-4 (Referenced as 131017 1134-2 in the E-mail Database)

From: Kimberly Greenhut [mailto:kimproduces@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, November 07, 2013 4:38 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Subject: Hyperion Bridge Design

Please consider an Hyperion Bridge design that gives cyclists and pedestrians safe and direct passage (without stairs) over the freeway. It would be great if it also included access to the LA River.

This is an opportunity to improve quality of life in Silver Lake and Atwater. Let’s build the city we want to live in. One with infrastructure that supports healthy choices for individuals and the environment and that encourages people to come out and be a part of their community.

Thanks you for you consideration.

Sincerely,

Kimberly Greenhut

--
____________________________
Kimberly Greenhut
kimproduces@gmail.com
415-260-6879

----
Subject: 131108 0847-5

From: Nina Grossman Warner [mailto:ninagrossman@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Thursday, November 07, 2013 4:26 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Subject: Hyperion Bridge

Dear Ms. Podesta:

We believe the “City” design on the table is a freeway over the river. It includes little traffic calming measures and will result in 55MPH traffic feeding into residential Silver Lake and Atwater. We ask that you lower the allowed or designed speed, remove the crash barriers and that you include generous and safe lanes for both pedestrians and cyclists.

Thank you
Nina Warner
Atwater Resident

-----
Subject: 131108 0849-1

From: Ross Tierney [mailto:rftierney@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, November 07, 2013 10:22 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT; tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
    mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All

Dear Ms. Podesta, Councilmember LaBonge, Councilmember O'Farrell, and Mayor Garcetti,

As someone who bikes or walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:
* Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
* Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
* Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
* No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
* A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,

Ross Tierney

4525 Franklin Ave, LA CA 90027

-----
Subject: 131108 0849-2

From: Kay Camphuis [mailto:kaycamphuis@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, November 07, 2013 6:03 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Subject: Hyperion Bridge Design

Dear Ms. Podesta,

Please please help those of us who like to walk to nearby businesses for our needs. We live in Silverlake/Los Feliz and often walk to Atwater Village across the Hyperion Bridge. It is now noisy, and dangerous. We think consideration for pedestrians and bicyclists in the new design will encourage less traffic, less pollution, and more exercise for the many Angelenos who are trying to make our beautiful city more walkable. By the way, I am 66 and my husband is 70. One of the reasons we live in a walkable neighborhood is that soon enough we may not be driving at all. This is about making LA a livable city for all ages. There is so much beauty here, let’s grab the brass ring and make it even more special.

Kay Camphuis
3776 Tracy St
Los Angeles, CA 90027

-----
Subject: 131108 0849-3 (Referenced as 131017 1134-2 in Letter Comments Database)

From: Karin Flores [mailto:kflores@folar.org]
Sent: Thursday, November 07, 2013 5:07 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: info@la-bike.org; leweye@gmail.com
Subject: COMMENT: Glendale Boulevard-Hyperion Avenue Complex of Bridges Improvement

November 7, 2013

Tami Podesta, Branch Chief
Division of Environmental Planning
California Department of Transportation District 7
100 South Main St, Los Angeles, CA 90012

RE: Glendale Boulevard-Hyperion Avenue Complex of Bridges Improvement

Dear Ms. Podesta,

Friends of the Los Angeles River, a non-profit organization, has advocated on behalf of the river since 1986, and here we offer our comments for the above project.

We have learned that Councilmember O'Farrell would like to create an advisory board for the design of the bridge, and Friends of the Los Angeles River would like to be invited to participate on this board.

We notice that you do not reference under "related projects" the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers document, "Los Angeles River Ecosystem Restoration Integrated Feasibility Study". If Alternative 16 or 20 is chosen, this will reconfigure the west bank of the river north of the bridge, which could potentially impact your detention/infiltration basin in Sunnynook River Park.

FoLAR would like to see pedestrian continuity created on the east bank of the river under the bridge complex. We have been told verbally that it is feasible to cut a horizontal walkway into the trapezoidal bank, but that funds are not available for this element in the current project budget. We hope to achieve this pedestrian connection in the future.

The community has expressed in both recent meetings the desire to make this bridge a river destination, with much more room for bicyclists and pedestrians, and more safety protection through separation of these pathways from car lanes. The idea of creating lookout stopping places has also been suggested, and it seems very appropriate, considering the current wildlife and the large-scale plans for increased river habitat quality.

Lastly, the current dimensions for the pedestrian facility on the Red Car piers should be widened, so that bicyclists and pedestrians can each have a lane, preventing clashes between the users. An engineer at the community meeting explained that the piers provide enough room to expand this pathway, although it would be a challenge to the project budget. If it cannot be expanded in this phase, perhaps it can be designed to allow for a future expansion.

Sincerely,
Subject: 131108 0849-4

From: D Thom Bissett [mailto:dthomb@mac.com]
Sent: Thursday, November 07, 2013 6:03 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT; tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: From a Silver Lake Resident: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All

Dear Ms. Podesta, Councilmember LaBonge, Councilmember O’Farrell, and Mayor Garcetti

As a long time Silver Lake Resident and avid cyclist, just the idea that there are plans to make the Hyperion Viaduct even more Bike and Human unfriendly amazes me in the worst of ways.

Currently there are no safe routes for anyone cycling to get to my neighborhood or even Los Feliz from the LA Bike Bike Path or any other Bike Friendly streets in Glendale or beyond. Fletcher Avenue, Glendale Blvd and Los Feliz are extremely unsafe options for cyclists. And with the horrendous street conditions and endless DWP construction, why would you contemplate making the streets even more unsafe?

I need to use the Hyperion Viaduct several times a week to get to Atwater Village, and even if I didn’t cycle, I don’t feel safe in a car with the speeds the other drivers barrel down into Atwater Village.

Thank you and now to the "Form Letter" sent to me about this matter:

As someone who bikes or walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:

- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
- A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,

D Thom Bissett
3220 Drury Lane
Los Angeles, CA 90039

PS! Pave our streets up to non-3rd World standards!

-----
Subject: 131108 0849-5

From: Jonathan Berman [mailto:jb@carpestella.com]
Sent: Thursday, November 07, 2013 5:23 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Subject: bridge

I bike and or walk over the bridge.
I avoid using cars and often commute to work.
Please make the bridge priority cyclists and walkers,
let the polluting cars wait.

Please let me know. My zip is 90026, I am in the area.

----------

Jonathan Berman, Associate Professor
Visual and Performing Arts Department

----
Subject: 131108 0849-6 (Referenced as 130930 0841-5 in the E-mail Database)

From: Vyki Englert [mailto:vyki.englert@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, November 07, 2013 5:44 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT; tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All

Dear Ms. Podesta, Councilmember LaBonge, Councilmember O’Farrell, and Mayor Garcetti,
As someone who bikes or walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:

* Bike lanes or cycle tracks on Hyperion Ave.
* 4 foot or greater sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks
* Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
* No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
* A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,
Vyki Englert
120 S Vignes Street Apt 403 Los Angeles, CA 90012
Subject: 131108 0850-1

From: Barbara Thomas [mailto:barbarathomasm@icloud.com]
Sent: Thursday, November 07, 2013 10:58 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Subject: HYPERION BRIDGE

I believe the "City" design on the table is a freeway over the river. It includes little traffic-calming measures and will result in 55MPH traffic feeding into residential Silver Lake and Atwater. We ask that you lower the allowed or designed speed, remove the crash barriers and that you include generous and safe lanes for both pedestrians and cyclists.

Thank you

Barbara Thomas

-----
Subject: 131108 0850-2

From: Barbara Thomas [mailto:barbarathomasm@icloud.com]
Sent: Thursday, November 07, 2013 10:58 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Subject: HYPERION BRIDGE

I believe the "City" design on the table is a freeway over the river. It includes little traffic-calming measures and will result in 55MPH traffic feeding into residential Silver Lake and Atwater. We ask that you lower the allowed or designed speed, remove the crash barriers and that you include generous and safe lanes for both pedestrians and cyclists.

Thank you

Barbara Thomas

-----
Subject: Hyperion Bridge renovation

This project presents an important opportunity for the city to respond to the paradigm shift now occurring here, away from an auto culture and towards the emerging urban culture in Los Angeles, with a repeatable prototype that reconceives our urban bridges to better serve our needs.

The Hyperion Bridge sits at the nexus of Silver Lake, Atwater Village and the LA River. Each has been developing its own identity and cultural significance independently, especially over the last 10 years. If linked urbanistically, the synergy of two neighborhoods and a park can form a significant piece of LA's emerging, vibrant urban mosaic. Conceived complexly, i.e. with multiple overlapping performance criteria, not a singular criteria of automobile speed and safety, the Hyperion Bridge can respond to its community's multiple needs functionally and beautifully, without compromise.

The vehicular lanes should be reduced to one in each direction, plus a third emergency lane. The design speed should be reduce from 55 to 35 mph. A protected bicycle lane and widened sidewalk should be installed on both sides, with new seating,( possibly following the historic seating on the bridge), and low level lighting. The extra 30 to 40 seconds it might take to cross the bridge as a motorist will be offset by the new experience of the bridge as a destination and a promontory, not merely a utilitarian vehicular link. With slower traffic from the bridge, feeding the intersection, accidents at Rowena and Hyperion Avenues will likely be reduced. Linkage from the bridge to the new park and LA River bike path below with new bike and pedestrian ramps is also very important. There should be no unsightly Jersey barriers, medians, etc. on the bridge. Separation of the bike lane from vehicular lanes is also necessary, possibly with well-designed bollards, planter boxes, curbs, etc.

I believe the biggest design challenge will be a signalized crosswalk at the north (Atwater) end of the bridge and safe merging of pedestrian and bike traffic there. It is very crucial for the neighborhood to have a safe crossing at this point, and challenging because of the multiple grade separations.

This design cannot be solved satisfactorily by traffic engineers alone. You need talented design professionals, architects and landscape architects, on this design team!

Sent from Rick's iPad

----
Subject: 131108 0850-4

From: Kara Watne Sergile [mailto:kara@kwsconsult.com]
Sent: Thursday, November 07, 2013 11:04 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT; tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All
Importance: High

Dear Ms. Podesta, Councilmember LaBonge, Councilmember O’Farrell, and Mayor Garcetti:

As someone who bikes or walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:

* Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
* Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
* Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
* No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
* A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,
Kara Sergile
1115 Moncado Drive
Glendale, CA 91207

[Image removed by sender.]

This email is free from viruses and malware because avast! Antivirus protection is active.

-----
Subject: 131108 0852

From: Sam Hobbs [mailto:Sam@SamHobbs.org]
Sent: Thursday, November 07, 2013 7:46 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT; om.labonge@lacity.org; ouncilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org;
mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway; Build a Safe Viaduct for All

I have previously lived on Hyperion Boulevard (near Baller Hardware) and when I did it was for more than a decade. I developed a serious case of asthma residing there. I believe that the abundance of vehicle emissions contributed to my health problems. My porch constantly had black dust on it.

I am concerned about the health of current residents of Hyperion Boulevard and the nearby area. I believe that Hyperion Boulevard gets too much vehicle traffic. It is unhealthy for our residents to attempt to support more traffic along Hyperion Boulevard. I believe it is a huge mistake to not support pedestrian and bicycle traffic along Hyperion Boulevard. We do not need more vehicles there.

I have been a resident of The City of Los Angeles for most of my 59 years.

As many others have said, the following are very practical and desirable:

* Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
* Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
* Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
* No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
* A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

--

Sam Hobbs

15912 Rnaldi Street

Granada Hills, CA

-----
Hi Tami -

I am writing with urgency to express my concern regarding the city of los angeles's proposed retrofit of the glendale hyperion complex of bridges. There are serious negative environmental impacts with this proposal.

We need sidewalks on both sides of the main Glendale Hyperion blvd connector between Atwater Village and Silverlak; no median & sidewalk crash barriers; and no banked roadbeds.

At RAC Design Build we prepared (2) 24x36" boards (attached as jogs & pdf, also available online here: http://racdb.com/HYPERION_BRIDGE_ALTERNATIVE.pdf <http://racdb.com/HYPERION_BRIDGE_ALTERNATIVE.pdf> ) of an alternate design that we feel is ideal for our communities: one 25mph lane for cars in either direction, sidewalks on both sides and a 12’ wide landscape buffered cycletrack that can accommodate emergency vehicles.

Per the Environmental document: two lanes is acceptable solution based on current peak hour traffic volume. They found current peak volume to be 1,325 vehicles/hr & that during construction two lanes @ 25mph could accommodate as many as 1,500 vehicles/hr, screencapture attached.

The crash barriers are not consistent with the historic landmark status of the bridge. Rebuild the balustrades and make them strong enough to withstand impacts, no concrete k rails should be permitted as they comprimise the original design.

Thank you for your attention. Please contact me with any questions.

Daveed Kapoor AIA

RAC DESIGN BUILD

3048 North Coolidge Avenue

Los Angeles, CA 90039

c | 323.252.8510
f | 888.808.3711
www.racdb.com
www.studiocortez.com
www.vimeo.com/racdb
Subject:  131108 1247

From: Doug Blush [mailto:madpix@me.com]
Sent: Friday, November 08, 2013 10:25 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT; tom.labonge@lacity.org; Mitch.Ofarrell@lacity.org;
john.brady@lacity.org; eric.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: Hyperion Bridge project comments

Hello Ms. Podesta, Mr. Brady, Coucilmembers LaBonge and O'Farrell, Mayor Garcetti and all at LA
City Hall,

I'm a Silverlake local of over 22 years, an avid biking and hiking enthusiast and a great fan of the
many new measures going into effect to expand access and auto-alternative pathways in the LA
River/Griffith area. I'm also a documentary filmmaker and often look for subjects of interest in
our community.

I apologize for these comments coming a day late (I was just informed of the deadline today), but I
wanted to express my deep desire to see the impending Hyperion Bridge project take great
account of the needs of bikes, pedestrians and non motor vehicle access. I believe the current
Bureau of Engineering plans do not go nearly far enough to assist these needs, and should be re-
examined before this very impactful and long-range project goes into effect. I know MANY of my
neighbors and friends feel the same way, and we see this new project as a huge opportunity to
enhance our unique area. The ideas forwarded by members of LA Walks and others are great
suggestions of how this project can benefit everyone, no matter the transportation choice.

I hope that there's continued movement to study the accessibility issues of sidewalks, crossings
and traffic control that will soon literally be set in stone for years to come.

Thanks for your attention,

Doug Blush
2500 Silver Lake Terrace
Los Angeles, CA

-----
Subject: 131113 1011

From: Aguiluz, Hyginus [mailto:hyginus.aguiluz@lausd.net]
Sent: Wednesday, October 09, 2013 12:40 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All

As someone who bikes or walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:

* Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
* Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
* Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
* No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
* A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,

Hyginus Quintos Aguiluz
4420 La Clede Avenue
Los Angeles, CA 90039

Helen Bernstein High School - Home of the Fiery Dragons!
1309 North Wilton Place
Hollywood, CA 90028
Phone: (323) 817-6437
Fax: (323) 860-9711
AME/APEX/BTLR/STEM - We're all BERNSTEIN DRAGONS!
Please consider the environment before printing this e-mail It's a matter of priorities. If you can afford a high tech phone, you should be able to buy school supplies.

-----
Subject: 131113 1017

From: Ronna [mailto:kingsizesoundlabsla@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, November 07, 2013 1:21 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Subject: Hyperion beige proposal

Ms. Pedesta,

Los Angeles Walks is concerned that the proposed design for Hyperion Ave. bridge will not be safe for walkers and cyclist.

Please if you can do a alternative plan safe for all!

As as a business owner at 2959 Glendale blvd, right at the beginning of the bridge entering Silver Lake, cars flyby and a very fast speed and its very dangerous for pedestrians and drivers.

Please for the safety of others please modify the proposed plan!

Ronna-

Ronna Bronstein-Trumfio
Studio Manager
Kingsizesoundlabs.com
323-533-0022 cell

Sent from my iPad

-----
FW: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All

Tami Podesta
Senior Environmental Planner
213-897-0309

California Department of Transportation
District 7, Division of Environmental Planning
100 South Main Street, Ste. 100
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Margaret Wehbi [mawehbi@gmail.com]

Sent: Friday, September 27, 2013 11:24 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org

Dear Ms. Podesta,

I am a 50 year old woman who likes bike to work, to errands and on the occasional casual bike group rides. I do not live near the Hyperion-Glendale bridge, but have ridden and shopped in this area. Navigating the Hyperion-Glendale bridge was downright frightening. Recently I read on LA.Streetsblog.org<http://LA.Streetsblog.org> http://la.streetsblog.org/2013/09/24/new-plans-for-hyperion-glendale-crossing-don-t-include-bike-lanes-wide-sidewalks/ that the plans for the new bridge don't include a safe route for pedestrians and cyclists.

Please design this bridge to include:

* Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
* Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
* Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
* No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
* A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

These design changes will insure that all can safely and easily commute over the LA river.

Sincerely,

Margaret Wehbi
5426 W 122nd St.
Hawthorne, Ca 90250
While the current proposal is a lose-lose, there's still time to halt the project and turn things around. This project needs to go back to the drawing board, with a new set of criteria.

The streets of our cities and towns are an important part of the livability of our communities. They ought to be for everyone, whether young or old, motorist or bicyclist, walker or wheelchair user, bus rider or shopkeeper. But too many of our streets are designed only for speeding cars, or worse, creeping traffic jams.

The current plan serves 1 priority: maximizing the theoretical throughput of vehicles at the greatest velocity possible.

Please redesign this project with the idea that a 9 year old girl riding on a bicycle can safely make her way across this bridge.
FW: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All

Tami Podesta  
Senior Environmental Planner  
213-897-0309

California Department of Transportation  
District 7, Division of Environmental Planning  
100 South Main Street, Ste. 100  
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Fri, Sep 27, 2013 at 6:02 PM

From: Geejay Maylad [gmaylad@jacobsongrp.com]
Sent: Saturday, September 28, 2013 12:31 AM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT  
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All

As someone who bikes or walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone's needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:

* Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
* Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with way finding signs
* Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
* No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
* A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,

GJ Maylad  
Glendale, CA 91206

This e-mail and any attached files may contain private and confidential information that is meant only for the intended recipient(s). If you are not an intended recipient of this e-mail, please do not forward, make any use of, or rely in any way on this e-mail or any information it contains. If you have received this e-mail in error, please delete it, destroy any printed copies, and notify the sender immediately.
FW: Please consider bikes as a vehicle, esp in regards to Hyperion Bridge

Podesta, Tami L@DOT <tami.podesta@dot.ca.gov>  
To: "Moreno, Cesar I@DOT" <cesar.moreno@dot.ca.gov>  
Cc: "Linda.moore@lacity.org" <Linda.moore@lacity.org>

Sat, Sep 28, 2013 at 2:18 AM

Tami Podesta  
Senior Environmental Planner  
213-897-0309

California Department of Transportation  
District 7, Division of Environmental Planning  
100 South Main Street, Ste. 100  
Los Angeles, CA 90012

From: Vyki Englert [vyki.englert@gmail.com]  
Sent: Saturday, September 28, 2013 3:52 AM  
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT  
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org  
Subject: Please consider bikes as a vehicle, esp in regards to Hyperion Bridge

Over, and over it has been proven with studies in cities big and small that cycling is not only a viable transportation alternative, but one that is necessary to build strong healthy neighborhoods. LA deserves to be a strong and healthy community.

As an experienced road cyclist that bikes often up to 18 miles each way to my workplace on the west side, I am used to navigating the roads in LA. Recently I have been riding across the existing construction and have been nervous as I navigate a narrow < 9 ft wide road painted with sharrows and cars moving at speeds greater than 40mph.

Due to flat terrain, and beautiful weather, the potential here for a viable cycling culture is unparalleled in this country. Take this chance to show LA you are willing and ready to become the next bike city and improve the quality of life for everyone on the roads.

As someone who bikes or walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:

* Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
* Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
* Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
* No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
* A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd.

There is no reason for this project not to be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.
FW: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All

Podesta, Tami L@DOT <tami.podesta@dot.ca.gov>  Sat, Sep 28, 2013 at 2:40 PM
To: "linda.moore@lacity.org" <linda.moore@lacity.org>
Cc: "Moreno, Cesar L@DOT" <cesar.moreno@dot.ca.gov>

Tami Podesta
Senior Environmental Planner
213-897-0309

California Department of Transportation
District 7, Division of Environmental Planning
100 South Main Street, Ste. 100
Los Angeles, CA 90012

From: Pete Holby [pholby@gmail.com]
Sent: Saturday, September 28, 2013 6:18 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All

To whom it may concern:

I live on the west side and frequently visit friends in Atwater Village and Glendale. To do this, the most convenient route (by far) is to cross the river and the 5 freeway via Hyperion ave. It has come to my attention that proposed revisions to this stretch of roadway will not adequately serve the needs of cyclists such as myself, and I would like to register my displeasure with this. Los Angeles' continued growth in cycling is one of my very favorite things about the city, and it would be a shame to see things go backward. This stretch of Hyperion is the flattest, most direct route from Silver Lake to Atwater, making it key for cyclists and pedestrians. Further, it is already a difficult ride - the road condition is terrible, there isn't much room, and there's a blind curve with little signagehipping drivers to the fact that they may be coming around the corner directly behind someone on a bicycle.

Consistent with the suggestions from the LA County Bicycle Coalition, I'd love to see:

- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
- A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

Thank you for considering these issues.

Peter Holby
FW: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All

Podesta, Tami L@DOT <tami.podesta@dot.ca.gov>                          Sat, Sep 28, 2013 at 2:40 PM
To: "linda.moore@lacity.org" <linda.moore@lacity.org>
Cc: "Moreno, Cesar L@DOT" <cesar.moreno@dot.ca.gov>

Tami Podesta
Senior Environmental Planner
213-897-0309

California Department of Transportation
District 7, Division of Environmental Planning
100 South Main Street, Ste. 100
Los Angeles, CA 90012

From: Harvey Woien [harwoien@juno.com]
Sent: Saturday, September 28, 2013 9:06 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonga@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All

As someone who bikes between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:

Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,

Harv Woien
1175 Montecito Drive
Los Angeles 90031
FW: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All

Podesta, Tami L@DOT <tami.podesta@dot.ca.gov>
Sun, Sep 29, 2013 at 4:42 PM
To: "linda.moore@lacity.org" <linda.moore@lacity.org>, "Moreno, Cesar L@DOT" <cesar.moreno@dot.ca.gov>

Tami Podesta
Senior Environmental Planner
213-897-0309

California Department of Transportation
District 7, Division of Environmental Planning
100 South Main Street, Ste. 100
Los Angeles, CA 90012

From: miguel ramos [mramos86@gmail.com]
Sent: Saturday, September 28, 2013 11:56 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All

As someone who bikes or walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone's needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:

* Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
* Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
* Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
* No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
* A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,

Miguel Ramos
FW: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All

Podesta, Tami L@DOT <tami.p pods e@dot.ca.gov>  
Sun, Sep 29, 2013 at 4:44 PM  
To: "linda.moore@lacity.org" <linda.moore@lacity.org>, "Moreno, Cesar I@DOT" <cesar.moreno@dot.ca.gov>

Tami Podesta  
Senior Environmental Planner  
213-897-0309

California Department of Transportation  
District 7, Division of Environmental Planning  
100 South Main Street, Ste. 100  
Los Angeles, CA 90012

From: Andres Tena [tenaandres@yahoo.com]  
Sent: Sunday, September 29, 2013 8:46 PM  
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT  
Cc: councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org; tom.labonge@lacity.org  
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All

As someone who bikes and walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone’s needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:

- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.  
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs  
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding  
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster  
- A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,

Andres Tena  
123 N. Ave 50  
Los Angeles Ca, 90042
FW: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All

From: Renate Kempowski [rdemeyer@mindspring.com]
Sent: Sunday, September 29, 2013 4:37 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: mayor.garcetti@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; tom.labonge@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All

As someone who bikes or walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone's needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:

- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
- A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,
Renate Kempowski RN
Dear Ms. Podesta,

I am a Silver Lake resident and a frequent visitor to Atwater Village. I love living in Silver Lake because it is such a "walkable" neighborhood, and I enjoy visiting Atwater Village for the same reason. I enjoy walking out to visit shops or go to a restaurant or cafe. It's nice to get out from behind the wheel sometimes. This very characteristic is one of the foremost reasons both neighborhoods are such desirable places to live.

Silver Lake and Atwater are physically close, but they are separated by a psychological barrier—the bridge. Realistically, the current bridge serves only cars. You have to be brave to cross it by any other means. I tried walking across it once and vowed never to do so again—I had to scamper across freeway on/off ramps. Yikes!

The inability to walk between these two neighborhoods makes them seem farther apart than they actually are. A badly designed bridge is an obstacle to the free flow of people between the communities.

So I was excited to hear that the bridge was being redesigned. Both neighborhoods have really developed into
FW: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All

Podesta, Tami L@DOT <tami.podesta@dot.ca.gov>  
Mon, Sep 30, 2013 at 9:10 AM  
To: "Moreno, Cesar l@DOT" <cesar.moreno@dot.ca.gov>, "linda.moore@lacity.org" <linda.moore@lacity.org>

Tami Podesta  
Senior Environmental Planner  
213-897-0309  

Department of Transportation  
Division of Environmental Planning  
100 South Main Street, Ste. 100  
Los Angeles, CA 90012

From: Gerardo Reyes [mailto:greyesvega@gmail.com]  
Sent: Sunday, September 29, 2013 6:22 PM  
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT  
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org  
Subject: : No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All

As a citizen who walks and bikes all over this great city, I'm asking that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone's needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:

- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
- A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.
FW: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All

Podesta, Tami L@DOT <tami.podesta@dot.ca.gov>  
Mon, Sep 30, 2013 at 9:11 AM  
To: "linda.moore@lacity.org" <linda.moore@lacity.org>, "Moreno, Cesar L@DOT" <cesar.moreno@dot.ca.gov>

Tami Podesta  
Senior Environmental Planner  
213-897-0309  

Department of Transportation  
Division of Environmental Planning  
100 South Main Street, Ste. 100  
Los Angeles, CA 90012

From: Andrea Denike Martinez [mailto:andrea.denike.martinez@gmail.com]  
Sent: Sunday, September 29, 2013 7:24 PM  
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT  
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org  
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All

As someone who bikes or walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone's needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:

- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
- No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster
- A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge
FW: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All

Podesta, Tami L@DOT <tami.podesta@dot.ca.gov>  
Mon, Sep 30, 2013 at 9:21 AM  
To: "linda.moore@lacity.org" <linda.moore@lacity.org>, "Moreno, Cesar L@DOT" <cesar.moreno@dot.ca.gov>

Tami Podesta  
Senior Environmental Planner  
213-897-0309  

Department of Transportation  
Division of Environmental Planning  
100 South Main Street, Ste. 100  
Los Angeles, CA 90012

From: Allan A. [mailto:allanalessio@yahoo.com]  
Sent: Sunday, September 29, 2013 10:59 PM  
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT  
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org  
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All

As someone who bikes between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone's needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:

Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.  
Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs  
Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding  
**No crash barrier and banked turns that will make people drive even faster**

A complete crosswalk on the Atwater end of the viaduct to let people access the sidewalk from both sides of Glendale Blvd. and give bicyclists an alternative through the dangerous merge

There is no reason for this project to not be consistent with the bike plan and Caltrans complete streets policy. The viaduct is currently the greatest barrier to safe bicycle access across the 5 Freeway and the LA River. This project can change that and make all travelers benefit.

Sincerely,

Allan Alessio
FW: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All

Tami Podesta
Senior Environmental Planner
213-897-0309

Department of Transportation
Division of Environmental Planning
100 South Main Street, Ste. 100
Los Angeles, CA 90012

From: Megan Armstrong [mailto:meganleearmstrong@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, September 30, 2013 3:34 PM
To: Podesta, Tami L@DOT
Cc: tom.labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; mayor.garcetti@lacity.org
Subject: No Hyperion Freeway - Build a Safe Viaduct for All

Tami Podesta,

As someone who bikes or walks between Silver Lake and Atwater Village, it is absolutely critical that Hyperion Ave. be made safe for people like me. Everyone's needs can be met if the project is designed for appropriate speeds through an urban community. Specifically, I would like the project to include:

- Bike lanes on Hyperion Ave.
- Wider sidewalks and well-marked crosswalks with wayfinding signs
- Narrower traffic lanes to provide more space for bicyclists and pedestrians and discourage speeding
APPENDIX F-6: Agency Comments

Federal Emergency Management Agency
Los Angeles County Department of Public Works
Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
State Clearinghouse
1) Reduce vehicle speed on Hyperion Avenue
2) Provide bike lanes on Hyperion Avenue (perhaps protected by barrier)
3) Add full-width crosswalk at Atwater Side of Glendale and Hyperion
4) Eliminate median and ruling barriers, and/or banked turns
5) Non-specific approval
6) Non-specific disapproval
7) This is not a pedestrian-friendly design
8) Do not increase or improve access to cyclists on Hyperion
9) Review multi-modal design be consistent with Bike Plan & Caltrans Safety Policy
10) Enhance safety for everyone
11) There should be narrower car/traffic lanes and reduce traffic lanes
12) There should be well-marked crosswalks and wayfinding signs
13) Preserve the historic bridge design
14) There should be wider sidewalks
15) Address traffic congestion
16) Consider proposed alternative designs
17) Provide accessibility to LA River
18) Provide a public hearing
19) Review related projects, specifically the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers document, Los Angeles River Ecosystem Restoration Integrated Feasibility Study that could potentially impact the detention/infiltration basin in Sunnymoak River Park
20) Emergency vehicles possibly will not be able to get through due to crash barrier
21) We would like to participate in advisory board
22) Security Measures for Pedestrian Bridge
23) On demand traffic light at I-5 exit
24) What are the number of lanes on pedestrian bridge/access?
25) Will there be a link between pedestrian paths on both sides of the bridge?
26) Keep the median barriers in the plan.
27) Reduce the bridge to one lane in each direction.
28) Provide benches on the sidewalks on the bridge.
29) Design the center of the bridge for pedestrians and bikes.
30) Create a public space on the bridge for pedestrians.
31) Provide noise mitigation during construction.
32) Will project provide proper bike/pedestrian detours, signage, and safe alternative routing if existing bike facility is impacted by construction?
33) Must maintain Metro facilities and services during project
34) Will bus shelters, benches and other amenities be installed?
35) Be consistent with Caltrans Complete Streets Policy (DD-64-R1) and FHWA Routine Accommodations Policy (23 C.F.R. § 652.5)-elderly and handicapped
36) Provide a signalized crosswalk with refuge areas at both sides of street at east end of bridge complex
37) Caltrans and the City of Los Angeles Cannot Certify the IS/EA if a Fair Argument Can Be Made That the Project Will Create Significant Impacts for Bicyclists
38) A wide shoulder/shoulder is not a bike lane
39) Review flood maps
September 18, 2013

Tami Podesta, Branch Chief
Division of Environmental Planning
California Department of Transportation District 7
100 South Main Street
Los Angeles, California 90012

Dear Ms. Podesta:

This is in response to your request for comments on Notice of Availability of Initial Study/Environmental Assessment, Notice of Intent to Adopt Mitigated Negative Declaration Invitation to Community Workshop and Opportunity for Public Hearing for the Proposed Glendale Boulevard-Hyperion Avenue Complex of Bridges Improvement Project.

Please review the current effective countywide Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRMs) for the County of Los Angeles (Community Number 065043) and City of Los Angeles (Community Number 060137, Maps revised September 26, 2008. Please note that the City of Los Angeles, Los Angeles County, California is a participant in the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP). The minimum, basic NFIP floodplain management building requirements are described in Vol. 44 Code of Federal Regulations (44 CFR), Sections 59 through 65.

A summary of these NFIP floodplain management building requirements are as follows:

- All buildings constructed within a riverine floodplain, (i.e., Flood Zones A, AO, AH, AE, and A1 through A30 as delineated on the FIRM), must be elevated so that the lowest floor is at or above the Base Flood Elevation level in accordance with the effective Flood Insurance Rate Map.

- If the area of construction is located within a Regulatory Floodway as delineated on the FIRM, any development must not increase base flood elevation levels. The term development means any man-made change to improved or unimproved real estate, including but not limited to buildings, other structures, mining, dredging, filling, grading, paving, excavation or drilling operations, and storage of equipment or materials. A hydrologic and hydraulic analysis must be performed prior to the start of development, and must demonstrate that the development would not cause any rise in base flood levels. No rise is permitted within regulatory floodways.
Tami Podesta, Branch Chief
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- All buildings constructed within a coastal high hazard area, (any of the “V” Flood Zones as delineated on the FIRM), must be elevated on pilings and columns, so that the lowest horizontal structural member, (excluding the pilings and columns), is elevated to or above the base flood elevation level. In addition, the posts and pilings foundation and the structure attached thereto, is anchored to resist flotation, collapse and lateral movement due to the effects of wind and water loads acting simultaneously on all building components.

- Upon completion of any development that changes existing Special Flood Hazard Areas, the NFIP directs all participating communities to submit the appropriate hydrologic and hydraulic data to FEMA for a FIRM revision. In accordance with 44 CFR, Section 65.3, as soon as practicable, but not later than six months after such data becomes available, a community shall notify FEMA of the changes by submitting technical data for a flood map revision. To obtain copies of FEMA’s Flood Map Revision Application Packages, please refer to the FEMA website at http://www.fema.gov/business/nfip/forms.shtml.

Please Note:

Many NFIP participating communities have adopted floodplain management building requirements which are more restrictive than the minimum federal standards described in 44 CFR. Please contact the local community’s floodplain manager for more information on local floodplain management building requirements. The Los Angeles floodplain manager can be reached by calling Gary L. Moore, City Engineer, at (213) 485-4835. The Los Angeles County floodplain manager can be reached by calling George De La O, Senior Civil Engineer, at (626) 458-7155.

If you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to call Michael Hornick of the Mitigation staff at (510) 627-7260.

Sincerely,

Gregor Blackburn, CFM, Branch Chief
Floodplain Management and Insurance Branch

cc:
Gary L. Moore, City Engineer, City of Los Angeles
George De La O, Senior Civil Engineer, Los Angeles County
Garret Tam Sing/Salomon Miranda, State of California, Department of Water Resources, Southern District
Michael Hornick, NFIP Planner, DHS/FEMA Region IX
Alessandro Amaglio, Environmental Officer, DHS/FEMA Region IX
October 9, 2013

Tami Podesta, Branch Chief
Division of Environmental Planning
California Department of Transportation District 7
100 South Main St, Los Angeles, CA 90012

INITIAL STUDY/MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION (IS/MND)
CITY OF LOS ANGELES
GLENALE BOULEVARD HYPERION AVENUE COMPLEX OF BRIDGES
IMPROVEMENT PROJECT

LOS ANGELES COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS COMMENTS

We completed our review of the IS/MND associated with the proposed Glendale Boulevard-Hyperion Avenue Complex of Bridges Improvement Project (referred to as viaduct complex). The proposed project is located between Atwater Village to the north and Silver Lake and Los Feliz to the south, on Glendale Boulevard and Hyperion Avenue between Glenfeliz Boulevard and Ettrick Street, in the City of Los Angeles.

The City of Los Angeles, in conjunction with the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) and Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), is proposing to modify the existing viaduct complex in order to correct existing safety and operational deficiencies, address pedestrian safety issues, meet current seismic performance standards, and to restore original design details to the railings. The major project features include widening of the Glendale Boulevard bridges by eight feet on each side, realignment of the I-5 northbound off-ramp to allow left turns onto southbound Glendale Boulevard, addition of a median barrier on the Hyperion Avenue viaduct roadway, construction of a wider sidewalk on the northwest side of Hyperion Avenue, and elimination of the southeastern sidewalk.

The following comments are for your consideration and relate to the environmental document only:

Permits and Approvals needed

1. Chapter 1, Proposed project, section 4, Permits and Approval Needed, table 1-3, List of Agency Approvals and Permits, page 1-32; Revise the permits needed from County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works as follows.
The document only includes obtaining easement from Los Angeles Flood Control District (LAFCD) to enter and work within LAFCD right-of-way. Revise the statement to include the following: “For any improvements within the Los Angeles County Flood Control District (LACFCD) right-of-way, a Use Agreement will be required if there is no existing easement permitting the work. In addition to this agreement, a responsible party must also be identified for the long term maintenance of such facilities”.

If you have any questions regarding the general comment, please contact Haris Harouny of Watershed Management Division at (626) 458-4346 or hharouny@dpw.lacounty.gov.

If you have any other questions or require additional information, please contact Teni Mardirosian of Land Development Division at (626) 458-4910 or tmardirosian@dpw.lacounty.gov.
October 11, 2013

Tammi Podesta, Branch Chief
Division of Environmental Planning
California Department of Transportation District 7
100 S. Main Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012

RE: Initial Study/Environmental Assessment and Mitigated Negative Declaration - The Glendale Boulevard-Hyperion Avenue Complex of Bridges Improvement Project

Dear Ms. Podesta:

The Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (LACMTA) is in receipt of the Notice of Availability of the Initial Study / Environmental Assessment (IS/EA) and Notice of Intent to Adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) for the proposed Glendale Boulevard-Hyperion Avenue Complex of Bridges Improvement Project. This letter conveys comments concerning issues in relation to the proposed project that may impact LACMTA's operations and facilities, as well as LACMTA's interests in promoting mobility of all modes within LA County.

The proposed bicycle and pedestrian improvements of the project including a new bike access ramp to the LA River, widened sidewalks, and improved crossings are good examples of integrating active transportation. The study further mentions that the Project may include wide outside shoulder lanes on Glendale Boulevard-Hyperion Avenue that are usable by cyclists. Due to high speeds and volumes of auto vehicles, LACMTA would support potential opportunities for this project to include a bikeway facility that provides a higher level of safety, comfort, and convenience for bicyclists on Glendale Boulevard-Hyperion Avenue.

We also encourage the Project to achieve compliance with the Caltrans Complete Streets Policy, meeting the needs of multi-modal transportation users while increasing safety for all roadway users. Furthermore, this corridor is a main connection linking the communities on both sides of the LA River between Glendale and Los Angeles. LACMTA encourages agencies to continue to expand bikeways throughout the region particularly with innovative facilities that increase bicycle ridership, safety, and connectivity.

It is also noted that the LA River Bike Path that runs under the project bridges is a major bicycle facility for the region. If the construction of the project is expected to impact the bicycle facility, the applicant should provide adequate detours for bicycles and pedestrians including proper signage and safe alternative routing.
In addition, Metro bus lines operate on Glendale Boulevard, San Fernando Boulevard and Fletcher Drive, near or within the proposed project. The following comments relate to bus operations and bus stops:

1. Although the project is not expected to result in any long-term impacts on transit, the contractor should be aware of the bus facilities and services that are present. Existing Metro bus stops must be maintained as part of the final project.

2. During construction, the stops must be maintained or relocated consistent with the needs of Metro Bus Operations. Metro Bus Operations Control Special Events Coordinator should be contacted at 213-922-4632 regarding construction activities that may Impact Metro bus lines. Other municipal bus service operators may also be impacted and should be included in construction outreach efforts.

3. LACMTA encourages the installation of bus shelters, benches and other amenities that improve the transit rider experience. Caltrans should consider the installation of such amenities as part of the bridge improvements if possible.

4. Final design of any bus stops and surrounding sidewalk areas must be Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) compliant and allow passengers with disabilities a clear path of travel to the bus stop from the proposed development.

If you have any questions regarding this response, please contact Marie Sullivan at 213-922-5667 or by email at sullivanma@metro.net.

Sincerely,

Nick Saponara
Development Review Manager, Countywide Planning
October 14, 2013

Linda Moore
City of Los Angeles - Bureau of Engineering
1149 S. Broadway, Suite 750
Los Angeles, CA 90015

Subject: Glendale Boulevard-Hyperion Avenue Viaduct Improvement Project
SCH#: 2007011107

Dear Linda Moore:

The State Clearinghouse submitted the above named Mitigated Negative Declaration to selected state agencies for review. The review period closed on October 11, 2013, and no state agencies submitted comments by that date. This letter acknowledges that you have complied with the State Clearinghouse review requirements for draft environmental documents, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act.

Please call the State Clearinghouse at (916) 445-0613 if you have any questions regarding the environmental review process. If you have a question about the above-named project, please refer to the ten-digit State Clearinghouse number when contacting this office.

Sincerely,

Scott Morgan
Director, State Clearinghouse
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCH#</th>
<th>2007011107</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Title</td>
<td>Glendale Boulevard-Hyperion Avenue Viaduct Improvement Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead Agency</td>
<td>Los Angeles, City of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>MND Mitigated Negative Declaration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>The Glendale Blvd.-Hyperion Ave. Viaduct Complex is located on Glendale Blvd. and Hyperion Ave. between Ettrick St. and Glenfeliz Blvd. in the City of Los Angeles. The proposed project would modify the viaduct complex to correct safety and operational deficiencies, meet current seismic performance standards and restore original design details to the railings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Lead Agency Contact**

- **Name**: Linda Moore
- **Agency**: City of Los Angeles - Bureau of Engineering
- **Phone**: 213 465 5751
- **Address**: 1149 S. Broadway, Suite 750
- **City**: Los Angeles
- **State**: CA
- **Zip**: 90015

**Project Location**

- **County**: Los Angeles
- **City**: Los Angeles, City of
- **Region**: 34° 6' 49.8" N / 118° 15' 55.5" W
- **Cross Streets**: Glendale Boulevard and Hyperion Avenue between Ettrick St. and Glenfeliz Blvd
- **Parcels No.**
- **Township**: Range
- **Section**: Section
- **Base**:

**Proximity to:**

- **Highways**: I-5
- **Airports**: Los Angeles River
- **Railways**: Glenfeliz & Ivanhoe ES
- **Waterways**: Circulation / Transportation
- **Schools**: Integration
- **Land Use**: Recreation

**Project Issues**: Aesthetic/Visual; Air Quality; Archaeologic-Historic; Biological Resources; Drainage/Absorption; Flood Plain/Flooding; Noise; Public Services; Recreation/Parks; Schools/Universities; Sewer Capacity; Soil Erosion/Compaction/Grading; Solid Waste; Toxic/Hazardous; Traffic/Circulation; Vegetation; Water Quality; Water Supply; Wetland/Riparian; Growth Inducing; Landuse; Cumulative Effects

**Reviewing Agencies**: Resources Agency; Department of Conservation; Department of Fish and Wildlife, Region 5; Office of Historic Preservation; Department of Parks and Recreation; Department of Water Resources; Office of Emergency Management Agency, California; Resources, Recycling and Recovery; California Highway Patrol; Caltrans, District 7; Air Resources Board, Transportation Projects; Regional Water Quality Control Board, Region 4; Native American Heritage Commission; State Lands Commission

**Date Received**: 09/11/2013  **Start of Review**: 09/12/2013  **End of Review**: 10/11/2013
APPENDIX F-7: Public Official Comments

Assemblyman Gatto’s Office
Councilmember O’Farrell’s Office
1) Reduce vehicle speed on Hyperion Avenue
2) Provide bike lanes on Hyperion Avenue (perhaps protected by barrier)
3) Add full-width crosswalk on Atwater Side of Glendale and Hyperion
4) Eliminate median and railing barriers, and/or banked turns
5) Non-specific approval
6) Non-specific disapproval
7) This is not a pedestrian-friendly design
8) Do not increase or improve access to cyclists on Hyperion
9) Propose a multi-modal design/be consistent with Bike Plan & Caltrans Safety Policy
10) Enhance safety for everyone
11) There should be narrower car/traffic lanes and reduce traffic lanes
12) There should be well-marked crosswalks and wayfinding signs
13) Preserve the historic bridge design
14) There should be wider sidewalks
15) Address traffic congestion
16) Consider proposed alternative designs
17) Provide accessibility to LA River
18) Provide a public hearing
19) Review related projects, specifically the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers document, Los Angeles River Ecosystem Restoration Integrated Feasibility Study that could potentially impact the detention/infiltration basin in Sunnynook River Park
20) Emergency vehicles possibly will not be able to get through due to crash barrier
21) We would like to participate in advisory board
22) Security Measures for Pedestrian Bridge
23) On demand traffic light at I-5 exit
24) What are the number of lanes on pedestrian bridge/access?
25) Will there be a link between pedestrian paths on both sides of the bridge?
26) Keep the median barriers in the plan.
27) Reduce the bridge to one lane in each direction.
28) Provide benches on the sidewalks on the bridge.
29) Design the center of the bridge for pedestrians and bikes.
30) Create a public space on the bridge for pedestrians.
31) Provide noise mitigation during construction.
32) Will project provide proper bike/pedestrian detours, signage, and safe alternative routing if existing bike facility is impacted by construction?
33) Must maintain Metro facilities and services during project
34) Will bus shelters, benches and other amenities be installed?
35) Be consistent with Caltrans Complete Streets Policy (DD-64-R1) and FHWA Routine Accommodations Policy (23 C.F.R. § 652.5) - elderly and handicapped
36) Provide a signalized crosswalk with refuge areas at both sides of street at east end of bridge complex
37) Caltrans and the City of Los Angeles Cannot Certify the IS/EA if a Fair Argument Can Be Made That the Project Will Create Significant Impacts for Bicyclists
38) A wide shoulder/shoulder is not a bike lane
39) Review flood maps
October 9, 2013

Ms. Tami Podesta, Branch Chief
Division of Environmental Planning
California Department of Transportation District 7
100 South Main Street
Los Angeles, California 90012

Dear Ms. Podesta,

I am writing as an elected official and concerned citizen to support the inclusion of bicycle lanes in the proposed project to modernize the Hyperion Avenue viaduct. The Hyperion Avenue viaduct and the surrounding communities of Atwater Village, Silver Lake, Los Feliz, and Glendale are within the boundaries of the 43rd Assembly District, which I represent. The Hyperion Avenue Bridge plays a critical role in connecting these communities.

I am concerned that the current project proposal would create something freeway-like, in an area where such a structure is not needed, wanted, or safe. A freeway-like bridge would also encourage unsafe automobile speeds and would fail to create a multi-modal transit route, which locals want and deserve.

I applaud the current proposal for its improvements to the LA River Bike Path, particularly the completion of the interchange between the Bike Path and Glendale Boulevard. However, local access improvements on one end of a project area are insufficient without a bridge project that provides safe accommodation between Silver Lake and Atwater Village. Without accommodations on Hyperion Avenue, cyclists who wish to travel east-west and cross the Los Angeles River and the 5 Freeway, will continue to face dangerous obstacles and significant inconvenience.

The Los Angeles County Bicycle Coalition has proposed an alternative design that provides a safer facility for all users and creates space for increased cycling and pedestrian facilities without decreasing automobile capacity. By lowering the design speed, removing the median crash barrier, not super-elevating turns, and striping urban lane widths, motorists will not be encouraged to pick up speed before entering the residential neighborhoods on either end of the viaduct. Community stakeholders consistently reiterated the need for calmer traffic conditions on the viaduct during project scoping, and I agree. As long as we can keep automotive traffic moving and provide safe bike lanes, we will have succeeded in the redesign.
As a state legislator and community member, I look forward to working with you to create a proposal that meets the needs of this modern urban transit route for automobiles, cyclists, and pedestrians. Thank you for your consideration of these comments. If my office can be of assistance during these processes, please do not hesitate to call.

Sincerely,

Mike Gatto
Assemblyman, 43rd District
November 1, 2013

Ms. Tami Podesta  
Branch Chief, Division of Environmental Planning  
California Department of Transportation, District 7  
100 S. Main Street  
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Re: Glendale Boulevard-Hyperion Avenue Complex of Bridges Improvement Project

Dear Ms. Podesta,

The Glendale Boulevard-Hyperion Avenue Viaduct is an important bridge complex that links the neighborhoods of Atwater Village, Silver Lake and Los Feliz. It is an integral thoroughfare for vehicles, pedestrians and bicycles and should continue to serve all multimodal needs.

The City of Los Angeles Department of Public Works, Bureau of Engineering, is the lead agency for this improvement project and began community outreach in October 2002. Now, approximately 11 years later, the project has progressed and an initial Community Workshop was held on the evening of Wednesday September 25, 2013, at which varying issues regarding speed and access were expressed. A subsequent public hearing was held the evening of Monday, October 28th, 2013. Community stakeholders have expressed great interest in this project and it is in the spirit of civic engagement that I write this letter.

The improvement project includes a seismic retrofit, the resolution of design deficiencies, traffic circulation improvements and the restoration of the bridge’s historic balustrades. Additionally, the improvement project proposes to widen traffic lanes, install a median barrier to separate northbound and southbound traffic lanes and to consolidate the two existing sidewalks into a single sidewalk on the west side of the Hyperion Bridge. The restored balustrades are to be protected from auto collisions with a 3-ft. crash barrier, which will interrupt the interior view.

Project mitigations include the construction of an alternate pedestrian and bicycle crossing over the Los Angeles River across the existing Red Car piers and an adjacent green space that will help infiltrate stormwater before it is discharged into the River. The new pedestrian crossing is to be completed before pedestrian access is temporarily disallowed on the bridge during the construction period. The bridge will remain operational for vehicles throughout construction with at least one operational traffic lane in each direction at all times.

The design phase of the proposed project is currently only at 35%, and as the design further evolves, I want to express my willingness to explore options that would include dedicated bicycle lanes on the Hyperion and Glendale sections, modification to traffic lane widths as currently proposed, a signalized
crosswalk that would span the entire width of the bridge, the removal of the center median barrier and/or decorative treatment and the removal and/or alternative placement of the 3-ft. roadway-edge crash barriers, which are intended to protect the balustrades. I believe it is important to fully explore these options to ensure that the bridge is safe, respects the surrounding neighborhoods and serves vehicles, pedestrians and bicycles.

To that end, as the proposed project progresses I will continue to engage community stakeholders and will form a citizens advisory group to ensure accountability and transparency in the design process. I believe that through a coordinated effort, the Glendale Boulevard-Hyperion Avenue Complex of Bridges Improvement Project can be completed in a manner that is timely and responsive to community stakeholder input.

With kind regards,

Mitch O’Farrell

MITCH O’FARRELL
Councilmember, District 13
Los Angeles City Council
City of Los Angeles

CC: Mayor Eric Garcetti
Councilmember Tom LaBonge, District 4
Deborah Weintraub, Bureau of Engineering
APPENDIX G: FHWA Air Quality Conformity Determination
Mr. Michael Miles  
District Director  
California Department of Transportation  
District 7  
100 South Main Street, Suite 100  
Los Angeles, CA 90012-3606  

Attention: Andrew Yoon, Senior Transportation Engineer  

SUBJECT: Project-Level Conformity Determination for the Glendale Boulevard – Hyperion Avenue Complex of Bridges Improvement Project  

Dear Mr. Miles:  

On February 6, 2014 the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) submitted to the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) a request for the project-level conformity determination for the Glendale Boulevard – Hyperion Avenue Complex of Bridges Improvement Project in the City of Los Angeles pursuant to 23 U.S.C. 327(a)(2)(B)(ii)(1). The project is in an area that is designated nonattainment for ozone (O$_3$), maintenance for course particulate matter (PM$_{10}$), nonattainment for fine particulate matter (PM$_{2.5}$) and maintenance for carbon monoxide (CO) and nitrogen dioxide (NO$_2$).  

The project-level conformity analysis submitted by Caltrans indicates that the project-level transportation conformity requirements of 40 C.F.R. Part 93 have been met. The project is included in the Southern California Association of Government’s (SCAG) currently conforming 2012-2035 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)/ Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS), and the 2013 Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP). The latest conformity determination for the 2012-2035 RTP/ SCS, through Amendment No. 1 and the 2013 FTIP through Amendment No. 13-04, was made by the FHWA and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) on July 15, 2013. The design concept and scope of the preferred alternative have not changed significantly from those assumed in the regional emissions analysis.  

As required by 40 C.F.R. 93.116 and 93.123, the localized CO and PM analyses are included in the documentation. The CO hotspot analysis was performed with the Caltrans’ Transportation Project-Level Carbon Monoxide Protocol. The analyses demonstrate that the project will not create any new violation of the standards or increase the severity or number of existing
violations. Based on the information provided, FHWA finds that the project-level conformity
determination for the Glendale Boulevard – Hyperion Avenue Complex of Bridges Improvement
Project in the City of Los Angeles conforms to the State Implementation Plan (SIP) in
accordance with 40 C.F.R. Part 93.

If you have any questions pertaining to this conformity finding, please contact Stew Sonnenberg,
FHWA Air Quality Specialist, at (916) 498-5889 or by email at stew.sonnenberg@dot.gov.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

For: Vincent P. Mammano
Division Administrator
MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT
BETWEEN THE CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
AND THE CALIFORNIA STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICER
REGARDING THE
GLENDALE BOULEVARD – HYPERION AVENUE VIADUCT
COMPLEX IMPROVEMENT PROJECT
CITY OF LOS ANGELES, LOS ANGELES COUNTY, CALIFORNIA

WHEREAS, the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) has assigned and the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) has assumed FHWA responsibility for environmental review, consultation, and coordination pursuant to 23 USC 327, which became effective on October 1, 2012 and applies to this undertaking; and

WHEREAS, Caltrans has determined that the Glendale Boulevard – Hyperion Avenue Viaduct Complex Improvement Project, City of Los Angeles, Los Angeles County, California (Undertaking), will have an adverse effect on the Glendale-Hyperion Viaduct Complex, which is comprised of six structures - Bridges 53 1069, 53C1179, 53C1881, 53C1882, 53C1883, 53C1884, a property determined to be eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places (National Register); and

WHEREAS, Caltrans has consulted with the California State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) pursuant to Stipulations X.C., and X.I of the January 2004 Programmatic Agreement among the Federal Highway Administration, The Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, The California State Historic Preservation Officer, and the California Department of Transportation Regarding Compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, as it Pertains to the Administration of the Federal-Aid Highway Program in California (PA), and where the PA so directs, in accordance with 36 CFR Part 800, the regulations implementing Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (16 USC Section 470f), as amended (NHPA), regarding the Undertaking’s effects on the historic property and has notified the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (Council) of the adverse effect finding pursuant to 36 CFR§800.6(a)(1), and the Council declined to participate per their July 13, 2009 letter; and

WHEREAS, Caltrans has thoroughly considered alternatives to the Undertaking, has determined that the statutory and regulatory constraints on the design of the Undertaking preclude the possibility of avoiding adverse effects to the Glendale-Hyperion Viaduct Complex during the Undertaking’s implementation, and has further determined that it will resolve adverse effects of the Undertaking on the subject historic property through execution and implementation of this Memorandum of Agreement (MOA); and

WHEREAS, Caltrans District 7 (District 7) and the City of Los Angeles (City) have participated in the consultation process and have been invited to concur in this MOA;

NOW, THEREFORE, Caltrans and the SHPO agree that, upon Caltrans’ decision to proceed
with the Undertaking, Caltrans shall ensure that the Undertaking is implemented in accordance with the following stipulations in order to take into account the effect of the Undertaking on the historic property, and further agrees that these stipulations shall govern the Undertaking and all of its parts until this MOA expires or is terminated.

STIPULATIONS

I. AREA OF POTENTIAL EFFECTS

A. The Undertaking’s area of potential effects (APE) is included as Attachment A to this MOA. The APE includes the public right-of-way that encompasses the boundaries of the viaduct complex with the widened Glendale Boulevard bridges over the Los Angeles River, encompassing the geographic area within which the undertaking may directly or indirectly cause alterations in the character or use of the historic property. Attachment A set forth hereunder may be amended through consultation among the MOA parties without amending the MOA.

II. TREATMENT OF HISTORIC PROPERTIES

A. Prior to the start of any work that could adversely affect characteristics that qualify the Glendale-Hyperion Viaduct Complex (Bridges 53 1069, 53C1179, 53C1881, 53C1882, 53C1883, 53C1884) as a historic property, the City shall contact the National Park Service Pacific West Region Office (NPS), to determine if additional recordation is required for the historic property beyond that provided in “Historic American Engineering Record, Glendale-Hyperion Viaduct, HAER No. CA-272,” 2000-2001. The City shall provide NPS 30 days to respond to their additional recordation determination request. If additional documentation is required, Caltrans shall ensure that the additional documentation is completed and accepted by NPS before the Viaduct is altered. The City shall prepare draft and final reports to be reviewed by Caltrans and NPS.

B. Upon completion of the documentation prescribed in subsection A, the City shall provide the documentation meeting current archival quality standards established by the NPS' Heritage Documentation Program to District 7 and the Caltrans Transportation History Library in Sacramento. The City shall also provide the archive quality documentation to NPS, if NPS requests it. Copies of the documentation shall be offered by the City to, at a minimum, the Los Angeles Public Library, Los Angeles Conservancy, Los Angeles City Historical Society, Historical Society of Southern California, and the California Office of Historic Preservation.

C. The City shall work with the Los Angeles Public Library to place the historical information from the HAER report, prescribed in subsection A, on a City website with a link to a public library website, such as the Los Angeles Public Library website, available to the public for a minimum period of three years. The information link shall also be made available to the Caltrans Transportation Library and History Center at Caltrans.
Headquarters in Sacramento for inclusion on their website.

D. The City shall produce a documentary (motion picture or video) that addresses the history of the Los Angeles River monument bridges, and their importance and use within the broader contextual history of the City of Los Angeles. The motion picture or video shall be of broadcast quality, between 30- and 90-minute duration, and shall be made available to local broadcast stations, public access channels in the local cable systems, and requesting schools/libraries; one copy shall be submitted to the Caltrans Transportation Library and History Center at Caltrans Headquarters in Sacramento.

E. The City shall produce and publish a booklet on the Historic Los Angeles River Bridges that addresses the history of the monumental concrete bridges of Los Angeles and this bridge’s place in that history. The booklet shall be similar in general format to the “Historic Highway Bridges of California” published by the California Department of Transportation (1991) and shall include high-quality, black and white images of the Los Angeles River Bridges, historic photographs or drawings, as appropriate, and text describing each of the bridges’ location, year built, builder, bridge type, significant character-defining features and its historic significance. City shall ensure that an electronic version of the booklet is posted on a City website and produce paper copies for distribution to local libraries, institutions and historical societies. One copy shall be submitted to the Caltrans Transportation Library and History Center in Sacramento. Caltrans shall ensure that the City maintains the camera-ready master booklet and produce additional copies if there is demand.

F. The City shall submit the 35%, 65% and 95% design plans and specifications for the Glendale-Hyperion Viaduct Complex to District 7 and request review by a Caltrans Professionally Qualified Staff Principal Architectural Historian for conformance with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties (SOI Standards). Caltrans shall be afforded 30 days to complete its review. The SHPO shall be afforded the opportunity to review the same design plans and specifications. Failure of the SHPO to respond within thirty (30) calendar days after receipt of the plans shall not preclude Caltrans from implementing the plans. Should the SHPO or the Council object within thirty (30) calendar days to any plans and specifications submitted for review, then Caltrans shall consult with the objecting party, for a period not to exceed ten (10) calendar days, to resolve the objection. If the objection cannot be resolved within this time period, Caltrans shall request the Council review the Finding in accordance with 36 CFR 800.5(c)(3).

G. The City shall prepare a construction monitoring plan and conduct periodic monitoring of construction activities to ensure the project is conducted in a manner that meets the SOI Standards. The City shall provide District 7 a draft construction monitoring plan. District 7 shall have thirty (30) calendar days after receipt of the document to review and comment. The City will address the comments and prepare a final construction monitoring plan. The plan shall include description of the project, description of the
historic property’s character-defining features, discussion of the monitoring’s purpose, and construction activities to be monitored, as well as methods, schedule, and procedures for monitoring and reporting. Caltrans shall ensure that the construction monitoring plan is implemented. Monitoring reports shall include photographs indicating that the activities are in compliance with the SOI Standards. The monitor shall meet the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards for Architectural Historian or Historic Architect pursuant to CFR 36 CFR Part 61, Appendix A (PQS Standards).

III. ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

A. Definitions. The definitions provided at 36 CFR§800.16 are applicable throughout this MOA.

B. Professional Qualifications and Standards. Caltrans shall ensure that only individuals meeting the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualifications Standards (48 FR 44738-39) in the appropriate field of study carry out or review appropriateness and quality of the actions and product required by Stipulation II. A in this MOA.

C. Discoveries and Unanticipated Effects. If Caltrans determines during implementation of the terms of this MOA or after construction of the Undertaking has commenced, that the Undertaking will affect a previously unidentified property that may be eligible for listing in the National Register, or affect a known historic property in an unanticipated manner, Caltrans will address the discovery or unanticipated effect in accordance with 36 CFR Part 800.13(b)(3). Caltrans at its discretion may hereunder assume any discovered property to be eligible for inclusion in the National Register in accordance with 36 CFR 800.13 (c).

D. Resolving Objections

1. Should any party to this MOA object at any time in writing to the manner in which the terms of this MOA are implemented, to any action carried out or proposed with respect to implementation of the MOA, or to any document prepared in accordance with and subject to the terms of the MOA, Caltrans shall immediately notify the other parties of the objection, request their comments on the objection within 15 days following receipt of Caltrans’ notification, and proceed to consult with the objecting party for no more than 30 days to resolve the objection. Caltrans will honor the request of any other parties to participate in the consultation and will take any comments provided by those parties into account.

2. If the objection is resolved during the 30 day consultation period, Caltrans may proceed with the disputed action in accordance with the terms of such resolution.

3. If at the end of the 30 day consultation period, Caltrans determines that the objection
cannot be resolved through such consultation, then Caltrans shall forward all documentation relevant to the objection to the Council, including Caltrans' proposed response to the objection, with the expectation that the Council will, within 30 days after receipt of such documentation:

a. Advise Caltrans that the Council concurs in Caltrans' proposed response to the objection, whereupon Caltrans will respond to the objection accordingly. The objection shall thereby be resolved; or

b. Provide Caltrans with recommendations, which Caltrans will take into account in reaching a final decision regarding its response to the objection. The objection shall thereby be resolved; or

c. Notify Caltrans that the objection will be referred for comment pursuant to 36 CFR Part 800.7(c) and proceed to refer the objection and comment. Caltrans shall take the resulting comments into account in accordance with 36 CFR 800.7(c)(4) and Section 110(1) of the NHPA. The objection shall thereby be resolved.

4. Should the Council not exercise one of the above options within 30 days after receipt of all pertinent documentation, Caltrans may implement their proposed response. The objection shall thereby be resolved.

5. Caltrans shall take into account any of the Council's recommendations or comments provided in accordance with this stipulation with reference only to the subject of the objection. Caltrans' responsibility to carry out all other actions under this MOA that are not the subject of the objection shall remain unchanged.

6. At any time during implementation of the measures stipulated in this MOA, should a member of the public raise an objection in writing pertaining to such implementation to any signatory party to this MOA, that signatory party shall immediately notify the other signatory party in writing of the objection. Either signatory party may choose to comment in writing on the objection to the other signatory party. Caltrans shall establish a reasonable time frame for this comment period. Caltrans shall consider the objection, and in reaching its decision, Caltrans will take all comments from the other signatory party into account. Within 15 days following closure of the comment period, Caltrans will render a decision regarding the objection and respond to the objecting party. Caltrans will promptly notify the other signatory party of its decision in writing, including a copy of the response to the objecting party. Caltrans' decision regarding resolution of the objection will be final. Following issuance of its final decision, Caltrans may authorize the action subject to dispute hereunder to proceed in accordance with the terms of that decision.

7. Caltrans shall provide all parties to this MOA, and the Council, if the Council has commented, and any parties that have objected pursuant to Section D.6 of the
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stipulation, with a copy of its final written decision regarding any objection addressed pursuant to this stipulation.

8. Caltrans may authorize any action subject to objection under this stipulation to proceed after the objection has been resolved in accordance with the terms of this stipulation.

E. Amendments

Any signatory party to this MOA may propose that this MOA be amended, whereupon all signatory parties shall consult to consider such amendment. The amendment will be effective on the date a copy signed by all of the original signatories is filed with the Council. If the signatories cannot agree to appropriate terms to amend the MOA, any signatory may terminate the agreement in accordance with Stipulation III. F, below.

F. Termination

1. If this MOA is not amended as provided for in section E of this stipulation, or if either signatory party proposes termination of this MOA for other reasons, the signatory party proposing termination shall, in writing, notify the other MOA parties, explain the reasons for proposing termination, and consult with the other parties for at least 30 days to seek alternatives to termination. Such consultation shall not be required if Caltrans proposes termination because the Undertaking no longer meets the definition set forth in 36 CFR Part 800.16(y).

2. Should such consultation result in an agreement on an alternative to termination, the signatory parties shall proceed in accordance with the terms of that agreement.

3. Should such consultation fail, the signatory party proposing termination may terminate this MOA by promptly notifying the other parties in writing. Termination hereunder shall render this MOA without further force or effect.

4. If this MOA is terminated hereunder, and if Caltrans determines that the Undertaking will nonetheless proceed, then Caltrans shall comply with the requirements of 36 CFR Part 800.3-800.6.

G. Duration of the MOA

1. Unless terminated pursuant to section F of this stipulation, or unless it is superseded by an amended MOA, this MOA will be in effect following execution by the signatory parties until Caltrans, in consultation with the other signatory party, determines that all of its stipulations have been satisfactorily fulfilled.

2. The terms of this MOA shall be satisfactorily fulfilled within ten (10) years.
following the date of execution by the signatory parties. If Caltrans determines that this requirement cannot be met, the MOA parties will consult to reconsider its terms. Reconsideration may include continuation of the MOA as originally executed, amendment of the MOA or termination. In the event of termination, Caltrans will comply with section F.4 of this stipulation, if it determines that the Undertaking will proceed notwithstanding termination of this MOA.

3. If the Undertaking has not been implemented within five (5) years following execution of this MOA, this MOA shall automatically terminate and have no further force or effect. In such event, Caltrans shall notify the other signatory parties in writing and, if it chooses to continue with the Undertaking, shall reinitiate review of the Undertaking in accordance with 36 CFR Part 800.

H. Progress Reports. The City will prepare semi-annual progress reports regarding the stipulation measures, to be circulated among the signatories.

I. Effective Date

This MOA will take effect on the date that it has been executed by Caltrans and the SHPO.

EXECUTION of this MOA by Caltrans and the SHPO, its filing with the Council in accordance with 36 CFR§800.6(b)(l)(iv), and subsequent implementation of its terms, shall evidence, pursuant to 36CFR§800.6( c), that Caltrans has afforded the Council an opportunity to comment on the Undertaking and its effects on historic properties, and that Caltrans has taken into account the effects of the Undertaking on historic properties.
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APPENDIX I: AVOIDANCE, MINIMIZATION, AND MITIGATION SUMMARY
Appendix I: Avoidance, Minimization, and Mitigation Summary

This section contains a compilation of all avoidance, minimization, and mitigation measures for the proposed project. Refer to Table S-2 in the Summary for detailed information regarding environmental impacts and proposed measures.

Avoidance and Minimization Measures

Archeological Resources

Although the Proposed Project is not expected to affect archaeological resources, as requested by the Chairman of the Gabrielino/Tongva Tribal Council, the following measure should be implemented:

A-1: A professional archaeologist should monitor all ground disturbing activities during construction and should act according to the Special Order and Caltrans policies if archaeological resources are discovered.

In addition, if buried cultural materials are encountered during construction, work in the area of the resource should be halted and applicable actions under City of Los Angeles and Caltrans policy should be implemented.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

The following measures are legal requirements, and are included for informational purposes only.

HZ-1: Contaminated Ground Water. Conduct groundwater sampling and testing during the design phase to determine the level of groundwater contamination and the depths. Require the selected contractor to prepare and implement a management plan in the event that hazardous wastes, petroleum hydrocarbons, and/or contaminated groundwater are encountered during construction. Implementation could require the contractor to utilize a photo-ionization detector (PID) or other organic vapor detector during all pile drilling/boring activities and to employ appropriate worker protection measures should detected levels exceed Cal-OSHA standards. Groundwater that seeps into the drilled hole for pile installations would be pumped out of the pile hole as or before it is filled with concrete. The contaminated water would be temporarily storage, and the water removed (vacuum truck) or treated and discharged under permit from the City or LARWQCB, depending on the discharge outlet. All contaminated groundwater, contaminated soil, and hazardous wastes and debris encountered or generated during construction would be
properly excavated, stored, tested, treated and/or disposed in accordance with all federal, state, and local laws and regulations.

**HZ-2:** Lead Chromate Traffic Paint. Perform representative sampling and testing of yellow traffic paint along the viaduct complex that could be affected by construction prior to removal. If lead, lead chromate, or other hazardous materials in the paint exceed standards, abate the traffic paint (prohibit its removal by sand-blasting or grinding methods) and properly dispose of the material prior to construction.

**HZ-3:** Aerially Deposited Lead. During design of the northbound I-5 off-ramp reconfiguration to Glendale Boulevard, perform representative sampling and testing of the area ramp alignment area for the presence of ADL. If ADL is present above action levels, abate the ADL-contaminated soil, in accordance with all applicable laws and regulations, prior to construction of the reconfigured ramp. A Health and Safety Plan by Contractor would be required pursuant to Contract General Conditions/General requirements (GC/GR).

**HZ-4:** Asbestos-Containing Materials or Lead-Based Paint. Perform a survey (during the design phase or prior to construction) of the bridge joints that could be disturbed from demolition or construction activity to determine if they contain asbestos. In addition, conduct a survey for the presence of LBP in areas of the viaduct complex to be removed or physically affected. If present, remove the ACM and/or LBP prior to or as part of the demolition process, in accordance with all applicable laws, regulations, and rules. A Health and Safety Plan by Contractor would be required pursuant to GC/GR requirements.

**Mitigation Measures**

**Biological Resources**

**B-1:** Coffer dams or other approved flow diversions should be erected in the existing concrete channel during project construction to minimize pollution of river water as part of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). To optimize pollution capture and stream flow during project implementation, flow should be diverted from one or two of the four channels at any given time.

**B-2:** Restore diverted flow within the Los Angeles River to the full width of the river channel upstream from the locations of the riparian/wetland islands. This would ensure that the wetlands immediately downstream of the concrete pad would not be deprived of water that they would otherwise receive.

**B-3:** Conduct a Worker Environmental Awareness Program (WEAP). All construction crews and contractors should be required to participate in WEAP training prior to starting work on the project. The WEAP training will include a review of the special-status species and
other sensitive resources that could exist in the Project area, the locations of the sensitive biological resources, their legal status and protections, and measures to be implemented for avoidance of these sensitive resources. A record of all personnel trained should be maintained.

**B-4:** Conduct pre-construction nest surveys of the riparian habitat within 500 feet of the work area (in the Los Angeles River channel) to identify nest sites for special-status bird species. The surveys should be conducted prior to the onset of breeding season before construction is scheduled to begin. If nest structures or sites are identified, they should be excluded to ensure that no nesting of these species occurs within 500 feet of construction activities.

**B-5:** A qualified biological monitor should monitor construction activities over the course of nesting bird season (February 15th to August 31st) for the presence of nests occupied by Migratory Bird Treaty Act-protected birds.

**B-6:** Conduct a pre-construction survey for arroyo chub (*Gila orcutti*) immediately below the viaduct complex. If any arroyo chub are found, the qualified biologist should install seine netting prior to construction in order to capture individuals of arroyo chub in the work zone. Captured individuals would be released at appropriate locations downstream of project site. This capture and release regime would occur at all significant phases of in-channel diversions, including the initial placement of diversions.

**B-7:** Install turbidity curtains at the downstream end of the construction work zone in the river channel for the duration of in-channel construction. Turbidity curtains should be inspected weekly and prior to and following storm events. If repair is necessary, maintenance should occur immediately (within 48 hours) to ensure pollutants do not disperse throughout the river.

**B-8:** Within 30 days before bridge construction or tree removal, a qualified biologist should conduct a pre-construction survey for the presence of roosting bats. If sensitive bat species are found, the following measures should be implemented:

If active nursery roosts are found (typically between April 15 and August 1) a work exclusion area of 500 feet should be cordoned off, and construction activities should be re-scheduled to occur after juvenile bats are able to forage independently. If sensitive bat species are present but there is not an active roost, the client should enter into a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with CDFG. Alternate habitat should be provided if bats are to be excluded from maternity roosts. A qualified biologist with a scientific collecting permit should implement bat exclusion measures. A roost with comparable spatial and thermal characteristics should be constructed as directed by the biologist. In the event that adult bats need to be handled and relocated, the biologist should prepare and implement a relocation plan subject to approval by CDFG that includes relocating all bats found on-site to an alternate suitable habitat.
Historic Resources

H-1: Recordation to Historic American Engineering Record Specifications: Prior to the start of any work that could adversely affect characteristics that qualify the Glendale-Hyperion Viaduct Complex as a historic property, contact the National Park Service Pacific West Region Office (NPS), to determine if additional recordation is required for the historic property beyond that provided in “Historic American Engineering Record, Glendale-Hyperion Viaduct, HAER No. CA-272,” 2000-2001. NPS should respond to the additional recordation request within 30 days. If additional documentation is required, it should be completed and accepted by the NPS before the viaduct is altered. Prepare draft and final reports.

H-2: HABS/HAER Dissemination: Upon completion of the documentation prescribed in Mitigation Measure H-1, documentation meeting current archival quality standards established by the NPS’ Heritage Documentation Program to District 7 and the Caltrans Transportation History Library in Sacramento shall be provided. Archive quality documentation shall also be provided to NPS, if NPS requests it. Copies of the documentation shall be offered to, at a minimum, the Los Angeles Public Library, Los Angeles Conservancy, Los Angeles City Historical Society, Historical Society of Southern California, and the California Office of Historic Preservation.

H-3: Online Publication: Work with the Los Angeles Public Library to place the historical information from the HAER report, prescribed in Mitigation Measure H-1, on a City website with a link to a public library website, such as the Los Angeles Public Library website, available to the public for a minimum period of three years. The information link shall also be made available to the Caltrans Transportation Library and History Center at Caltrans Headquarters in Sacramento for inclusion on their website.

H-4: Video Documentary: Produce a documentary (motion picture or video) that addresses the history of the Los Angeles River monument bridges, and their importance and use within the broader contextual history of the City of Los Angeles. The motion picture or video shall be of broadcast quality, between 30- and 90-minute duration, and shall be made available to local broadcast stations, public access channels in the local cable systems, and requesting schools/libraries; one copy shall be submitted to the Caltrans Transportation Library and History Center at Caltrans Headquarters in Sacramento.

H-5: Informational Booklet: Produce and publish a booklet on the Historic Los Angeles River Bridges that addresses the history of the monumental concrete bridges of Los Angeles and this bridge’s place in that history. The booklet shall be similar in general format to the “Historic Highway Bridges of California” published by the California Department of Transportation (1991) and shall include high-quality, black and white images of the Los Angeles River Bridges, historic photographs or drawings, as appropriate, and text
describing each of the bridges’ location, year built, builder, bridge type, significant character-defining features and its historic significance. Ensure that an electronic version of the booklet is posted on City of Los Angeles website and produce paper copies for distribution to local libraries, institutions and historical societies. One copy shall be submitted to the Caltrans Transportation Library and History Center in Sacramento. Ensure that the camera-ready master booklet is maintained and produce additional copies if there is demand.

**H-6:** Design Plans and Specifications Reviews: Ensure that a Caltrans Professionally Qualified Staff Principal Architectural Historian reviews the 65% and 95% design plans and specifications for the Glendale-Hyperion Viaduct Complex are in conformance with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties (SOI Standards), and that SHPO is afforded the opportunity to review the same design plans and specifications. Failure of the SHPO to respond within thirty (30) calendar days after receipt of the plans shall not preclude Caltrans from proceeding with the undertaking. Should the SHPO or the Council object within thirty (30) calendar days to any plans and specifications submitted for review, then Caltrans shall consult with the objecting party, for a period not to exceed ten (10) calendar days, to resolve the objection. If the objection cannot be resolved within this time period, the FHWA shall request the Council review the Finding in accordance with 36 CFR 800.5(c)(3).

**H-7:** Construction Monitoring Plan: Prepare construction monitoring plan and conduct periodic monitoring of construction activities to ensure the project is conducted in a manner that meets the SOI Standards. Provide Caltrans a draft construction monitoring plan, in which Caltrans shall have thirty (30) calendar days after receipt of the document to review and comment, and prepare a final construction monitoring plan. The plan shall include description of the project, description of the historic property’s character-defining features, discussion of the monitoring’s purpose, and construction activities to be monitored, as well as methods, schedule, and procedures for monitoring and reporting. Caltrans shall ensure that the construction monitoring plan is implemented. Monitoring reports shall include photographs indicating that the activities are in compliance with the SOI Standards. The monitor shall meet the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards for Architectural Historian or Historic Architect pursuant to CFR 36 CFR Part 61, Appendix A (PQS Standards).

**Traffic**

**T-1:** The signalization for the realigned off-ramp intersection will include traffic control for southbound Glendale Boulevard traffic, north of the Hyperion Bridge overcrossing. Traffic control will include, but not limited to, signalization to allow traffic to stop north of Hyperion Bridge overcrossing rather than at the new realigned off-ramp intersection.
The design, placement, and operation of the device would meet LADOT and Caltrans requirements.

**T-2:** Construct an alternate pedestrian crossing over the Los Angeles River across the existing Red Car piers (downstream of the viaduct complex) to connect the bike path along the southwest side of the Los Angeles River with Glendale Boulevard on the northeast side of the river. The pedestrian crossing, in conjunction with the new access to the LA River bikeway from northbound Glendale Boulevard, would provide a detour route around the Glendale Boulevard Bridges during construction. In order for this measure to serve as an effective detour for pedestrians, the pedestrian crossing and the new access to the bike path would have to be fully constructed and operational before commencing the widening of Glendale Boulevard Bridges.
APPENDIX J: Endangered Species List
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Scientific Name</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>General Habitat Description</th>
<th>Habitat Potential/Absence</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marsh sandwort</td>
<td><em>Arenaria paludicola</em></td>
<td>FWS-END</td>
<td>WET MEADOWS AND MARSHES.</td>
<td>ABSENT</td>
<td>Last observed in 2009 in Hollywood Quad. The habitat within the project is RIVERINE. The habitat associated with this species does not occur within the project area, therefore the species is not anticipated to occur in the project area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal dunes milk-vetch</td>
<td><em>Astragalus tener var. tii</em></td>
<td>FWS-END</td>
<td>COSTAL BLUFFS, DUNES, COAST</td>
<td>ABSENT</td>
<td>The habitat associated with this species does not occur within the project area and the micro-habitat within the project limit is marginal at best, therefore the species is not anticipated to occur in the project area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevin’s barberry</td>
<td><em>Berberis nevinii</em></td>
<td>FWS-END</td>
<td>CHAPARRAL, SANDY TO GRAVELY SOILS, OR WASHES</td>
<td>ABSENT</td>
<td>The habitat associated with this species does not occur within the project area and the micro-habitat within the project limit is marginal at best, therefore the species is not anticipated to occur in the project area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Bernardino Aster</td>
<td><em>Symphyotrichum defoliatum</em></td>
<td>FWS-END</td>
<td>GRASSLAND, San Gabriel Mtns., San Bernardino Mtns.</td>
<td>ABSENT</td>
<td>The habitat associated with this species does not occur within the project area and the micro-habitat within the project limit is marginal at best, therefore the species is not anticipated to occur in the project area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gambel’s Watercress</td>
<td></td>
<td>FWS-END</td>
<td>MARSHES, STREAM BANKS, LAKE MARGINS</td>
<td>ABSENT</td>
<td>The habitat associated with this species does not occur within the project area and the micro-habitat within the project limit is marginal at best, therefore the species is not anticipated to occur in the project area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwestern Willow flycatcher</td>
<td><em>Empidonax trailii extimus</em></td>
<td>DFW-E</td>
<td>COTTONWOOD/WILLOW RIPARRIAN</td>
<td>ABSENT</td>
<td>General, marginal habitat for this species is present within the project quadrangle, however no habitat was observed within the project area during field surveys. The species is not expected to be present within the project area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Peregrine Falcon

*Falco peregrines*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FWS – E</th>
<th>DFW – P</th>
<th>CLIFFS, EMBACKMENTS</th>
<th>ABSENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The habitat associated with this species does not occur within the project area and the micro-habitat within the project limit is marginal at best, therefore the species is not anticipated to occur in the project area.

### Least Bell’s vireo

*Vireo vellii pusillus*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DFG – E</th>
<th>FWS-E</th>
<th>RIPARIAN</th>
<th>ABSENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The habitat associated with this species does not occur within the project area and the micro-habitat within the project limit is marginal at best, therefore the species is not anticipated to occur in the project area.
APPENDIX K: Possible Configurations for Hyperion Viaduct with Bicycle Lanes
This Exhibit is strictly a preliminary design alternative under consideration, and does not represent the final design of the bridge.
EXHIBIT 2

HYPERION AVENUE BRIDGE OVER I-5, RIVERSIDE DRIVE AND LA RIVER (LOOKING NORTH)
Caltrans Bridge Numbers 53-1069, 53C-1882, and 53C-1881

1) THREE LANES (ONE LANE DOWNHILL; TWO LANES UPHILL)
2) SIDEWALK ON ONE SIDE
3) 6 FT. MEDIAN (NO BARRIER)

HYPERION AVENUE AT WAVERLY DRIVE (LOOKING NORTH)
Hyperion Avenue here is City street not on bridge; Waverly Bridge is 53C-1179

1) THREE LANES (ONE LANE DOWNHILL; TWO LANES UPHILL)
2) SIDEWALK ON ONE SIDE
3) 6 FT. MEDIAN (NO BARRIER)

This Exhibit is strictly a preliminary design alternative under consideration, and does not represent the final design of the bridge.
EXHIBIT 3

HYPERION AVENUE BRIDGE OVER I-5, RIVERSIDE DRIVE AND LA RIVER (LOOKING NORTH)
Caltrans Bridge Numbers 53-1069, 53C-1882, and 53C-1881

1) THREE-11 FT. LANES (ONE LANE DOWNHILL; TWO LANES UPHILL)
2) SIDEWALK AND BUFFER ON BOTH SIDES
3) 6 FT. MEDIAN (NO BARRIER)

This Exhibit is strictly a preliminary design alternative under consideration, and does not represent the final design of the bridge.

HYPERION AVENUE AT WAVERLY DRIVE (LOOKING NORTH)
Hyperion Avenue here is City street not on bridge; Waverly Bridge is 53C-1179

1) THREE-10 FT. LANES (ONE LANE DOWNHILL ; TWO LANES UPHILL)
2) SIDEWALK AND BUFFER ON BOTH SIDES
3) 4 FT. MEDIAN ( NO BARRIER)

This Exhibit is strictly a preliminary design alternative under consideration, and does not represent the final design of the bridge.