

# THE SILVERSTEIN LAW FIRM

*A Professional Corporation*

215 NORTH MARENGO AVENUE, 3RD FLOOR  
PASADENA, CALIFORNIA 91101-1504

PHONE: (626) 449-4200 FAX: (626) 449-4205

ROBERT@ROBERTSILVERSTEINLAW.COM  
WWW.ROBERTSILVERSTEINLAW.COM

April 29, 2020

## **VIA OVERNIGHT DELIVERY**

Mindy Nguyen  
City of Los Angeles, Department of City Planning  
221 North Figueroa Street, Suite 1350  
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Re: Objection to Denial of Request for Extension of 45-Day Comment Period  
for Hollywood Center Project Draft Environmental Impact Report  
("DEIR"); Case Number ENV-2018-2116-EIR;  
State Clearinghouse Number 2018051002

Attachment to the letter of the  
above-referenced subject.

Administrative Record from  
StopTheMillenniumHollywood.com  
vs. City of Los Angeles  
(LASC Case No. BS144606  
("Original Millennium Case"))

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

CITY PLANNING COMMISSION  
REGULAR MEETING

- - - - - )  
IN THE MATTER OF: )  
HEI/GC Hollywood & Vine Condominiums )  
v. )  
City of Los Angeles )  
- - - - - )

Thursday, March 28, 2013  
City Hall -  
Public Works Board Room 350  
200 North Spring Street  
Los Angeles, CA 90012

B E F O R E:  
VICE PRESIDENT REGINA FREER, CHAIR  
COMMISSIONER GEORGE HOVAGUIMIAN  
COMMISSIONER ROBERT LESSIN  
COMMISSIONER DANA PERLMAN  
COMMISSIONER BARBARA ROMERO

A P P E A R A N C E S:  
Gerald Neuman, Esq.  
Alfred Fraijo, Esq.  
Sheppard, Mullin, Richter & Hampton LLP  
Counsel for Hollywood Millennium  
  
Daniel Wright, Esq.  
Silverstein Law Firm  
Counsel for Appellant, Communities  
United for Reasonable Development  
Victor De la Cruz, Esq.  
Manatt, Phelps & Phillips, LLP  
Counsel for Appellant, AMDA College and  
Conservatory of the Performing Arts  
  
Luciralia Ibarra  
LA City Planning Department  
Sergio Ibarra  
LA City Planning Department

PAGES 1 - 366

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

Philip Aarons  
Millennium Partners

Gary Handel  
Handel Architects

APPELLANTS:  
Ann Geoghan  
Jim Geoghan  
Alex Chavez  
Greg Johnson  
George Abrahams  
Sarajane Schwartz  
Fran Reichenbach

Brian Currey  
Mayor's Office

Marcel Porras  
Office of Councilmember Eric Garcetti  
Rushmore Cervantes  
Los Angeles Housing Department

Tom LaBonge  
Councilmember  
Michael LoGrande  
LA Planning Department

Shane Parker  
Parker Environmental

INDEX

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

Motion to deny the appeals 350  
and sustain the decision of the Deputy  
Advisory Agency, approved

Motion to approve the proposed 356  
project per staff recommendations, with  
modifications and technical corrections,  
approved



1 THE CHAIR: So, we're going to go  
2 ahead and get started again.

3 Again, this is a City Planning  
4 Commission meeting. We're preparing to  
5 hear cases 5 and 6; we're going to hear  
6 them together. This is VTT-71837-CN-1A  
7 with the associated environmental, which  
8 is in council district 13. And the  
9 expiration date is the 3rd of April. As  
10 well as -- I'm sorry, I'm reading them  
11 out of the order -- am I? No, and case  
12 number 6 -- CPC-2008-3440-ZC-CUB-CU-ZV-  
13 HD, with the associated environmental.  
14 This same project in council district 13;  
15 expiration date is the 3rd of April.

16 And I will turn to our city  
17 attorney, who has some clarification  
18 regarding the item that has been removed  
19 from our agenda.

20 MS. KHORASANEE: Thank you,  
21 Commissioner Freer. Adrienne Khorasanee,  
22 city attorney's office, for the record.

23 Upon learning of a conflict of  
24 interest, the city attorney advised that  
25 the planning commission would be

1           disqualified from hearing the entire  
2           matter, based on government code section  
3           1090, which prohibits boards from  
4           considering a contract in which one of  
5           its members has a financial interest,  
6           unless an exception applies.

7           No exception was applicable. Under  
8           city law, when a commission is  
9           disqualified, the matter is referred to  
10          the board of referred powers, which sits  
11          as the conflicted board. Upon learning  
12          this, the developer has decided to  
13          withdraw the development agreement.  
14          Given that a development agreement is no  
15          longer involved, the conflict involving  
16          the board is removed, and the planning  
17          commission may consider this matter.

18          THE CHAIR: Thank you. So, to  
19          clarify then, the seventh item that was  
20          on the agenda has been removed; that was  
21          the development agreement.

22          So, we're going to be moving forward  
23          with items 5 and 6. I'd like to call  
24          Luci Ibarra up, of our staff to help.  
25          And just to let folks know how the

1 hearing will run, since we do have a full  
2 house. We will have comments from the  
3 staff, who will help us to understand  
4 from their point of view the project.  
5 We'll then call for the applicant, who  
6 will have some time, and we'll talk about  
7 the time that they'll be allotted to make  
8 their presentation.

9 There are several appellants to this  
10 case. We're going to give equal time in  
11 the presentation to the group of  
12 appellants. I am going to ask, since  
13 there are different appellants, and we  
14 want to keep equal time for fairness'  
15 sake, that you have some conversations  
16 with yourselves about how you want to  
17 organize and utilize the time that we're  
18 going to be allotted to appellants.

19 And then we also will have a public  
20 comment period. So, if, for some reason,  
21 there are issues that are not raised  
22 within the context of the appellants or  
23 the developer -- excuse me, the  
24 applicant's presentation, there is  
25 opportunity within the context of public

1 comment for those comments to be received  
2 and noted and understood by us.

3 And then we'll turn to our own  
4 deliberations once we have gone through  
5 the public comment.

6 So I'm hoping that we can run this  
7 smoothly. This is in Hollywood, but it's  
8 not the Academy Awards so there's not a  
9 band to let you know that you're going  
10 overtime. But we are going to keep very  
11 judiciously to the time restrictions that  
12 we apply to public comment. Because we  
13 have loads of public comment -- about a  
14 hundred speakers, we're going to allow  
15 for a minute per speaker. It's a lot.  
16 And so, I will be very firm. I have been  
17 dying to be able to use this, but I'm  
18 hoping honestly that I don't have to.  
19 But I will cut you off, should I need to.  
20 So I just want to prepare you that a  
21 minute goes very, very quickly, so take  
22 some time to gather your thoughts in  
23 advance of us calling for public comment.

24 So, Luci, please.

25 MS. IBARRA: Good morning,

1 Commissioner Freer, commissioners.

2 Luci Ibarra with the planning  
3 department in the major projects section.  
4 I'm here to present to you the Millennium  
5 Hollywood project.

6 As mentioned previously, the case  
7 numbers associated with this project are  
8 CPC-2008-3440, with the suffixes for zone  
9 change, conditional use, variance, and  
10 the height district change.

11 And there's an appeal before you on  
12 the tract that was approved by the  
13 advisory agency. Together with this is  
14 an ENV-2011-675 for the EIR that was  
15 prepared for the project.

16 To familiarize you with the land use  
17 and zoning designations, the property is  
18 located in the Hollywood Community Plan.  
19 It is consisting of two sites flanking  
20 Vine Street, Yucca Street to the north.  
21 Hollywood Boulevard is less than 400 feet  
22 away to the south. And you have Ivar to  
23 the west and Argyle Avenue to the east.

24 The property bound by Ivar, Vine  
25 Street, and Yucca is characterized as the

1 west site, whereas the other is  
2 characterized in the east site as we move  
3 forward.

4 The land use designation here is  
5 regional center commercial, which is  
6 typically designated for areas where we  
7 feel that they can accommodate a high  
8 intensity of uses and densities  
9 consistent with major transit centers.  
10 So this property is located less than 500  
11 feet from the Metro station, the  
12 Hollywood and Vine Metro station.

13 The Q associated with this property  
14 is respective of the Hollywood Community  
15 Plan update, which permitted residential  
16 uses with a minimum .5 FAR, for non-  
17 residential uses. And this is to  
18 encourage the job's housing balance that  
19 is designated for this designation in the  
20 Hollywood Community Plan.

21 It is located in height district 2,  
22 which provides no height limit. And the  
23 D associated with the height district  
24 allows for four and a half to one FAR,  
25 and an FAR of six to one with CPC

1 approval, which is before you today.

2 Part of the project includes  
3 development regulations and a land-use-  
4 equivalency program. And given the  
5 market conditions, the planning  
6 department has been tasked with  
7 permitting and reviewing projects that  
8 ask for some flexibility to accommodate  
9 the market conditions and the still  
10 fragile development community that is  
11 grappling with some of the financial  
12 issues that are beyond our scope.

13 With that said, the tract map that  
14 was approved with this by the advisory  
15 agency including the following: 41 lots,  
16 including air space lots; the development  
17 of 492 residential units; 200 hotel  
18 rooms; approximately 100,000 square feet  
19 of new office space, and this is in  
20 addition to the existing office space  
21 that's associated with the Capitol  
22 Records and Gogerty Buildings, which are  
23 historic buildings that will be  
24 maintained and preserved as part of this  
25 development.

1           There are 34,000 square feet of  
2 restaurant use proposed, as well as  
3 35,000 square feet of fitness and sports  
4 club use and 15,000 square feet of retail  
5 use.

6           Now, I should note that the fitness  
7 club and sports use is reflective of the  
8 zone change that's proposed to you today.  
9 The reason that we need that zone change  
10 is to allow the sports club use in  
11 this -- in this project. Gymnasiums are  
12 not explicitly allowed in the C4 zone.  
13 There are other similar uses, such as  
14 commercial swimming pools, recreational  
15 buildings, and private and not-for-profit  
16 clubs that are comparable to sports use,  
17 but are not expressly allowed in the C4  
18 zone. This is why the C2 zone change is  
19 before you.

20           The Environmental Impact Report for  
21 this project -- this is the summary of  
22 the process for that. It included an NOP  
23 issued in April -- in April through May  
24 31st, a public scoping meeting, the  
25 circulation of the DEIR, and the final,



1           which was released in February of this  
2           year.

3           It recognized and acknowledged  
4           significant and unavoidable impacts  
5           despite the mitigation that was imposed.  
6           And here they are listed. It included  
7           two aspects for aesthetics. It was the  
8           focal view obstruction of the Capitol  
9           Records, and that is only at the  
10          development scenarios, including the 220-  
11          foot height and the 400-foot height.

12          As we'll get into the development  
13          regulations later and we'll go -- we'll  
14          speak to those more specifically, you'll  
15          see that we have several scenarios that  
16          play with the available height limit or  
17          not -- no height limit in this area. And  
18          so the developer is proposing a set of  
19          development regulations that show what  
20          would happen to the building and the  
21          massing when you play with the height.

22          Again, the cumulative visual  
23          impacts -- this is related to height and  
24          massing. When you compare this project  
25          with the other projects related and

1 proposed for this area.

2 Air quality with respect to  
3 construction and operational only because  
4 this property is located just south of  
5 the U.S. 101 freeway, and air quality in  
6 this area is already at a -- at an  
7 challenged local spot.

8 The noise -- construction and  
9 operational, and transportation. So five  
10 study intersections were identified as  
11 significantly impacted by this project  
12 following litigation. And thirteen  
13 cumulative study intersections and  
14 sixteen cumulative intersections when you  
15 look out into the future.

16 The requested entitlements before  
17 you, as I've mentioned, include the zone  
18 change, the height district change is to  
19 remove the delimitation which is before  
20 you, and it's -- it's a request that the  
21 applicant is making to reach the six-to-  
22 one FAR, which is permitted. The vesting  
23 conditional use to allow a hotel within  
24 500 feet. And the conditional uses are  
25 to include the project because it flanks

1 two sides of Vine Street. To define it  
2 as a unified development and allowing  
3 that floor area to be averaged over --  
4 across both sites, the sale and  
5 dispensing of a full line of alcoholic  
6 beverages, and to permit live  
7 entertainment, which is consistent with  
8 the character of the community.

9 The variances is to permit outdoor  
10 eating areas above the ground floor and  
11 to allow less than the required parking  
12 for the sports club and facility. And  
13 this is something that is -- that we'll  
14 speak to later. But it -- it's  
15 reflective of the permitted exceptions in  
16 the code for projects that are mixed use  
17 developments near transit, and before you  
18 in authority that's allowed in the code.

19 And then -- and so the -- so that's  
20 the one that reduced onsite parking for  
21 transportation alternatives. That's the  
22 one that's before you.

23 With respect to the vesting and zone  
24 and height district change, the existing  
25 zone -- C4-2D-SN would then become 2-TQ-

1 C2-2-SN. The T is the tentative tract  
2 conditions. These are conditions that  
3 are reflective of the infrastructure  
4 associated with the development of the  
5 site. So those that were required in the  
6 tract for improvements to sewers,  
7 streets, and other public works types  
8 improvements -- those are attached to  
9 this, to this T. In the even that they  
10 should never effectuate the tract, we've  
11 captured those in this entitlement.

12 The Q is reflective of the qualified  
13 conditions, and these are site-specific  
14 conditions to the project development and  
15 include some mitigation measures.

16 The 2 of the height limit is  
17 consistent with what is existing, which  
18 is no height limit. And the D is part of  
19 the process of removing the four and a  
20 half to one FAR with your approval, which  
21 would allow it to go to six to one.

22 And the SN is reflective of the  
23 Hollywood Signage Supplemental Use  
24 District, which will be maintained and  
25 will regulate signage on the site.

1           Before you again is the tract  
2           appeal. Now, the public hearing for both  
3           the tract and the hearing officer  
4           satisfactions of the CPC before you was  
5           held on February 19th. The advisory  
6           agency issued its approval of the tract  
7           on February 22nd, which was followed with  
8           an appeal end date of March 1st -- 4th,  
9           excuse me.

10           There are six appeals filed. And  
11           the predominance of the issues associated  
12           were traffic for FAR increase, the  
13           parking reductions, the views, the  
14           density, the construction, specifically  
15           noise and height.

16           To go into these issues -- the  
17           appellant contend that the traffic  
18           conditions are already detrimental, and  
19           the project would exacerbate conditions.  
20           The traffic study identified thirty-nine  
21           study intersections. The existing levels  
22           of service are acceptable at a majority  
23           of the intersections, with one exception  
24           during the P.M. peak hour. Acceptable  
25           levels of service per DOT policy are

1 levels A through D, and then one --  
2 levels A through -- E through F, excuse  
3 me, are considered unacceptable.

4 So with and without the project,  
5 twenty-four of the thirty-nine  
6 intersections would continue to operate  
7 at acceptable levels of service. Fifteen  
8 would operate at levels of E through F,  
9 at one or both of the P.M. peak hours.

10 Before mitigation, there would be  
11 significant impacts at thirteen of those  
12 intersections, and with mitigation, only  
13 five study intersections would be  
14 characterized as significant.

15 The views -- there was many concerns  
16 from Hollywood hillside residents with  
17 respect to the views due to the proposed  
18 height. And in one reference, they refer  
19 to the Hollywood Redevelopment Plan.

20 In one instance of the Hollywood  
21 Redevelopment Plan, there is a reference  
22 to the protection of -- or consideration  
23 of use to and from the hillside, but that  
24 is identified only with respect to the  
25 Franklin Avenue design district, and that

1 is not where this project is located.

2 The Hollywood Community Plan also  
3 identifies views as a potential impact  
4 with respect to aesthetics, but states  
5 that it would be considered on a site-  
6 specific basis on an individual project  
7 discretionary review.

8 So for every project that comes  
9 before you, you can analyze -- or you can  
10 critique or analyze the views and impacts  
11 associated with each project on a  
12 discretionary basis as the cases come  
13 before you.

14 The EIR identified, as I mentioned,  
15 two categories where the project would  
16 impact views. One was with focal-view  
17 obstruction to the Capitol Records  
18 Building, again at 220 feet and again at  
19 400 feet. And the cumulated visual  
20 impacts with heightened massing together  
21 with the other projects --

22 MR. PERLMAN: I'm sorry, Luci, I  
23 don't mean to interrupt you. Dana  
24 Perlman. Can you explain what you mean  
25 by the focal impact at 220 and 440?

1 MS. IBARRA: Okay. So when the  
2 building -- as the building goes higher,  
3 and we'll get into this later, the aim is  
4 to provide a slimmer structure, such that  
5 the views to the Capitol Records Building  
6 will be preserved and expanded. As the  
7 building gets shorter, the massing  
8 becomes larger, and that impacts those  
9 focal views to the Capitol Records  
10 Building from certain vantage points.

11 MR. PERLMAN: Does the 220 -- 440  
12 refer to distance from the location?

13 MS. IBARRA: It -- it refers to the  
14 massing of the building that will  
15 compromise views to Capitol Records  
16 Building.

17 MR. PERLMAN: Thank you.

18 MS. IBARRA: The development  
19 regulations that are proposed to be  
20 attached as conditions of approval  
21 reflect and encourage height so as to  
22 minimize impacts at a street-level scale  
23 to the views, and this -- well, we'll go  
24 into that in more detail later.

25 Construction: One of the appellants



1           made the case or tried to make the case  
2           that noise mitigation in the EIR failed  
3           to identify them as a sensitive receptor.  
4           So typically what we do as the lead  
5           agency, we can identify which uses are  
6           considered sensitive. And in this case,  
7           and which has a building -- a commercial  
8           structure at the corner of Yucca and  
9           Vine. It's a commercial structure  
10          located one block south of the 101  
11          freeway. It's a commercial use in a  
12          regional center commercial land-use  
13          designation in a very urban area. And we  
14          didn't think that they were consistent  
15          with the character of a sensitive use,  
16          which we typically reserve for schools  
17          that address and house under-aged  
18          children, childcare centers, long-term  
19          health care facilities, hospices and  
20          hospitals, and residences.

21                 For that reason, we didn't identify  
22                 them as a sensitive receptor. However,  
23                 we did modify our mitigation measures to  
24                 include all adjacent uses to receive the  
25                 maximum available mitigation for noise

1 construction related impacts,  
2 irrespective of their designation as a  
3 sensitive receptor.

4 So they received the maximum  
5 available mitigation available, although  
6 the EIR does acknowledge that these are  
7 significant and unavoidable impacts and  
8 that even with mitigation, these are just  
9 unavoidable.

10 The other issue that was brought up  
11 in the appeals and as well as in the  
12 public hearing, was with respect to the  
13 FAR. Historically, this property, by  
14 virtue of being located in the Hollywood  
15 Redevelopment Plan, can achieve an FAR of  
16 up to six to one. It's located in  
17 regional center commercial land-use  
18 designation, which is explicitly called  
19 out to receive an FAR incentive under the  
20 new community plan. But, historically,  
21 in the old Hollywood Community Plan, it  
22 was allowed at three to one. But if you  
23 were located in the Hollywood  
24 Redevelopment area, you could receive an  
25 FAR four and a half to one, with an FAR

1 of six to one with CRA approval.

2 Now, without the CRA and without the  
3 Hollywood Redevelopment Plan, this was  
4 captured in the community plan update,  
5 which permitted the four and a half to  
6 one FAR for this land-use designation and  
7 a six to one with your approval.

8 Other issues associated include  
9 density. Now one of the appeal issues  
10 was that this project was too dense for  
11 the site and for the community, but I  
12 should point out that there's an  
13 exception in the code that allows any  
14 uses in the R5 zone that are located in  
15 the CR, C1 C-1/2, C2, C4, and C5 zone.

16 Now the R5 zone allows a density of  
17 200 square feet per unit. With that,  
18 based on the size of this property, you  
19 could achieve a maximum of 972 units on  
20 this site, based on the zone and the  
21 exception in the code.

22 As proposed and was approved with  
23 the vesting tract, they're only proposing  
24 492 units.

25 Parking: The code also includes

1 various exceptions for mixed-use projects  
2 that include office and redevelopment --  
3 for projects located in the redevelopment  
4 areas in the state enterprise zone, which  
5 this project does. And for those  
6 projects located near transit, which this  
7 satisfies, and it allows a ten percent  
8 reduction. And, again, for  
9 transportation alternatives, which we'll  
10 go into later with the transit-oriented  
11 measures that are associated with the  
12 project.

13 Again with height, this project  
14 area, or this project site, I should say  
15 more specifically, does not have a  
16 history of a height limit under the  
17 community plan. In 1980 -- the 1988  
18 community plan did not identify a height  
19 limit for this property or this zone, and  
20 neither does the Hollywood Community Plan  
21 update.

22 At this point, I'd like to pass it  
23 on to my colleague, Sergio Ibarra, who's  
24 going to go into the project site and the  
25 development regulations.

1 MR. IBARRA: Good morning,  
2 commissioners. I'm Sergio Ibarra with  
3 the planning department, and I'm going to  
4 go over the development regulations and  
5 the land-use equivalency program. But  
6 I'm going to begin first with greater  
7 context in regards to the existing site.

8 So as you can see, currently the  
9 site is developed by surface parking  
10 lots. There's an east site and a west  
11 site, and the west site has their rental  
12 car facility onsite.

13 On the west site, you have the AMDA  
14 facility to the north, as well as a  
15 three-story commercial building that was  
16 recognized as a historic resource in the  
17 EIR. On the east site, you have the  
18 Capitol Records building and the Gogerty  
19 Building to the northern edge, northwest.  
20 And the service parking lots flank both  
21 sides of every block.

22 And the site is also within a  
23 quarter mile of the Hollywood and Vine  
24 Metro stop.

25 So here we have a northern view of

1 the Capitol Records Building and the jazz  
2 mural that was -- which was recently  
3 restored. And here you have a view from  
4 the Capitol Records Building, looking  
5 south to the Hollywood Playhouse. Here  
6 you have a view of the Gogerty Building  
7 on the corner of Yucca and Franklin.

8 And this is the west site. A  
9 surface parking lot with the rental car  
10 facility, looking towards the Capitol  
11 Records Building. And the actual project  
12 looks to preserve this kind of view;  
13 that's a three-block view of the Capitol  
14 Records Building. That's one of the  
15 objections of the development plan.

16 And here you have a view of the  
17 Hollywood Playhouse. And the project  
18 also has a fifteen-foot setback. That's  
19 required adjacent to the Hollywood  
20 Playhouse, so that you can preserve the  
21 architectural views of this resource.  
22 And it also has a setback after forty  
23 feet that is ten feet, so that it's  
24 compatible with this resource in terms of  
25 its massing.

1           And here's the rental car facility  
2           that's on the northern edge of the site,  
3           right next to the historic three-story  
4           commercial building.

5           And this is the office building that  
6           AMDA occupies, fronting Vine Street and  
7           Yucca.

8           And here is a view of Yucca Street.  
9           On the top, you have the east block, and  
10          that's the Gogerty Building and the  
11          Capitol Records Building together. And  
12          then on the west block, you have the  
13          three-story commercial building and the  
14          surface parking lot. And AMDA is right  
15          next to it on the corner.

16          This is a western view of what the  
17          Hollywood skyline would look like with  
18          the project. The two tall towers would  
19          be the actual project, and the Capitol  
20          Records Building is directly adjacent to  
21          it and the Sunset Vine Tower is on the  
22          far right. And this is just for greater  
23          context of what the project is. It's a  
24          focal point to the community.

25          This is a diagram of future

1 developments surrounding the site. And  
2 it's important to note that we -- the  
3 commission has approved two previous  
4 cases where the FAR was increased to six  
5 to one, and they are within this diagram.  
6 They're also located on Yucca and  
7 Hollywood Boulevard.

8 Now I'm going to begin the  
9 development regulations. This is a  
10 diagram of the different heights that are  
11 allowed, the maximum height scenarios.  
12 It's important to note that B and C are  
13 where the tallest towers can be located,  
14 up to 585 maximum in terms of feet, and A  
15 and D can be no taller than 220 feet.  
16 And only the shaded areas are developable  
17 areas, and not the area right -- right  
18 near the Capitol Records Building.

19 And this is a table that's within  
20 development regulations that shows you  
21 the different ranges of height. It's a  
22 little complicated, but we can begin with  
23 the first column at the tower height.  
24 You have basically four different ranges.  
25 You can go up to 585 feet or 550 feet,



1 400 feet, or 200 feet. What changes in  
2 every height scenario is if you reach 585  
3 feet, you get more open space. And  
4 that's on the far-right column. You see  
5 the twelve percent, ten percent, eight  
6 percent, and five percent. So 585 feet  
7 gives you 12 percent of open space.

8 Another distinction is the maximum  
9 floor area -- actually the maximum tower  
10 floor plate in square feet. So the  
11 taller you have of a tower, the smaller  
12 the floor plate becomes, creating an  
13 elegant, tall tower. So what you get  
14 with height is a slimmer tower and more  
15 open space, and greater views of the  
16 Capitol Records Building, which is the  
17 three focal points that Luci described  
18 earlier.

19 And this is just a site plan of the  
20 massing in relation to the Capitol  
21 Records Building. And as you can see,  
22 you have the 585-foot tower on the left,  
23 which is of darker shading. And you have  
24 the 220-foot tower on the far right. And  
25 you would always have a podium that would

1 reach no more than 150 feet. So anything  
2 greater than 150 feet is a tower. And  
3 also you have a diagram of the open  
4 spaces. You can see the open spaces  
5 triangulated to preserve the Capitol  
6 Records Building views. The three views  
7 of concern are the view from Hollywood  
8 and Vine, and from the Hollywood freeway  
9 east of Argyle and west of Vine. And so  
10 the development regulations ensure that  
11 the triangulated area -- it's a forty-  
12 degree angle; I'm not sure if you can see  
13 it, but it's shown there -- will never be  
14 developed on, and it will be part of the  
15 open space.

16 Another important thing to note is  
17 that there will always be a passageway on  
18 both sites that will connect Argyle to  
19 Vine and Vine to Ivar, and that's  
20 required as part of the development  
21 regulations, and I'll go over that in a  
22 bit.

23 So one of the development  
24 regulations is that you must have a  
25 minimum separation of eighty feet between

1 towers. And that's just to not have an  
2 overwhelming mass onsite. Another one is  
3 to have a minimum 20-foot setback above  
4 150 feet, and that's shown -- let's see  
5 if I can point -- well, the 2 that are  
6 numbered are 20-foot setbacks and they're  
7 closest to the Pantages Theater, and  
8 that's just to create some distance  
9 between a historic resource.

10 And the number three bubble is  
11 there's a maximum of forty percent of the  
12 street wall that can actually be tower  
13 when it's fronting Vine Street. So only  
14 forty percent of that frontage fronting  
15 Vine Street can be occupied by a tower.

16 And there's a minimum 10-foot  
17 setback above 150 feet for both sites,  
18 and that's just to continue the street  
19 wall that exists along this district,  
20 because there was a historic height  
21 maximum of 150 feet in the past. And so  
22 that historic structures are no taller  
23 than 150 feet, and Capitol Records is  
24 actually 150 feet if you exclude the  
25 trilan (ph.).

1           And there's a setback from Capitol  
2           Records to ensure that the tower is not  
3           directly adjacent to Capitol Records, and  
4           that's in addition to the triangulated  
5           open space that's required.

6           And this is just an example of what  
7           the development regulations would  
8           produce. This is a 585-foot tower. You  
9           have the eighty feet separating the two  
10          towers. You have your twelve percent  
11          open space with the triangular open space  
12          that preserves the view of Capitol  
13          Records. You have a maximum floor plate  
14          of 13,325 square feet, and that maximum  
15          floor plate can be used for both towers.  
16          Meaning, that if you create two towers,  
17          you cannot use more than 13,325 square  
18          feet. If you use one tower, you use that  
19          square footage for one tower. And the  
20          open space has a forty-degree angled line  
21          that's maintained.

22          On this slide is just to show the  
23          relationship between what the project  
24          would look like if it was fully  
25          developed, maximizing the square footage

1 approximately to the Capitol Records  
2 Building. And as you can see, there's a  
3 podium within the project that measures  
4 120 feet. The Knickerbocker Hotel is 130  
5 feet. Capitol Records is 150 feet. And  
6 we actually conditioned the project so  
7 that the podium can be no taller than 120  
8 feet. They had proposed 150 feet, but we  
9 felt that 120 feet was more appropriate,  
10 as in this diagram that was provided to  
11 us.

12 And this is the development  
13 regulations at the lowest height. At 220  
14 feet, you can have -- you don't need to  
15 abide by the 80-foot separation between  
16 towers. You can have one tower along the  
17 site. The setbacks are the same, except  
18 for that standard. And the open space is  
19 minimized in this height scenario.

20 And this is an Axon (ph.) diagram  
21 showing you what the 220-foot scenario  
22 would look like. As you can see, you  
23 have one building at 220 feet. It would  
24 be broken up by the site plan itself, and  
25 we also have very stringent design

1 guidelines that would ensure that it  
2 would be varied and not a monotonous  
3 building, and it would read potentially  
4 as two buildings.

5 And it's also important to note that  
6 on the west site, they would have 2  
7 towers and they would be required to do  
8 so at this height scenario of 220 feet.

9 And now we're going to go over the  
10 open space that's required. On the east  
11 site where Capitol Records is at, you're  
12 always going to have that triangulated  
13 open space to preserve views, so they  
14 cannot build upon that open space that  
15 you see in the triangle.

16 And on the west site, you have a  
17 fifteen-foot stepback along Vine Street,  
18 and that's partly to respect the  
19 neighboring Hollywood Playhouse. And you  
20 also have a ten-foot setback along Yucca  
21 Street, and that's to differentiate  
22 between the historic three -- the three-  
23 story building on Yucca.

24 And it is an example of how the open  
25 space changes when you have greater

1 height. As you can see, it increased.

2 And this is an example of a  
3 publicly-accessible passageway. The  
4 H's -- where the H's are are the rooftops  
5 of the towers, and the rest is passageway  
6 that would extend from Vine Street to  
7 Argyle and Ivar. And these are required  
8 in any development scenario, with a  
9 minimum width of twenty feet. And the  
10 development regulations allow for  
11 obstruction, such as open-air cafes, bike  
12 racks, and other pedestrian amenities.  
13 And there's also a crosswalk existing  
14 between the two sites. So the  
15 passageways further connect both sites  
16 together, as well as creating a  
17 pedestrian amenity and potentially  
18 programming for visitors. And so --  
19 yeah, that's required, and it changes in  
20 terms of the greater height you have in  
21 the towers, the more required open-air  
22 publicly-accessible passageways is  
23 required, as well. It ranges from twenty  
24 to fifty percent. So it can also be  
25 enclosed.

1           So now I'm going to go over the  
2           land-use equivalency. As Luci described  
3           earlier, the maximum trips were analyzed,  
4           and that is when you add the A.M. peak  
5           hour and the P.M. peak hour trips, you  
6           have a maximum of 1,498 trips. That's  
7           574 plus 924.

8           And the way the land use equivalency  
9           program works, is you can exchange land  
10          uses that are permitted as long as you  
11          don't exceed the maximum trip count that  
12          was analyzed in the EIR. And in this  
13          case, it was 1,498, and that was based on  
14          the maximum commercial scenario, because  
15          that generated the most trips.

16          Another consideration is that you  
17          can't exceed a certain degree of land-use  
18          designation for residential or  
19          commercial, because the impacts for the  
20          maximum residential and maximum  
21          commercial scenario was analyzed in the  
22          EIR. So that there's a maximum in terms  
23          of how much commercial or residential  
24          they can also develop as part of the  
25          land-use equivalency program.



1           And the way you come up with trips  
2           is through this conversion factor. So if  
3           you're doing residential units, you would  
4           multiple the .685 trips per dwelling unit  
5           and your other uses, and make sure that  
6           you don't go over the 1,498 side. At no  
7           point will you go over the trips that  
8           were analyzed in the EIR.

9           And now I'll bring this back to Luci  
10          Ibarra to conclude this presentation.

11          MS. IBARRA: I am Luci Ibarra with  
12          the planning department. To finalize the  
13          presentation before you, I am going to  
14          speak to the bicycle access and parking.

15          The project abuts Yucca -- a portion  
16          of Yucca that was designated and defined  
17          as the first bicycle-friendly street.  
18          It's less than a mile, and it connects  
19          the Vine Street to as far west as --  
20          where's the red? It's here -- and it  
21          just goes past Cherokee and Las Palmas,  
22          and I think -- I think it's Highland.  
23          The bicycle ordinance is included in the  
24          development regulations, but this case  
25          was filed prior to the effective date of

1 the bicycle ordinance, but the applicant  
2 has included those regulations in the  
3 development regulations.

4 With that said, they've also gone on  
5 to include 200 square feet of bicycle  
6 repair for long-term parking, and that  
7 will be included in the development  
8 regulations, as well.

9 So before you, as we were  
10 recommending, that you recommend and  
11 certi -- recommend that the city council  
12 certify the EIR that was prepared for the  
13 project, along with the related  
14 environmental findings and the statement  
15 of envir -- overriding considerations,  
16 excuse me. Based on the goals that we've  
17 identified in the Hollywood Community  
18 Plan, and that is to encourage  
19 development of underutilized properties  
20 in Hollywood, with the exception of the  
21 Capitol Records and Gogerty Building, the  
22 project is predominantly surface parking  
23 now.

24 The project itself will provide  
25 1,635 direct jobs in the development that

1 proposes residential units, which  
2 promotes the jobs-housing balance that's  
3 identified in the Hollywood Community  
4 Plan, as well as the regional center  
5 commercial land-use designation.

6 The project is a transit-oriented  
7 development that locates, again, jobs and  
8 housing near transit, and it promotes the  
9 economic investment in the Hollywood  
10 area.

11 Our recommendation to you on the CPC  
12 case 2008-3440, we recommend that you  
13 approve the vesting zone change from C4  
14 to C2, the height district change from 2D  
15 to remove the delimitation to allow an  
16 FAR six to one, a vesting conditional use  
17 to permit a hotel use within 500 feet of  
18 an R zone, and approve the conditional  
19 uses allowing the floor area averaging of  
20 a unified development, the sale and  
21 dispensing of the full line of alcoholic  
22 beverages, and to permit live  
23 entertainment and dancing on the site.

24 Along with the variances permitting  
25 outdoor areas above the ground floor

1 associated with the restaurants, reduce  
2 parking for the sports club and fitness  
3 facility, and to allow for reduced shared  
4 onsite parking with the transportation  
5 alternatives.

6 With respect to the appeal, we  
7 recommend that you deny the appeals to  
8 uphold the advisory agency's  
9 determination that the project is  
10 consistent with the C2 and C4 zones, the  
11 Hollywood Community Plan update, and is  
12 consistent still with the Hollywood  
13 Redevelopment Plan and the previous  
14 Hollywood community plan, and it is  
15 developed under the maximum permitted  
16 density for the zone and the right  
17 regional center commercial land use  
18 designation.

19 In conclusion, we recommend approval  
20 of the project as presented before you,  
21 along with the regulations and the land-  
22 use equivalency. The project is an  
23 appropriate infill development of an  
24 urban center of properties that are  
25 vastly underused and neglected. It

1 complements Hollywood, the Walk of Fame,  
2 and other character of development with  
3 respect to uses. It's consistent with  
4 the community plan update. And, again,  
5 it locates jobs near transit, and it  
6 locates housing near transit, and it  
7 promotes landscaping, publicly-accessible  
8 plazas and walkable development  
9 consistent with our -- with our planning  
10 principles.

11 And with that, I'll take any  
12 questions that you may have with respect  
13 to our presentation.

14 THE CHAIR: Commissioners -- this is  
15 Commissioner Freer -- if there are any  
16 clarifying questions for Luci, I'm sure  
17 Luci's going to be available, so we can  
18 continue to ask questions as we go  
19 forward.

20 Great. Thank you.

21 So why don't we turn now to the  
22 applicant? And we have a number of folks  
23 who have signed up as speakers relevant  
24 to the applicant. Alfred Fra-ji?

25 MR. FRAIJO: Fraijo.

1 THE CHAIR: Thank you. Gerald  
2 Neuman, Phil Aarons, and Gary Handel. So  
3 is twenty minutes enough time for you?

4 MR. FRAIJO: Yes, we will squeeze  
5 ourselves into those twenty minutes.

6 MR. NEUMAN: We may -- we actually  
7 may need a few more to go through  
8 specific community benefits and some  
9 conditional

10 THE CHAIR: We can't hear you. You  
11 can speak in to the mic, please, and  
12 announce yourself, please.

13 MR. NEUMAN: Jerry Neuman with the  
14 applicant. We may need additional time  
15 to go through the specific benefits and  
16 to address specific appeal points. We  
17 could either do the latter in rebuttal,  
18 or we can do it as part of our  
19 presentation.

20 THE CHAIR: Okay. I think I prefer  
21 that you do it as a part of your  
22 presentation, so is twenty-five minutes  
23 enough?

24 MR. NEUMAN: Yeah, we can --

25 THE CHAIR: And we're going to be

1 giving equal time then to the appellants.

2 So --

3 MR. NEUMAN: Sure. We would expect  
4 any time that we have is equal.

5 THE CHAIR: Okay. So let's go then  
6 for twenty-five minutes?

7 MR. AARONS: Thank you very much.

8 Commissioners, my name is Philip  
9 Aarons. I'm a founding partner of  
10 Millennium Partners, the developers of  
11 the Millennium Hollywood project before  
12 you for consideration. And I want to  
13 thank you sincerely for the opportunity  
14 to address you this morning and to answer  
15 any questions you may have.

16 Seven years ago, when Millennium and  
17 its partner, Argent Ventures, were  
18 presented with the option to acquire the  
19 Capitol Records Building and the 4.5  
20 acres of surface parking lots next to and  
21 across Vine Street, we saw an opportunity  
22 to create a development that would both  
23 preserve and celebrate one of the great  
24 icons of mid-twentieth century  
25 architecture and bring needed investment

1 and pedestrian life to one of the world's  
2 most famous intersections, Hollywood and  
3 Vine.

4 The challenge was how to design a  
5 transit-oriented development with a major  
6 focus on preservation, good jobs,  
7 walkability, and bike friendliness. And  
8 this became our central concern of the  
9 team we assembled many of whom you will  
10 hear from today.

11 Working in alignment with the  
12 principles established by the planning  
13 commission and the department staff, and  
14 in dialogue with community stakeholders,  
15 we worked to formulate a plan and a set  
16 of entitlements that allowed a market-  
17 responsive mix of uses while protecting  
18 open-space connections, historic  
19 structures, views, excellent urban  
20 design. We think the appropriate balance  
21 and significant community benefits is  
22 what you have before you today.

23 Millennium Partners has worked for  
24 nearly twenty-five years building  
25 successful, architecturally-distinguished



1 developments in urban neighborhoods  
2 across the country, ranging from Boston  
3 to San Francisco to the Upper West Side  
4 of Manhattan to Georgetown and Washington  
5 itself.

6 With each development, we work with  
7 local government and our neighbors to  
8 formulate a design and a mix of uses that  
9 responds to the unique characteristics of  
10 each city and each site. And in each  
11 case, we stay with our projects. We stay  
12 with the projects we start. Millennium  
13 retains to this day a significant  
14 financial interest in every urban mixed-  
15 use project we have developed since 1991.

16 In becoming part of the Hollywood  
17 community, we took our time and listened  
18 to a variety of stakeholders to tell us  
19 what they felt was important to develop  
20 on this site. We've had hundreds of  
21 meetings with community members since  
22 2006, and over and over we have heard  
23 certain principles expressed that define  
24 the way this site should be developed.

25 Overlaid with that, were the

1           planning department's very own  
2           principles, including and most  
3           importantly, to Do Real Planning. We  
4           learned a lot from the planning  
5           department, and we want to take the  
6           opportunity to thank them for their  
7           leadership in shaping this project on  
8           essential issues, as to how to combine  
9           buildings and open space into an urban  
10          form that makes them part of an  
11          integrated cityscape.

12                 We wanted to start with the  
13          principle of promoting a walkable city.  
14          Hollywood has a strong pedestrian  
15          history, and the Walk of Fame continues  
16          to attract millions of visitors on foot.  
17          We set about to further that walkability  
18          by leveraging Hollywood's unique history  
19          of public courtyards, marrying them with  
20          the city's desire to establish active  
21          alleyways, in order to create a series of  
22          attractive, safe, welcoming public open  
23          spaces for Hollywood residents and  
24          workers, which create linkages to other  
25          destinations in the area, both those that

1 are popular today and that those will be  
2 in the future. Hopefully, the Little  
3 Country Church garden, the East Cahuenga  
4 Alley, and, of course, the future  
5 Hollywood Central Park.

6 We've worked to ensure excellent  
7 design standards; included as part of the  
8 requested entitlements for our project  
9 are design standards and guidelines.  
10 These guarantee that there will be high  
11 quality architecture on this project, and  
12 they will be explained in greater detail.  
13 They've been explained beautifully by  
14 Luci and Sergio. They'll be explained by  
15 our architect. They are critical to our  
16 thinking.

17 We wanted to promote density around  
18 transit. Millennium Hollywood is located  
19 less than 500 feet from a Hollywood and  
20 Vine Red Line station. And at a  
21 fundamental level, our project is about  
22 getting people out of their cars and onto  
23 the Metro, onto their feet, and on their  
24 bikes. Accommodating growth by placing  
25 residential units and office space in

1 such close proximity to mass transit, not  
2 only assures better usage for the mass  
3 transit, it establishes the clear path  
4 for transit success across the city, a  
5 series of investments that Los Angeles  
6 has made with great enthusiasm and  
7 something that is to be applauded.

8 We made a commitment as well because  
9 we expect people to use the transit  
10 that's available to a transportation  
11 demand management plan that you'll also  
12 hear more about.

13 We are focused on bringing jobs to  
14 where housing exists. This is a key  
15 commitment of ours to provide a mix of  
16 uses of housing with good jobs, hotel,  
17 sports club, office, neighborhood-serving  
18 retail, and the continued use, very  
19 importantly, of Capitol Records Building  
20 as a music industry center. So that we  
21 can help improve the job-housing balance  
22 in the community. And we have signed  
23 agreements with the building trades union  
24 and here with members of both unions, who  
25 are with us today. And in addition, this

1 site represents an opportunity to bring a  
2 major entertainment or tech company to  
3 Hollywood, who recognizes what Hollywood  
4 will in the future mean to tech  
5 development.

6 We are also committed to homes for a  
7 variety of incomes. We will provide a  
8 variety of different units of different  
9 sizes, which means they will be available  
10 at different price points and appeal to a  
11 mix of people. In addition, we are  
12 totally committed to providing affordable  
13 housing in the community, a long-term  
14 personal interest of mine, which is why  
15 we have signed an agreement with LAHD to  
16 provide a 4.8-million-dollar payment to  
17 the city's housing department for the  
18 development of over a hundred new units  
19 in two projects being built by the  
20 Hollywood Community Housing Corporation,  
21 both near transit centers.

22 Green buildings -- green buildings  
23 are not just a trend. It's increasingly  
24 becoming a way of life that's expected by  
25 people moving into new neighborhoods.

1 That's why we are committed to building a  
2 Millennium Hollywood to lead certified  
3 standards.

4 We also have a commitment to  
5 arresting visual blight. There are no  
6 signs, no super graphics, no blade walls  
7 being sought as part of this project.  
8 And even though, as I'm sure all of you  
9 know, that's a huge economic detriment to  
10 the developer, we did not feel that this  
11 was appropriate for Hollywood, and there  
12 are plenty of signs there already.

13 Open space is a key element of our  
14 program. There are a number of existing  
15 pedestrian open spaces in Hollywood that  
16 we have drawn for on our plans. Perhaps  
17 the biggest inspiration, and you'll see  
18 this in the architectural presentation,  
19 was the historic courtyards at Man's  
20 Chinese Theatre, Crossroads of the World,  
21 and the Egyptian Theatre. That's why we  
22 hired James Corner Fields Operations, the  
23 landscape architects for the justly  
24 acclaimed High Line park in New York, to  
25 be our landscape architects. They are

1 designing our public open space. The  
2 plan that they came up with, a series of  
3 thematically linked gardens and open  
4 spaces that look out and invite the  
5 community into the Millennium Hollywood  
6 project, covers nearly one-third of the  
7 land site that we're building on. And  
8 these will be a unique set of safe,  
9 vibrant pedestrian welcoming spaces.

10 There's one more guiding principle  
11 for Millennium Hollywood. It's just as  
12 fundamental as the ones I've already  
13 mentioned, if not more so, and that is  
14 preservation. Millennium Hollywood is  
15 first and foremost a preservation  
16 project. And by preservation, I mean the  
17 preservation of the Capitol Records  
18 Building, its continued use as a music  
19 industry building, the protection of the  
20 historic views of Capitol Records from  
21 the intersection of Hollywood and Vine  
22 and from the 101 freeway to the south,  
23 and the creation and long-term  
24 preservation of new opportunities to view  
25 neighboring historic buildings -- the

1           Avalon, as was mentioned earlier, and  
2           hopefully, at some point, the restored  
3           gardens at the Little Country Church.

4           As Lou Naidorf, the architect of the  
5           Capitol Records Building, said in a  
6           recent interview, the Capitol Records  
7           Building after sixty years deserves  
8           better than to be surrounded by vacant  
9           parking lots. And Hollywood deserves a  
10          strong, significant project at the  
11          eastern end of the historic portion of  
12          Hollywood Boulevard.

13          It is possible, as we have designed  
14          it, for elegant urbanism to establish a  
15          new Hollywood downtown, based on its  
16          historic downtown, at the intersection of  
17          Hollywood and Vine. Our Millennium  
18          Hollywood project takes the beauty, the  
19          excitement, the glamour of Hollywood of  
20          the past and creates a specific  
21          environment for Hollywood in the future.

22          It is the perfect and appropriate  
23          balance between a wide variety of  
24          competing interests and concerns and  
25          impacts you will hear.



1           And to describe how we came to the  
2 conclusion from an architectural  
3 perspective, I'd like to introduce our  
4 architect, Gary Handel.

5           MR. HANDEL: Members of the  
6 commission, my name is Gary Handel,  
7 founding principal of Handel Architects.

8           I'd also like to begin by thanking  
9 your staff. Their dedication,  
10 intelligence, and professional during the  
11 years that we've been working with them  
12 have been extraordinary, and their  
13 impassioned advocacy for the public realm  
14 has made this a better project.

15           Sergio and Luci basically went  
16 through some of the ideas behind the  
17 design guidelines. But their basic  
18 purpose is to ensure quality and  
19 consistency of design through the full  
20 implementation of the project while  
21 allowing the developer certain  
22 flexibility to adapt the project to  
23 market conditions.

24           Next.

25           There -- it's broken up into design

1 standards and guidelines, and together  
2 they encompass several hundred individual  
3 regulations, restrictions, and  
4 recommendations, which taken together  
5 form a comprehensive and binding  
6 development framework for the site.

7 Next.

8 Within the twelve chapters of the  
9 guidelines and standards are a number of  
10 key objectives. Amongst those are to  
11 preserve the Capitol Records and Gogerty  
12 Buildings, and to protect other historic  
13 resources, to preserve the views of  
14 Capitol, to create active landscape civic  
15 clauses, to create new mid-block  
16 pedestrian connections, to create a  
17 vibrant urban spaces for residents and  
18 visitors, to create a true mixed-use  
19 development which can revitalize this  
20 area, to eliminate the visual blight of  
21 surface parking, to establish linkages to  
22 public transportation routes in the area,  
23 to establish standards to ensure  
24 architectural excellence, to provide  
25 designs that address, respect, and

1 complement the existing context, to  
2 create architecture that minimizes  
3 negative environmental impacts, to create  
4 buildings that emphasize the vertical  
5 architecture, and to develop a visual  
6 gateway to Hollywood from the freeway.

7 The programmatic richness of this, I  
8 think, is important to understand. While  
9 there is certain flexibility in the exact  
10 composition of the elements on the site,  
11 the idea is to do a development that  
12 includes residential, hotel, office  
13 space, restaurants, and retail, sports  
14 clubs, structured parking, and publicly-  
15 accessible open spaces. These kind of  
16 developments are what we know from our  
17 previous experience, can revitalize the  
18 urban core of cities.

19 Sergio talked about the height  
20 standards, basically establishing that so  
21 we'll move -- we'll move through that.  
22 And then basically within the guidelines  
23 and standards, are also things that  
24 basically regulate the street walls that  
25 shape and inform the pedestrian realm.

1           Next.

2           And this chart, I think is -- you  
3 know, that Sergio also went through, is  
4 very informative, because it establishes  
5 the binding regulations between height,  
6 open space, and lot coverage, which  
7 really are the key aspects of this for  
8 you to understand to -- to look at this  
9 project.

10           And then -- next -- you know, these  
11 together show the various alternatives of  
12 the 220, the 400, and the 585-foot  
13 height, with the increasing amounts of  
14 open space and the move towards lower  
15 blockier buildings and skinnier elegant  
16 ones. It's a little bit hard to  
17 understand this from just looking at  
18 these acts on a metric, so we created a  
19 series of pedestrian views from key  
20 vantage points to illustrate that.

21           So this is standing at Hollywood and  
22 Vine, looking towards the Capitol Records  
23 project without the project. And then at  
24 the 220-foot height mark, basically in  
25 order to fully -- to build out the

1 project, all of the mass is pushed down  
2 and occupies substantially most of the  
3 site, minus what the required open space  
4 is. By allowing greater height on the  
5 site, we can move the buildings back from  
6 Vine Street, and -- and -- go back -- and  
7 you basically increase the visibility of  
8 Capitol. And at the tallest heights, we  
9 can essentially free it up. We put in  
10 the 400-foot-high scene most of the open  
11 space in the service of freeing up this  
12 view. But I think the effects are even  
13 more significant in the next series of  
14 views.

15 Go forward.

16 So here we are, across Argyle  
17 Street, with our back to the Little  
18 Country Street (sic) -- Church.

19 Go back.

20 Looking toward -- looking west  
21 towards the Capitol Records Building.  
22 And this is a historic view without the  
23 project.

24 Next.

25 You're at the 220-foot mark. Again,

1 the full build-out of that site is  
2 apparent, and so basically, we have the  
3 required passage that can connect all of  
4 the sites, but the views towards Capitol  
5 are impacted. On the right, that's not  
6 our project. That's the Second Street  
7 Ventures project as designed and  
8 approved, inputted into -- into the  
9 rendering.

10 Next.

11 At 400 feet, we can begin to move  
12 space off of that -- that corridor, and  
13 that moves space into the tower. But  
14 there's still the requirement at that  
15 height to build a significant structure  
16 on Argyle.

17 Next.

18 And then at the 585-foot mark, most  
19 of the bulk can be moved into the tower,  
20 which gives us enormous flexibility in  
21 shaping the public realm and freeing up  
22 the views to Capitol Records.

23 Next.

24 And so with the -- the guidelines  
25 and standards as a binding foundation and

1 framework, we created our -- our current  
2 design proposal.

3 Next.

4 And it builds on what we just showed  
5 you in terms of using the podiums and  
6 scaling them appropriately to match into  
7 the existing context. We've low --

8 Go back.

9 We've lowered elements that would  
10 front onto Argyle and the west side of  
11 Vine Street to match the existing  
12 context, and higher elements on the east  
13 side of Vine and on -- and -- and on  
14 Ivar.

15 Next.

16 This shows the beginnings of the  
17 creation of that public space linkage  
18 through the site. The requirement would  
19 be all of that frontage would be lined by  
20 retail to activate that use.

21 Next.

22 And then we also had the -- the idea  
23 on a planning basis that those spaces  
24 could be extended to the vacant parking  
25 lots to the west, along the Little

1 Country Church, and along Carlos Avenue  
2 to the new Hollywood Central Park. So  
3 it's -- it could be part of what we think  
4 could be a magnificent series of public  
5 open spaces.

6 These open spaces are integral to  
7 the architecture and design of the  
8 project, and so the goal is really to  
9 create a pedestrian-friendly environment  
10 for the core of Hollywood, to provide  
11 significant open space both in quantity  
12 and quality, and to provide, you know,  
13 new ways to see Capitol Records. And  
14 it's been designed as a series of  
15 individual spaces that link together.

16 Next.

17 These spaces are of significant  
18 size. And so in this diagram, we've  
19 overlaid known Hollywood iconic spaces  
20 onto the open space within our plan. So  
21 working our way from Argyle on the left,  
22 you can see Grauman's Chinese overlaid  
23 into -- into our space, and then fronting  
24 onto Vine on the left side of the east  
25 parcel, you can see Grauman's Egyptian



1 put into the plan. And then across Vine  
2 Street, you can see the overlay of  
3 Crossroads of the World laid into our  
4 site, just to give a sense of scale.

5 These -- these spaces will link  
6 together to create that seamless  
7 pedestrian network that will take you  
8 from Argyle to -- from Argyle to Vine to  
9 Ivar.

10 Next.

11 And then working our way from east  
12 to west, you can see the lounge, which is  
13 seen as a more active social space.

14 Next.

15 And you can see the views of that --  
16 of that space there, with its fire pit,  
17 lounge, and juice bar.

18 Next.

19 Working our way to the west is the  
20 garden, which is a more contemplative,  
21 quieter space.

22 Next.

23 And a view of the -- of the garden.  
24 And then fronting onto Vine Street, is  
25 the stage. And you can see how the Jazz

1 Singer mural has been turned into a  
2 proscenium for performance, stepped  
3 seating to allow for those performances  
4 to happen. And Zak Spike's (ph.)  
5 anchoring the southern end of that plaza.

6 Next.

7 And a view looking at the stage from  
8 above.

9 Across Vine is the Plaza, which goes  
10 from the Walk of Fame to a café at its  
11 back, and it has a series of -- of  
12 interesting features to it. It'll have a  
13 cinema projection screen. It'll have  
14 interactive LED pavings, so that you can  
15 basically program the Plaza. You can  
16 play it, like Tom Hanks in Big. You can  
17 find out if your musical choices are in  
18 sync with other members of -- of the  
19 Plaza. You -- this is a -- a view of the  
20 Plaza looking back towards the café, with  
21 a movie in progress.

22 Next.

23 And here you would see the Plaza on  
24 a -- on a typical day. And so the idea  
25 is that this is a very flexible and

1 programmable space. And so on some days  
2 it would be used typically, on some days  
3 you could bring a number of food trucks  
4 to the site. Other days it could host a  
5 farmer's market, and it could also be a  
6 venue for performances that were more  
7 appropriate to this than for the stage  
8 across the street.

9 In the -- you know, the architecture  
10 or the urban design and planning are seen  
11 as of a piece. And so the idea is really  
12 to combine for the podium elements the  
13 vocabulary of typical urban building  
14 blocks for the podium, and then to  
15 combine that with the indoor and outdoor  
16 living ideas that are embodied in the  
17 case study houses.

18 And to move away from a slick  
19 monolithic tower to a tower that's more  
20 made up of an aggregation of elements.

21 Next.

22 And in that, we were inspired by  
23 this amazingly poetic image of -- of  
24 Pierre Koenig's case study house 22, with  
25 its living room seemingly suspended over

1 the city. And we took that --

2 Next.

3 -- as an idea to basically build the  
4 tower out of these building blocks that  
5 would have those -- the features of those  
6 case study houses. Provide a number of  
7 them --

8 Next.

9 -- aggregate them and combine them  
10 in different ways --

11 Next.

12 -- in order to create an aggregate  
13 form which is made up of smaller elements  
14 combining to make a cohesive whole.

15 To introduce elements of layering,  
16 screening, and texture, in order to  
17 create a tower that moves away from the  
18 all-glass building to something that's a  
19 little bit softer and more -- and more  
20 permeable.

21 Next.

22 And to use those tower elements to  
23 frame the Capitol Records Building, to  
24 activate the pedestrian passages. So  
25 basically, here we are looking across

1 Vine towards the Capitol plaza and the  
2 cafe.

3 Next.

4 And then in the stage area, looking  
5 at the Jazz Singer mural proscenium and  
6 towards the western site. To allow for  
7 public access to certain components of  
8 the project. So in this case, the  
9 observatory lounge, which is on the top  
10 floor of the hotel building, which will  
11 be located on the west site, and the view  
12 by day and by night.

13 And then a view looking towards the  
14 south, showing the framing of Capitol  
15 Records by the new towers. And a view at  
16 night, which we think captures the spirit  
17 and romance -- next -- of what Hollywood  
18 was, is, and can be.

19 Thank you.

20 MR. NEUMAN: Ms. Freer, members of  
21 the commission, my name is Jerry Neuman  
22 and I am here representing Millennium  
23 Partners with regard to the item before  
24 you.

25 As Mr. Handel indicated, the

1 Millennium Hollywood project brings  
2 together a number of incredible elements  
3 to create an extraordinary project that  
4 addresses impacts, responds to market  
5 conditions, provides mitigations that  
6 account for changing economic and  
7 development conditions, establishes a  
8 foundation for economic growth, provides  
9 exceptional community benefits, and  
10 solidifies the establishment of what has  
11 historically been downtown Hollywood as  
12 the walkable, transit, and bike-friendly  
13 area it has long aspired to be.

14 We've accomplished this through  
15 many -- through many ways, mostly working  
16 with your staff and their steadfast  
17 adherence to your Do Real Planning  
18 principles and their indelible planning  
19 leadership. It is in this project, we  
20 have broken new ground in the creation  
21 and establishment of the most  
22 comprehensive design guidelines any  
23 single project has ever undertaken.  
24 We've established both a comprehensive  
25 set of community benefits and a means of

1 providing them that go well beyond any  
2 previously approved project in the area.

3 Finally, we have imagined the needs  
4 and desires of those looking to Hollywood  
5 as a place where they could live, work,  
6 and connect to the rest of the city in a  
7 true urban fashion, without the need of  
8 their own cars.

9 In short, working with your staff,  
10 we have delivered on your mandate to  
11 create infill projects that not only  
12 respond to today, but actively work to a  
13 change -- to change and accommodate the  
14 social attitudes of tomorrow.

15 You've already seen a presentation  
16 of the design guidelines, so I'm going to  
17 skip a little bit of that part of the  
18 presentation and want to talk to you  
19 about our community benefits program.

20 Our community benefits program is  
21 comprehensive and provides extensive  
22 community benefits throughout --  
23 throughout Hollywood, and especially  
24 within our area.

25 A number of these items may not have

1 direct nexus, and for those items, we  
2 have now entered into third-party  
3 agreements which represent our commitment  
4 towards them. So that while the city may  
5 feel that they aren't -- there isn't a  
6 nexus that you can impose upon us, and  
7 therefore you want to know that we are  
8 committed to doing them, we have entered  
9 into the agreements that will be enforced  
10 by others so that you know that that  
11 commitment is real.

12 For instance, we have entered into a  
13 project labor agreement, as well as a  
14 continuing agreement with HERE regarding  
15 the employment of individuals within the  
16 hotel that aren't members of the labor  
17 union.

18 In that, we have also included  
19 substantial local hiring requirements and  
20 job training programs for local  
21 residents. These are extensive in their  
22 nature and provide very specific means by  
23 which local hiring is done, and can be  
24 tooled down to trying to target groups  
25 that are most at need.



1           We have committed to a community  
2           organizing meeting space. This is a  
3           commitment that we think is important  
4           because we want to engage our community  
5           in a very real way. And we think the  
6           project as a place for our community  
7           provides a nexus to doing that. And we  
8           would ask you that you would condition a  
9           community space of -- a community meeting  
10          space --

11          THE CHAIR: Okay. Mr. Neuman, how  
12          much more time are you going to request?

13          MR. NEUMAN: We have a number of  
14          community benefits we want to run  
15          through, and then we have appeals. So I  
16          don't know how you want me to handle  
17          this. I can do that; I can do the  
18          responses.

19          THE CHAIR: Yeah, I wanted you to  
20          handle it within --

21          MR. NEUMAN: Yeah, I --

22          THE CHAIR: -- the allotted time.  
23          So, okay, here's what I'm going to do.  
24          We'll do thirty --thirty. So --

25          MR. NEUMAN: I'm going to rush.

1 THE CHAIR: -- that -- exactly. So  
2 you have five more minutes, and then I  
3 really will cut you off.

4 MR. NEUMAN: Okay.

5 THE CHAIR: Thank you.

6 MR. NEUMAN: We would ask you to  
7 condition a community meeting space of  
8 not less than 1,200 feet within the  
9 project, subject to our -- pulling of our  
10 building permits would need to include  
11 those plans.

12 We had offered a circulation shuttle  
13 that goes on demand to people within the  
14 hillside to bring them down to our  
15 parking areas and to provide shuttle  
16 services throughout Hollywood as a  
17 private means. And we would -- we  
18 believe that is an important part of our  
19 traffic demand management plan, and  
20 therefore, would ask that you impose it  
21 as a condition because we think our  
22 project needs a traffic demand management  
23 plan that -- that should be conditioned  
24 to the project. And as such, we are  
25 offering to spend a maximum of 250,000

1           dollars per year on those shuttle plans.

2           We have a bike amenities. We would  
3 request because we want this to be a  
4 bike-friendly, and as you saw from the  
5 staff report, we are on the bike lines.  
6 We would want the bike amenities for a  
7 minimum of fifteen years to be included  
8 in our project conditions that we provide  
9 kiosks or tenant space for at least 200  
10 square feet for bike repair services, as  
11 well as bike parking facilities and bike  
12 repair pads.

13           We think the linkage as to transit  
14 is very, very important. We would like  
15 you to require us, and we would accept as  
16 a condition of approval, because we think  
17 there's appropriate nexus, that we  
18 install directional signage showing  
19 pedestrian routes to all public  
20 transportation access points within a  
21 four-block area of the project.

22           Also, that we would provide 10,000  
23 dollars to the Department of  
24 Transportation for the installation of  
25 directional signs showing where the DASH

1 is at the nearest points of the project,  
2 and also an additional 25,000 dollars for  
3 Metro directional signage for pedestrian  
4 routes between public transportation,  
5 access points, and our project.

6 We would like parking -- we would  
7 like to incorporate parking tracking  
8 services. We think parking in our  
9 project has been an issue raised by the  
10 community, and as such, we think it is  
11 important that we contribute 50,000  
12 dollars to the Department of  
13 Transportation Express Park program for a  
14 new parking meter technology as well as  
15 vehicular sensors and real-time parking  
16 information for people within their apps.

17 We also believe that the Vine Street  
18 Metro connection is very important. We  
19 will engage with urban planning and  
20 architectural firm -- we would like to  
21 engage an urban planning and  
22 architectural firm to provide a study on  
23 the portal north of Hollywood Boulevard  
24 as well as at the Vine Street station and  
25 the viability of that as a means of

1 access to the Metro station.

2 We think that that study should be  
3 done, and we're happy to provide that  
4 study. And that should also be a subject  
5 to that study being done would be a  
6 requirement of our pulling a building  
7 permit.

8 We have suggested Metro passes. We  
9 shall provide Metro passes for the sale  
10 of within the project and maintain a  
11 coordinated place for Metro pass  
12 purchases. And we will request and have  
13 availability for our Metro passes for  
14 employees and occupants and residents of  
15 the area, and will provide at least one  
16 hundred Metro passes on an ongoing basis.

17 We think that having commuter  
18 parking is very important. And as such,  
19 we would -- we think that we would want  
20 our parking to be utilized by people who  
21 want to access, and we have plenty of  
22 public parking which can do that, that  
23 will access the Park & Ride areas in the  
24 Metro. So we will provide monthly fees  
25 not to exceed fifty dollars in the first

1 year, and then increase by three percent  
2 thereafter for people who wish to provide  
3 for at least ten spaces for people who  
4 want to utilize Park & Ride on a monthly  
5 basis.

6 We will provide discounted parking  
7 of ten percent for people who utilize  
8 Metro passes. So if you want to park and  
9 ride, we will offer a ten percent  
10 discount if you show us your Metro pass.  
11 As well as within the zip code of our --  
12 around our site, both within the hill  
13 area as well as directly around the site,  
14 which we have provided staff with the zip  
15 codes -- we would provide ten percent  
16 discounted parking for residents within  
17 those areas.

18 We think having residents utilize  
19 our services and utilize our project is  
20 vital as a member of the community, and  
21 we think that that is an important nexus  
22 that we share with the community.

23 We have shared vehicular parking.  
24 We will maintain ten parking spaces for  
25 non-residential parking -- within the

1 non-residential parking areas for shared  
2 vehicle services, such as Zipcars. And  
3 we will have Zipcars provided there and  
4 as a -- and will provide promotion for  
5 those Zipcars. We think for our  
6 residents, where we are trying to have  
7 people move out of their cars, having a  
8 shared parking and a shared car  
9 utilization is vital for reducing traffic  
10 and other impacts of our project.

11 We will look to study -- we've been  
12 asked by the neighborhood council and we  
13 think it's an important part of the  
14 aesthetics and -- and visual area that  
15 we -- we provide a -- a study of medians  
16 on Vine. People within the area and how  
17 our project intersects on Vine. We think  
18 it's important that that aesthetic be --  
19 be addressed.

20 THE CHAIR: Thank you, Mr. Neuman.  
21 I appreciate that.

22 MR. NEUMAN: We'll have more later.

23 THE CHAIR: Okay. I'd now like to  
24 move to the appellants, and their  
25 representatives. There are six

1 appellants, and I have five speaker cards  
2 here indicating that they are associated  
3 with the appellants. And so I'll call  
4 them. And if there is a sixth that  
5 should be recognized, please let me know.

6 Daniel Wright from the Silverstein  
7 Law Firm. Annie Geoghan from the Whitley  
8 Heights, I believe it is?

9 George Abrahams, the Argyle Civic  
10 Association.

11 Fran Reichenbach from the Beachwood  
12 Canyon Neighborhood Association.

13 And Sarajane Schwartz from the  
14 Hollywoodland Homeowners Association.

15 So as I mentioned in the  
16 introduction, we now will have thirty  
17 minutes total for the appellants. And so  
18 I am hoping that you will be respectful  
19 of the fact that there are folks behind  
20 you. You might want to tap them on the  
21 shoulder if they are going over, because  
22 we will stay judicious with the thirty  
23 minutes.

24 So I presume that you all have  
25 spoken and are able to divide yourselves



1 in a way that everybody is going to think  
2 is fair.

3 So please announce your name for the  
4 record and begin. The clock is starting  
5 with thirty minutes.

6 Yes? Excuse me?

7 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER:

8 (Indiscernible).

9 THE CHAIR: Yeah, if you can come up  
10 and queue, that would probably be  
11 helpful, or at least sit close to the  
12 front so that you are able to come as  
13 soon as the speaker finishes.

14 Yeah. So it's approximately five  
15 minutes per person, although we didn't  
16 have a sixth person. Somebody else is  
17 doing it, so it's probably a little more  
18 than that.

19 Please.

20 MR. WRIGHT: Good morning, Madame  
21 President and commissioners. I'm Daniel  
22 Wright of the Silverstein Law Firm. We  
23 represent Mr. and Mrs. Geoghan of Whitley  
24 Terrace, who are the appellant  
25 representatives on behalf of the

1 following community organizations listed  
2 in our appeal letter: Whitley Heights,  
3 Beachwood Canyon, Hollywood Dell,  
4 Hollywoodland, Argyle Civic, La Mirada  
5 Avenue Neighborhood Association.

6 I'd like to reserve one minute of  
7 appellant's time for rebuttal, as we have  
8 the burden of proof on our appeal on the  
9 tentative tract map.

10 Let the record reflect that I have  
11 today submitted our further objection  
12 letter to the project, the development  
13 agreement, and all associated  
14 entitlements as proposed to you for the  
15 related planning entitlements and as  
16 approved by the advisory agency's  
17 determination, also under appeal by my  
18 clients to you.

19 First, my clients would object to  
20 your proceeding to consider the CPC  
21 entitlements without the development  
22 agreement. The entire project is based  
23 upon the development agreement and its  
24 development regulations and the land-use  
25 equivalency programs. Being inextricably

1 related, if you approve the entitlements  
2 today without the development agreement,  
3 you're approving this project without,  
4 for instance, any height limit or design.  
5 Most of the presentation you heard today  
6 was on the development agreement, and  
7 yet, you're not considering the  
8 development agreement. These things  
9 being inextricably linked, you must  
10 consider them together.

11 And on a related note, I'd like to  
12 talk about the 1090 problem. My  
13 understanding of 1090, a government code,  
14 is that when it disqualifies a member of  
15 a commission who has a financial interest  
16 in a project, the disqualification  
17 applies to the entire project. Mr.  
18 Roschen, to my knowledge, is not merely a  
19 party to the development agreement. He  
20 has his own contract with Millennium, and  
21 thus, this disqualifying interest applies  
22 to his participation in all of the  
23 entitlements. And, therefore, it  
24 disqualifies this commission. So what we  
25 ought to be doing is you should

1 terminating this hearing immediately.

2 Also, I'd like to raise the issue  
3 that it was brought to our attention that  
4 the commission members did not receive  
5 the exhibits to any of the appeals that  
6 were filed in your package. And that  
7 means that you have not had in front of  
8 you the evidence that supports our  
9 appeals. We object to that on the  
10 grounds of due process of law.

11 Now to my --

12 MR. PERLMAN: Excuse me, Mr. Wright.  
13 This won't count against you, but we do  
14 have the exhibits, just for the record.

15 MR. WRIGHT: You've -- you've --  
16 you've received them today. I hope  
17 you've had a chance to read them but --

18 MR. PERLMAN: We - we -- excuse  
19 me --

20 MR. WRIGHT: -- I've also like to  
21 point out that --

22 MR. PERLMAN: Mr. Wright, excuse me,  
23 sir. We have them. They are in the  
24 record. So you can proceed on another  
25 point.

1 MR. WRIGHT: Yes, but you did not  
2 receive them in the mail for your  
3 consideration. And I'd also like to  
4 point out --

5 MR. PERLMAN: We also, sir, did not  
6 receive your letter in the mail and  
7 various other documents that are  
8 submitted at the last minute. So they  
9 are in the record for --

10 MR. WRIGHT: Well, I submitted a  
11 two-page letter in compliance with your  
12 rules. That's what you received.

13 THE CHAIR: Please proceed.

14 MR. WRIGHT: I hope that that  
15 doesn't come out of my time, Madame  
16 President.

17 Also, I'd like to point out that the  
18 exhibits attached to the letter filed on  
19 behalf of the music school was not mailed  
20 to the members of commission, and since  
21 we are relying on that letter as well and  
22 are adopting all of its arguments, again,  
23 that's a violation of due process.

24 Now to the merits. To quote the  
25 words of former Planning Commission

1 Member Jane Usher in response to a  
2 previous ill-conceived Hollywood project,  
3 this is a project where the developer  
4 comes before the commission asking for  
5 the sun, the moon, the stars, and there's  
6 not even a hint or whisper of it being an  
7 appropriate request.

8 In this case, Millennium comes  
9 before you asking for the sun, the moon,  
10 the starts, the Milky Way, the universe,  
11 and apparently dark matter, a mysterious  
12 component that may or may not exist in  
13 our universe. And dark matter is  
14 precisely a good name for what passes for  
15 the project description in Millennium's  
16 EIR. I hope you had a chance to at least  
17 read that.

18 As far as I can tell, the city  
19 planning director proposes to grant a  
20 black box design envelope surrounding the  
21 city's iconic Capitol Records Building.  
22 It's a project that cannot be seen now  
23 prior to discretionary decision-making  
24 and will only be revealed to the public  
25 after construction begins sometime within

1 the twenty-two-year life of the  
2 development agreement. So don't hold  
3 your breath on those jobs.

4 What will the project be? Will it  
5 be 200 hotel rooms or zero rooms? Will  
6 it be 492 condos? Will it be 492  
7 apartments? None of those, but maybe  
8 mostly commercial or not? Will there be  
9 a health club, of what size, or not?  
10 Hey, how about a giant observation deck  
11 on top of the two 585-foot-tall towers  
12 that has a bar or maybe a restaurant, or  
13 not? Or maybe the towers will be low  
14 massive affairs, only 220 feet tall,  
15 which will be surrounding the Capitol  
16 Buildings, which itself is only 150 feet  
17 tall.

18 Will the above boxy above-ground  
19 parking podium be three stories, seven,  
20 or fifteen? It depends on where you look  
21 in the documents. There is no defined  
22 project here, and that is required by  
23 CEQA. The whole idea of a project  
24 description is to describe a proposed  
25 project, identify the anticipated

1 impacts, and impose feasible mitigation  
2 measures. That is not happening here.  
3 The project description is amorphous and  
4 slippery, purposely written to allow  
5 infinite combinations of these possible  
6 land uses within a black box design  
7 envelope granted by the city. And it  
8 would make every developer in city say,  
9 hey, I want one of those black box design  
10 envelopes, too, for twenty-two years.

11 So think about the precedent that  
12 this concept would create for you. Would  
13 it be, let's Do Real Planning, or would  
14 it be, let's hand over our land-use  
15 authority without knowing what the  
16 project will be? We contend it's the  
17 second one.

18 Because there's no finite project  
19 description which CEQA mandates and this  
20 is a fatal flaw that cascades all the way  
21 through the entire EIR, depriving you, as  
22 a decision-maker, and the public of any  
23 meaningful ability to assess the impacts  
24 or identify mitigation measures -- it  
25 must be denied by you. On this ground



1 alone, it's legally deficient.

2 In addition to our own appeal  
3 documents and exhibits, the comment  
4 letters, particularly by the music school  
5 and the condos at the W Hotel, filed by  
6 their representatives, raise innumerable  
7 fatal additional defects, all of them  
8 coming from this fatal project  
9 description.

10 And the city planning department has  
11 apparently adopted this without any  
12 critical review. No one from planning  
13 could stand before you with a straight  
14 face and tell you that they exercised  
15 independent judgment in adopting this EIR  
16 and black box design envelope as the  
17 city's own work. It's planning  
18 malfeasance to allow this project to go  
19 forward or this far in the planning  
20 process, without requiring a defined  
21 project.

22 Therefore, our client -- my clients  
23 hereby adopt and endorse all objections  
24 in evidence submitted into the record  
25 that demonstrates the EIR is fatally

1           flawed in countless ways.

2           Our appeal also pointed out that the  
3           advisory agency's adopted policy that  
4           condominiums in congested parking areas  
5           like Hollywood require 2.5 parking spaces  
6           per dwelling unit. Attached to our  
7           comment letter today is a copy of that  
8           policy, pages, and also the analysis of  
9           the Hollywood Gower project in a -- in a  
10          case that we succeeded against the city  
11          recently.

12          In those -- in that project, the EIR  
13          was set aside due to flawed parking  
14          analysis and a denial of a fair hearing.  
15          In that case, our evidence established  
16          that the same planner who acted as the  
17          advisory agency in this case accepted new  
18          environmental review documents and  
19          revised findings drafted by the  
20          developer's consultants without making  
21          any independent review of the new  
22          parking. We proved in court he never  
23          looked at it before the final hearing.  
24          Those actions were found in our favor by  
25          the court as a derailment of the CEQA

1 process of the city, and this commission  
2 and this city council's approvals of the  
3 deficient EIR were set aside by the  
4 court.

5 The Millennium project's EIR solves  
6 the advisory agency parking problem by  
7 making it disappear like that dark matter  
8 of the universe. The EIR fails to  
9 identify it as an applicable land-use  
10 policy. There's no discussion of it, and  
11 therefore, it -- it essentially  
12 constitutes an implicit secret relief  
13 from the advisory policy without  
14 disclosing it.

15 There's also further parking  
16 reductions from the existing lower code  
17 required for apartments, and thus, the  
18 parking analysis for this reason alone is  
19 fatally flawed.

20 When this was pointed out at the  
21 advisory agency planner, at the hearing,  
22 he ignored it, and does not discuss it in  
23 the determination letter before you.  
24 This is staff misconduct. It violates  
25 CEQA mandate to disclose the facts in

1 good faith, analyze them, to identify  
2 impacts, and implement feasible  
3 mitigation measures. Simply ignoring  
4 mandatory legal duties is not good faith,  
5 and on this ground, you should find that  
6 the EIR is deficient.

7 Finally, the entire entitlement  
8 proposed for Millennium is based upon the  
9 Hollywood Community Plan adopted last  
10 year by the city. That plan is  
11 currently -- has three lawsuits  
12 challenging it, including one by the  
13 Silverstein Law Firm, where we just  
14 exposed a pattern and practice of the  
15 city attorney's office to purposely  
16 exclude materials required by law to be  
17 CEQA -- part of the CEQA administrative  
18 record.

19 After the trial court ordered the  
20 city attorney to comply with the law,  
21 suddenly our administrative record had  
22 50,000 additional pages that had been  
23 excluded under this policy for years by  
24 this city. When those cases are heard on  
25 the Hollywood Community Plan, we expect

1           them to be over -- the Hollywood plan to  
2           be overturned. And, therefore, you  
3           should not proceed with consideration of  
4           such a massive project of this size until  
5           the Hollywood Community Plan challenges  
6           are resolved.

7           And with that, I reserve one minute  
8           for rebuttal and step aside for the  
9           remaining appellants.

10          Thank you for your close attention,  
11          commissioners.

12          THE CHAIR: Please introduce  
13          yourself.

14          MR. DE LA CRUZ: Good morning,  
15          commissioners, or good afternoon. I lost  
16          track of time. Victor De la Cruz with  
17          Manatt, Phelps & Phillips. I'm here on  
18          behalf of AMDA College and Conservatory  
19          of the Performing Arts.

20          I am pleased to be here today to let  
21          you know that AMDA's concerns about the  
22          project and EIR have been resolved, and  
23          we have withdrawn our appeal and our  
24          comments on the Environmental Impact  
25          Report. We thank Millennium, and we

1           thank the council office, for working  
2           closely with us to resolve our concerns,  
3           and look forward to seeing this  
4           transformative project create a new  
5           vibrant environment not only for AMDA,  
6           but for all of Hollywood.

7           Thank you very much.

8           MS. GEOGHAN: Mr. and Mrs. Jim  
9           Geoghan on behalf of the aforementioned  
10          communities, would like to waive our  
11          time, if possible, to the legal counsel,  
12          Mr. Wright, for his rebuttal.

13          THE CHAIR: The appellants are  
14          within the time, so there's no waiving.  
15          It's -- now's your bite at the apple.

16          MS. GEOGHAN: Okay. So the -- the  
17          thing is we have over 1,000 signatures on  
18          a petition against it. We have three out  
19          of the four Hollywood neighborhood  
20          councils have opposed it, and the  
21          Hillside Federation, which I believe is  
22          twenty to thirty organizations, have  
23          opposed it. And we -- I'm very confused  
24          as to Mr. Aarons constantly saying in  
25          articles that he wants community input.

1 I think he's gotten enough community  
2 input. And we would also -- for the  
3 record, I'd like to say that Mr. Garcetti  
4 has been contacted, and he has denied  
5 this project in interviews and at  
6 debates. One was the night before our  
7 first hearing here, February 19th. And  
8 that's a problem.

9 We are very much against the  
10 conflict of interest of the person who  
11 recused himself today of even being the  
12 architect on this project. And also that  
13 this is to protect and preserve the area.  
14 The LA Conservancy has come out on their  
15 own website; they're against this.  
16 Hollywood Heritage is against this. This  
17 is not framing the Capitol Records  
18 Building. If you stand on one corner,  
19 maybe you'll be able to see the Capitol  
20 Records Building. And the welcoming  
21 thing, Mr. Aarons? Well, first of all,  
22 Mr. Aarons in an interview said that he  
23 wants to build bold things that are the  
24 new Hollywood landmarks. We have a  
25 landmark, and your buildings will be

1 obstructing it.

2 And the welcoming thing for the  
3 community? Great. Ground level?  
4 Beautiful. Give us the green, give us  
5 the bike shop in the building. Give us  
6 all of that stuff. The jobs? Fantastic.  
7 I grew up in New York City. I worked in  
8 three hotels to pay my way through  
9 school. There were plenty of jobs, and  
10 none of the buildings were fifty-five  
11 stories in midtown Manhattan. So where  
12 does a building have to be fifty-five  
13 stories and higher to create jobs, to  
14 create community, to bring people to an  
15 area? Develop, build, revitalize this  
16 area. But, no, we don't want the whole  
17 skyline reinvigorated, as your website  
18 says.

19 The neighborhood councils that  
20 opposed this have been beaten up on  
21 Millennium's website, and we're filing  
22 reports that they've represented what  
23 went on at neighborhood council meetings  
24 many of us were at. They've denied. And  
25 they -- the fact that they oppose them,



1 we kind of thought that with all the  
2 money, they didn't have to go after the  
3 little community neighborhood councils.

4 And that's what I have to say. No  
5 elimination of the D thing, the heights  
6 are ridiculous. You know this is insane.  
7 We know this is insane. The whole city  
8 knows it's insane, but you're going to  
9 build it. Wait.

10 THE CHAIR: Can you state your name  
11 one more time for the record, please?

12 MS. GEOGHAN: This is Jim Geoghan  
13 from Whitley Heights.

14 THE CHAIR: Thank you.

15 MR. ABRAHAMS: George Abrahams,  
16 Argyle Civic Association.

17 What's really flawed with this whole  
18 project is the planning concept itself.  
19 Transit-oriented development is a failed  
20 planning model. The reason that it does  
21 not work, has not worked, and will never  
22 work, is because TODs are self-limiting.  
23 Once traffic congestion becomes  
24 intolerable, people start leaving the  
25 area, and new residents simply decide to

1 live elsewhere in less dense areas.  
2 Thus, the required density to make mass  
3 transit viable is never achieved. The  
4 only way to get to the required density  
5 would be with a Berlin Wall, to keep  
6 people from escaping like in the Cold  
7 War.

8 The only city which does have what  
9 amounts to a Berlin Wall and the density,  
10 is Manhattan, where there is the Hudson  
11 and the East River. But Los Angeles is  
12 surrounded by broad expanses of open land  
13 and that's where the people will go.

14 In some cities, TOD advocates,  
15 having failed to convince people to agree  
16 with their ideas, have reacted by trying  
17 to force people to follow them. But even  
18 these cities, which tried to artificially  
19 create a Berlin Wall by prohibiting  
20 construction of single-family homes in  
21 the suburbs surrounding the central city,  
22 such as Sydney and Melbourne, Australia,  
23 had to abandon stringent urban  
24 containment policies when housing became  
25 prohibitively expensive and politicians

1           faced a revolt at the polls.

2           Sir Peter Hall, in a classic work  
3           forty years ago, *The Containment of Urban*  
4           *England*, led an evaluation of the effects  
5           of the British Town and Country Planning  
6           Act of 1947, between 1966 and '71. The  
7           principal purpose of the act had been  
8           urban containment using the land  
9           rationing strategies of today's smart  
10          growth, such as urban growth boundaries  
11          and comprehensive plans that forbade  
12          development on large swaths of land that  
13          would otherwise be developable.

14          The finding of Hall and his  
15          colleagues were echoed later by a Labor  
16          government report in the mid 2000s which  
17          showed housing affordability had suffered  
18          under the -- this planning regime.  
19          England is now embarking on a program to  
20          liberalize the restrictive land-use  
21          policies, just as New Zealand did in  
22          2011. And also in 2011, Florida repealed  
23          its statewide smart growth mandate and  
24          closed the administrative bureaucracy  
25          that had overseen the program.

1           Mass transit is another failed  
2           component of TODs. According to the U.S.  
3           Census American community survey, travel  
4           to work in Los Angeles by mass transit  
5           takes 1.73 times longer than travel by  
6           car. Listen to what Wendell Cox, a  
7           former three-term member of the Los  
8           Angeles County Transportation  
9           Commission, appointed by Mayor Bradley --  
10          has his own planning firm. He's a  
11          fellow -- a senior fellow of urban  
12          policy. In this Canadian study,  
13          Improving the Competitiveness of  
14          Metropolitan areas, in which he concluded  
15          that long commute times undermines the  
16          productivity of Canadian municipalities.  
17          "There's much concern about the  
18          competitiveness of the nation's  
19          metropolitan areas. Particular attention  
20          has been directed towards the generally  
21          longer commute times of Canadian workers  
22          and the diminished competitiveness that  
23          occurs as a result. While the prospects  
24          for improving transit commute times are  
25          discouraging, some current strategies

1           could increase traffic congestion,  
2           lengthy commute times, and make  
3           metropolitan areas less competitive.  
4           Compact cities, also called smart growth  
5           policies, have been adopted across Canada  
6           in an effort to reduce automobile use and  
7           increase urban densities. International  
8           data indicates that higher densities are  
9           associated with greater traffic  
10          congestion, and data from U.S.  
11          metropolitan areas indicate the commute  
12          times are longer where employment  
13          densities are higher. The most recent  
14          data indicates a strong relationship  
15          between greater transit use and greater  
16          traffic congestion. Further, higher  
17          traffic densities are strongly associated  
18          with higher levels of air pollution."

19                 So when you combine a TOD policy  
20                 that can never increase density beyond  
21                 the point where you have traffic  
22                 congestion, with the net effects of  
23                 traffic congestion that makes the city  
24                 less competitive than other cities that  
25                 are not congested, you have the

1 prescription for the only outcome -- a  
2 failed, unlivable city.

3 Can we have -- tell me how much time  
4 we have left?

5 THE CHAIR: An update. You have  
6 eleven minutes left for this -- you have  
7 eleven minutes left for the appellants.

8 MR. ABRAHAMS: Okay. I'm going to  
9 use three more minutes.

10 Okay.

11 THE CHAIR: There's -- there's three  
12 others behind you. So --

13 MR. ABRAHAMS: Yeah. Well, I tell  
14 you what. If they want to come up, they  
15 can speak -- yeah, they'll speak, and  
16 I'll finish up.

17 MR. CHAVEZ: Dear commissioners, I  
18 am Alex Chavez, president of the  
19 Hollywoodland Homeowners Association.

20 Hollywoodland is a community  
21 located -- is a community located  
22 directly beneath the Hollywood sign. And  
23 it's comprised of 550 homes and 1,200  
24 residents.

25 We oppose Millennium Hollywood's

1 plan to build two giant skyscrapers in  
2 our community.

3 We're not opposed to development.  
4 We want to be very clear about that. We  
5 like community development and the jobs  
6 it create, and its contribution to our  
7 local economy. But we are horrified by  
8 the looming threat of gross  
9 overdevelopment, which is what Millennium  
10 Hollywood means to us.

11 On its face, the project sounds like  
12 it might be a good idea. Here's the  
13 glowing way they describe themselves in  
14 their literature: "Millennium Hollywood  
15 will transform a series of surface  
16 parking lots into transit-oriented  
17 pedestrian-friendly development. We will  
18 further the resurgence of Hollywood as a  
19 place for Angelenos to live, work, dine,  
20 and play, and for the rest of the world  
21 to visit."

22 That sounds really nice, doesn't it?  
23 Well, let me explain why for the people  
24 of Hollywood it's not so nice.

25 First of all, two buildings over

1 fifty stories high are an absolute insult  
2 to our community. Fifty stories? Why  
3 not seventy-five stories? You know, why  
4 not a hundred stories? Think of all the  
5 jobs we could create.

6 Here's why two fifty-story buildings  
7 are grossly inappropriate. The Capitol  
8 Records Building is thirteen stories.  
9 The W Hotel is twelve stories. The  
10 Sunset Vine Tower outstrips the other two  
11 at twenty stories. But Millennium  
12 Hollywood aspires to be two or three  
13 times higher than any other buildings in  
14 our community. That is not just a  
15 (indiscernible) violation for a skyline,  
16 but it violates us in countless other  
17 ways, as well.

18 We don't have the infrastructure to  
19 support this colossal constructions. We  
20 don't have the roads to support all the  
21 people that would live and work and  
22 commute to and from these buildings. We  
23 don't have the emergency services that  
24 would serve them and continue to serve  
25 the rest of us in an efficiency way. We



1 don't have the parking space to  
2 accommodate the needs of these goliath  
3 structures.

4 We have heard approval from union  
5 members and the business community voiced  
6 at previous hearings. I am a union  
7 member, and I am an entrepreneur who has  
8 started and operates several business.  
9 But we cannot give blanket approval to  
10 these megastructures just because they  
11 create jobs and business. If a project's  
12 built at fifteen or twenty stories, as  
13 might be appropriate, it would still  
14 create jobs, and it would be great for  
15 our economy. We don't need two fifty-  
16 story buildings to create jobs and  
17 business, if in the long run, they hurt  
18 our community.

19 As a union member, I would never  
20 want any other union workers to suffer  
21 job losses because Millennium Hollywood  
22 fails to move forward. But why the  
23 outrageous and oversized plan? Don't  
24 they have the responsibility to present a  
25 reasonable alternative for this

1 development?

2 All these questions remain  
3 unanswered. I hope the city planning  
4 commission will consider all these  
5 important questions before moving this  
6 project on to the next phase.

7 On behalf of the neighbors of  
8 Hollywoodland, thank you for listening.

9 MR. WILLIAMS: James Williams. We  
10 have seven minutes on the clock.

11 MR. JOHNSON: Good morning. My name  
12 is -- good morning, Madame Commissioner,  
13 commissioners. My name is Greg Johnson.  
14 I am a representative of the Hollywood  
15 Dell Civic Association appeal, and I am a  
16 resident of the Hollywood Dell and a  
17 member of the Hollywood Dell Civic  
18 Association.

19 The association has more than 1,500  
20 single-family homes, condominiums, and  
21 apartments. I'm representing in excess  
22 of 5,000 residents within 500 feet of the  
23 project.

24 I'm also a commercial real estate  
25 broker, and believe that Hollywood should

1 be redeveloped reasonably and  
2 proportionately to the size of existing  
3 structures, historic buildings, and in  
4 concert with surrounding residential  
5 communities.

6 The HDCA appeal both jointly and  
7 individually, the advisory agency's  
8 determination letter, because we believe  
9 the advisory agency failed to adequately  
10 consider the impacts the proposed project  
11 will have on surrounding commercial and  
12 residential communities. These impacts  
13 are based upon the project's proposed  
14 size, massing, scale, height, land use,  
15 traffic generation, reduced onsite  
16 parking allocation, and increased noise,  
17 light, and air pollution. The project's  
18 1.1 million square feet is grossly out of  
19 scale to other Hollywood projects, both  
20 existing and planned, and larger than all  
21 but a handful of buildings in Los  
22 Angeles.

23 With 2 towers of approximately 585  
24 feet in height, the project would contain  
25 two of the fifteen tallest buildings in

1 Los Angeles. The resulting density and  
2 height of the project would dwarf the  
3 historic thirteen-story Capitol Records  
4 Buildings and all other existing  
5 structures in Hollywood as well as the  
6 fifty-seven city-approved projects slated  
7 for Hollywood development, none of which  
8 exceed thirty stories.

9 The fifty-story towers will block  
10 views to and from Hollywood Hills,  
11 obscure views of the Hollywood sign, and  
12 appear from various locations throughout  
13 the city to be taller than Mount Lee,  
14 while casting significant shadows across  
15 hundreds of homes and apartments.

16 Increased traffic generated from the  
17 project will essentially landlock our  
18 neighborhood during peak A.M. -- P.M.  
19 travel times, increasing traffic density  
20 along both Franklin Avenue and Cahuenga  
21 Boulevard, issues the project's proposed  
22 traffic mitigation simply ignore,  
23 which -- and also hitting two of those  
24 highly impacted intersections.

25 Our neighborhood is located less

1 than 500 feet from the project. Noise  
2 and light generated from the outdoor  
3 venues proposed for the project will be  
4 directly transmitted into our yards and  
5 residences.

6 Additional traffic congestion  
7 generated by the project's proposed  
8 observation deck, record court and  
9 performance plaza were not considered in  
10 the EIR or in calculations for onsite  
11 parking.

12 Further, failure of the project to  
13 conform to any CEQA guidelines -- to many  
14 CEQA guidelines, including the provisions  
15 to provide a stable and accurate project  
16 description, an identify of a five-mile  
17 study area for CALTRAN traffic studies,  
18 an AQMD air quality studies, as well as  
19 an additional CEQA failure by the city  
20 and the project's EIR to cumulatively  
21 consider the impacts the Millennium  
22 project in relation to the fifty-seven  
23 current Hollywood developments. All of  
24 which have been taken into  
25 consideration -- should have been taken

1           into consideration by the advisory agency  
2           prior to issuing the determination letter  
3           in favor of the project's vesting, tract  
4           map, variances, and development.

5           In regards to the proposed  
6           variances, each of the eight variances do  
7           not meet the threshold for grant var --  
8           to grant variances, specifically under  
9           the LA city charter and under the LA  
10          municipality code. A variance cannot be  
11          granted to give relief from self-imposed  
12          hardships and cannot be granted unless  
13          the following is true: 1) the strict  
14          application of existing law would result  
15          in practical difficulties or unnecessary  
16          hardships on the applicant. There are no  
17          existing laws. Practical difficulties or  
18          hardships on the applicant -- the  
19          original three to one FAR on the property  
20          would allow today a 583,000 square foot  
21          mixed-use project with similar mix of  
22          uses to be developed that would  
23          significantly reduce traffic congestion,  
24          the size, both scale and height of the  
25          project.

1           Item number 2, the -- under these  
2           variances, the special circumstances  
3           applicable to the property that do not  
4           apply to other properties in the same  
5           zone or vicinity. There are no such  
6           special circumstances.

7           Number 3, the variances necessary  
8           for the applicant to preserve and enjoy  
9           substantial proper right -- proper --  
10          property rights, which because of the  
11          special circumstances and difficulties,  
12          other property owners in the same zone or  
13          vicinity get to enjoy. There's no such  
14          property rights in existence.

15          4, the granting variance won't be  
16          material or detrimental to public or  
17          injurious to other property owners in the  
18          same zone or vicinity. As detailed  
19          earlier, granting any or all of the  
20          variances would be detrimental to the  
21          other property owners adjacent to the  
22          project.

23                 MR. WILLIAMS: Three minutes left.

24                 MR. JOHNSON: Thank you.

25                 Prior to the vote -- well, I'll cede

1 the rest of my time to other speakers.

2 THE CHAIR: I encourage you lift up  
3 new issues should there be some, too.

4 MS. SCHWARTZ: My name is Sarajane  
5 Schwartz. I'm a current board member of  
6 the Hollywoodland Homeowners Association  
7 and past president.

8 For thirty-five years, I've been a  
9 resident of Hollywoodland, eagerly  
10 awaiting the proper development of  
11 Hollywood, not its public rape. The  
12 unprecedented scale and mass of this  
13 project is totally inappropriate and  
14 outrageous. The almost hundred-year-old,  
15 already gridlocked streets and limited  
16 infrastructure cannot support this  
17 project.

18 If you approve this project, you  
19 will presiding over a wake for Hollywood.  
20 As resident -- as residents flee an  
21 overly congested neighborhood, as a  
22 tourist destination, visitors do not come  
23 to Hollywood to see skyscrapers that  
24 obliterate iconic landmarks. As an  
25 entertainment capital, as the many



1 entertainment-related events with street  
2 closures will have to find a new, less  
3 congested area, and of our residents, who  
4 no doubt will suffer deaths due to the  
5 inability of emergency vehicles to reach  
6 their destinations. Or even worse, the  
7 inability to evacuate the hills in case  
8 of a fire.

9 I urge you to reject these twin  
10 tombstones that will bring about the  
11 death of Hollywood and undoubtedly some  
12 of its residents. It's too big.

13 MR. WILLIAMS: One minute twenty  
14 seconds.

15 MS. SCHWARTZ: Everything else that  
16 the developers presented is smoke and  
17 mirrors.

18 Thank you.

19 MS. REICHENBACH: Geez, I hope I can  
20 do this.

21 Hi. My name is Fran Reichenbach.  
22 I'm with Beachwood Canyon Neighborhood  
23 Association. I'm going to be real brief.

24 We're not for no development; we're  
25 for smart development. Development in

1 this area has always been 150 feet or 12  
2 to 14 stories, to maintain the historic  
3 scale. Hollywood Boulevard itself has  
4 continued to honor this historic scale.  
5 Even the W Hotel maintained the scale.  
6 To create skyscrapers where -- means that  
7 preservation of Hollywood doesn't mean  
8 anything. This -- this project lacks  
9 specificity as required by CEQA. It  
10 doesn't address major impacts on traffic  
11 infrastructure or emergency response  
12 resources. And the developers and city  
13 staff say that these impacts are less  
14 than significant.

15 Yet, three out of four neighborhood  
16 councils reject the project. Many other  
17 groups join them, including Hancock Park.  
18 The neighborhoods north of Franklin  
19 already suffer extreme and extended  
20 response times. As a matter of fact, the  
21 fire department will take longer to  
22 respond to calls in these two towers  
23 since the traffic is expected, according  
24 to those -- those documents, is expected  
25 to be gridlocked after the project is

1 built.

2 There's no -- I'm just going to go a  
3 tiny, tiny bit.

4 There's no --

5 THE CHAIR: I can give you about  
6 fifteen seconds if you can wrap up,  
7 please.

8 MS. REICHENBACH: Okay. There's  
9 no -- there's no mitigation in place to  
10 adjust these impacts. I would caution  
11 the city attorney to pay attention to the  
12 things that Silverstein law group put  
13 before you, at the beginning of this.  
14 Okay.

15 THE CHAIR: Thank you. I appreciate  
16 them.

17 Okay. We now have some comments  
18 from the mayor and council offices.  
19 Excuse me?

20 A break? Okay.

21 Yes, nature calls. We're going to  
22 take a five-minute break and we will  
23 return and we'll resume with -- excuse  
24 me. I just -- I want to be clear what  
25 we're going to be resuming with. With

1           comments from the mayor's office and the  
2           council offices when we return.

3                     Take a break.

4                     (Recess)

5           THE CHAIR: Okay. We're back on.  
6           The city planning commission. If I can  
7           have -- folks, please take a seat and  
8           calm their voices.

9                     This is a little awkward. Nature  
10           did call, and so it was urgent. But what  
11           we're going to do is hear from the  
12           mayor's office, the council offices, and  
13           LAHD. This is the city family. And then  
14           we're gong to be breaking for lunch. And  
15           so I apologize for that, but that calls  
16           as well. You want us to have sustenance  
17           as we consider this complicated case.  
18           And I will let folks know that there is a  
19           farmer's market just outside of city hall  
20           if you want to take advantage of that  
21           during the lunchtime. We will take a  
22           very quick lunch, so that we can come  
23           back and hear the remaining of public  
24           testimony. We have over a hundred  
25           speakers, and so we're going to be

1 thinking about how to organize our time  
2 regarding that.

3 But for now, we will hear from Brian  
4 Currey, from the mayor's office, from  
5 Marcel Porras, from the councilman's  
6 office, Rushmore Cervantes from LAHD, and  
7 I believe that's -- and Councilman  
8 LaBonge, as well.

9 Please begin, Mr. Currey.

10 MR. CURREY: Good afternoon. I'm  
11 Brian Currey. I am counsel to the mayor  
12 and deputy mayor for economic and  
13 business policy. I'm pleased to be here  
14 on behalf of Mayor Villaraigosa in  
15 support of the project.

16 Millennium Hollywood will be a  
17 transformative, mixed-use, equitable,  
18 transit-oriented development project that  
19 will preserve and frame the iconic  
20 Capitol Records Building.

21 The project will transform a series  
22 of underutilized parcels in Hollywood  
23 into a new pedestrian and bike-friendly  
24 meeting place for the community and for  
25 visitors to our city.

1           The proposal makes a huge step  
2 forward towards the vibrant, active and  
3 economically prosperous Hollywood that we  
4 envision for the future. We need to  
5 bring investment and activity back to our  
6 key urban hubs, places with excellent  
7 transit options and the potential for  
8 increased jobs and economic activity.

9           I'd like to thank the planning  
10 department, their staff, and the  
11 commission for thoughtful consideration  
12 of the project. It is a very important  
13 project for the city and for Hollywood in  
14 terms of its economic impacts on the  
15 neighborhood and on the city as a whole.  
16 The project will involve between half a  
17 billion and a billion dollars of capital  
18 investment into our city. Some 6,000  
19 construction jobs under a project labor  
20 agreement will be part of the project  
21 with an emphasis on local hiring for  
22 people in Los Angeles. More than 1,000  
23 permanent jobs will be located at the new  
24 facility. There will be some 15 million  
25 dollars in upfront monies for the city

1 and another 5.8 million in annual  
2 revenues to the City of Los Angeles.

3 We need continued renewed investment  
4 in our communities. This is exactly the  
5 sort of elegant density along transit  
6 hubs that forms the framework for our  
7 vision of a future Los Angeles, that is  
8 more sustainable, that is less dependent  
9 upon automobiles, and that remains  
10 vibrant.

11 Thank you very much.

12 THE CHAIR: Thank you.

13 MR. PORRAS: Good afternoon. Marcel  
14 Porras, senior planning and economic  
15 development deputy for Councilmember  
16 Garcetti.

17 Councilmember Garcetti does not  
18 support the project as is currently  
19 envisioned, because the proposed height  
20 is out of scale with the Hollywood  
21 landscape and does not have --

22 THE CHAIR: Thank you. I appreciate  
23 your enthusiasm, but I don't want to set  
24 a precedent for clapping or booing or any  
25 of that going forward so that we can stay

1 on point. Thank you, though.

2 Please continue.

3 MR. PORRAS: -- and does not have a  
4 broad enough level of support throughout  
5 the community. The councilmember looks  
6 forward to working closely with  
7 Councilmember Tom LaBonge, community  
8 groups, and residents to assess other  
9 options at this site in collaboration  
10 with the developer that would continue  
11 the progress we have seen in Hollywood in  
12 recent years.

13 Thank you.

14 Thank you. I have my card now,  
15 Madame Chair.

16 THE CHAIR: Thank you so much.

17 MR. LABONGE: Good morning. I want  
18 to thank Councilman Garcetti for all the  
19 work that he has done in Hollywood. I --  
20 I really think that's a very good  
21 statement that was made, because we work  
22 together. We work together. There's no  
23 borders.

24 Seven years ago -- Rushmore --  
25 seven years ago I was with Mayor



1 Villaraigosa. We were at the -- walking  
2 through the construction at the  
3 observatory. And the mayor went, Tommy,  
4 highrise all along Wilshire. And I said,  
5 Mr. Mayor, park mile specific plan,  
6 meaning there's a balance. And, yes, we  
7 want development, but there's certain  
8 zoning that needs to take place. Let's  
9 have a discussion on the right height.  
10 I'm a -- I'm a Griffith Park hiker every  
11 day. And you look at there and it's --  
12 it's taller than what I think it should  
13 be. What is the right height? That's  
14 something for the planners, for the  
15 planning department. Where's Michael  
16 LoGrande? He's probably on the top of  
17 this building, seeing if it's the right  
18 height.

19 So I just wanted to say as you  
20 consider this, I think there's a  
21 tremendous aspect to the project on the  
22 ground floor. Jobs are real important.  
23 But I don't want to see it so tall that  
24 it affects the psyche of Hollywood, which  
25 is special. The thirteen-story, very

1 special Capitol Records Building is very  
2 complementary to the area, but design  
3 that's appropriate is what I suspect.  
4 And I want to, in the future, to be able  
5 to put the arms around both the people on  
6 that side of the room and the people on  
7 that side of the room, to build a better  
8 Hollywood with the blessing of the  
9 planning commission.

10 Thank you very much.

11 THE CHAIR: Thank you. Thank you.

12 MR. LABONGE: I do not support the  
13 height. I do support a project, but I do  
14 not support the height. And that's a  
15 real big -- the tallest building in  
16 Hollywood, I want to let you know, is --  
17 you know how many stories?

18 THE CHAIR: You're going to tell me.

19 MR. LABONGE: Twenty-two stories,  
20 twenty-two stories. So figure out a  
21 balance. Twenty-nine, thirty-six, forty-  
22 two, hike.

23 THE CHAIR: Thank you.

24 Please.

25 MR. CERVANTES: Good afternoon,

1           commissioners. Rushmore Cervantes,  
2           executive officer with the Housing  
3           Department.

4           THE CHAIR: We thought you were the  
5           mayor.

6           MR. CERVANTES: Yes. Well,  
7           I'm -- I -- I made the unfortunate  
8           mistake of allowing Councilman LaBonge to  
9           speak in front of me. I always hate  
10          following him after he speaks. But --  
11          I'm here just very briefly to the  
12          commission what the developer has offered  
13          to the City of Los Angeles relative to  
14          community benefits.

15          They negotiated with the Los Angeles  
16          Housing Department to provide eight --  
17          approximately 4.8 million dollars that  
18          would go into the affordable housing  
19          trust fund for the creation of affordable  
20          housing for large families at 50 percent  
21          area median income or below in two  
22          specific projects within the project  
23          area.

24          And if for whatever reason either  
25          one of those projects do not become

1           viable, those monies will be retained  
2           with the affordable housing project --  
3           trust fund, excuse me, and the housing  
4           department will provide affordable  
5           housing of a similar AMI in the same  
6           area. And these projects will not  
7           require any additional city funds to go  
8           along with that. So at the very least,  
9           for the community benefit for the  
10          affordable housing piece, they're  
11          providing a substantial amount of money.  
12          So I just wanted to go on the record to  
13          let you know what they've offered.

14                 Thank you.

15                 THE CHAIR: Thank you very much.

16                 So with a little bit of awkwardness  
17                 and embarrassment, we are going to break  
18                 for lunch. But I promise you that we  
19                 will have a long involve -- well, I'm not  
20                 going to promise long; you will deliver  
21                 long -- hearing for us. But we will  
22                 consider all of your comments, so again  
23                 there's a farmers market. We're going to  
24                 be taking thirty minutes for lunch, so  
25                 that we will return in thirty minutes

1 from now.

2 (Recess)

3 THE CHAIR: Okay. So a city  
4 planning commission meeting, March 28th.  
5 We've gone back and forth about how to  
6 organize the public comment period,  
7 because we have so many public speakers.  
8 And we appreciate the interest and the  
9 passion, and we want to hear from as many  
10 folks as possible and get as much  
11 testimony as possible.

12 And so what we've decided on is that  
13 we're going to split the time. Forty-  
14 five minutes for those who support;  
15 forty-five minutes for those who are  
16 opposed.

17 And as opposed to calling the  
18 speaker cards as folks come up, if you  
19 will state your name, so that we know  
20 that you have in fact submitted a speaker  
21 card, and we'll have that for the record.

22 And we'll be doing it in sequence,  
23 so I will those who were in support of  
24 the project first; those who are opposed  
25 to the project, second. And what I will

1 ask is that you please -- so that we get  
2 as much information as possible relative  
3 to your point of view, that you seek new  
4 points. That we absolutely understand,  
5 we want to hear that you support a point  
6 that was already made. But if that is  
7 the extent of what you have to offer,  
8 that will allow for us to get as many  
9 folks within that forty-five minute  
10 period as possible. And I know that is a  
11 challenge; there's a great passion on  
12 both sides of this issue, and we  
13 understand that and want to validate  
14 that. But if you have heard your point  
15 made, it is important for us to know that  
16 you support that point, to say that, but  
17 you needn't necessarily reiterate to a  
18 great extent. What we want is as broad  
19 amount of information as possible, so the  
20 newer the point, that is something that  
21 is elaborated or giving us a different  
22 perspective, that's going to be valuable  
23 to us as we go forward.

24 So right now, I'd like to call those  
25 who are in support. What I'd ask you to

1 do, is if you can line up behind the  
2 podium, please. Yes, this is going to be  
3 chaotic. I understand. If you see folks  
4 who you know and trust in the line and  
5 you want to cede time to them, perhaps,  
6 that is something that we encourage you  
7 to do.

8 But I also urge you to limit  
9 yourself. Please be as judicious as  
10 possible about this. This is going to be  
11 pure chaos, I can tell. But -- so this  
12 is folks who are in support of the  
13 project.

14 We're putting forty-five minutes on  
15 the clock. I urge you to, not  
16 aggressively but assertively tap one  
17 another on the shoulder when you're  
18 moving over a minute, probably, you need  
19 to do that, so we get as many people as  
20 possible.

21 So please be sure you state your  
22 name for the record, and being.

23 Please.

24 MR. BROWN: Good afternoon. My name  
25 is Piedmont Brown. I'm the president of

1 the Ironworkers, Local 433, with  
2 thousands of hardworking members. I'm  
3 here on behalf of our members to support  
4 the Millennium Hollywood project. Right  
5 now we have members on the job in  
6 Hollywood on Sunset Boulevard building  
7 the new Emerson College. There's a lot  
8 of growth today in Hollywood. That's  
9 because years ago we made the right  
10 decision to build the Red Line subway.  
11 Local 433 helped in that project. With  
12 the Red Line in place, we could build new  
13 developments without a terrible impact on  
14 traffic. Millennium Hollywood is a  
15 transit-orientated development. The aim  
16 is to get people out of their cars, to  
17 get into the city and the urban  
18 experience. When we built the Red Line,  
19 people said no one would ride it. They  
20 said no one in Los Angeles would get on  
21 it and get on a train. Well, people do  
22 ride the subways, and they do live in  
23 high-rise buildings. Millennium  
24 Hollywood is a smart transit-orientated  
25 development. It's just what we need, and



1 we're just the people to build it. We  
2 urge you to vote yes.

3 Thank you.

4 MR. SMITH: Good afternoon, council,  
5 or commissioners. I'm Gilbert Smith and  
6 I am chair of the Ricardo Montalban  
7 Foundation, owner and operator of the  
8 Ricardo Montalban Theatre on Vine Street.

9 Anybody know that theater?

10 I'm doing my job. Thank you.

11 I'm here in support of the  
12 Millennium project. As part of the  
13 infrastructure of Hollywood, I have a  
14 unique perspective. I grew up on  
15 Homewood Avenue. My grandmother bought  
16 property on Homewood to bring our family  
17 to Hollywood. My wife's parents came to  
18 Hollywood in the 1920s. I walked the  
19 streets in the 1950s, when it was a  
20 burgeoning community coming out of World  
21 War Two. We had a very dark period, and  
22 I was asked to come into the theater  
23 which was an abandoned, misused facility  
24 on the part of Hollywood and Vine, the  
25 entertainment capital of the world.

1           We have a unique opportunity here to  
2           create a new infrastructure, to service  
3           the new entertainment streaming and  
4           entertainment community. People still  
5           flock here to create entertainment,  
6           because the talent, the weather, and the  
7           infrastructure that's already in place.  
8           And for the most part, over the last  
9           twenty years, the entertainment community  
10          had fled from Hollywood and we're now  
11          bringing it back.

12           One of the things that I want to say  
13          in closing is that I think that it's very  
14          important for the commission to establish  
15          with the developer and with the community  
16          stakeholders and with the community, a  
17          monthly meeting in the process of  
18          building this facility and this venue.  
19          We had that with the W project, because I  
20          was directly across the street, and we  
21          went through three and a half years of  
22          construction. There are many problems  
23          that are associated with that, with  
24          (indiscernible) people, organized as to  
25          how to come to your venue and -- and

1 egress and ingress and just the monthly  
2 problems that are called.

3 So anyway, thank you very much for  
4 your time.

5 MR. HUNT: Edward Hunt, president of  
6 Melrose Hill Neighborhood Association.

7 We support this project primarily  
8 because we'd rather see in transit-  
9 oriented developments tall, slender  
10 towers that permit generous ground floor  
11 landscape pedestrian areas that are part  
12 of the view rather than blocking the  
13 view. And we'd rather not see short, fat  
14 towers that block the -- blot out the  
15 view and have only minimum ground floor  
16 landscape spaces.

17 Thank you.

18 MR. WOOD: Good afternoon. Clyde  
19 Wood. I'm here representing CIM. We're  
20 one of the largest landowners and  
21 stakeholders in Hollywood. We do support  
22 the project, and I'm just going to make  
23 two very brief points.

24 The first one is that as landowners,  
25 developers, and any stakeholders, the

1 most important thing to us is consistency  
2 and predictability. And we support this  
3 project because it is consistent with the  
4 general plan and the community plan.

5 There is no height district. The FAR  
6 increase is at your discretion. And the  
7 density is below the allowable density.  
8 The variances and CUPs they're requesting  
9 are only to allow uses that would provide  
10 the mix of amenities that you need in  
11 this kind of project. So people who are  
12 opposed to this project are not  
13 necessarily opposed to the project.  
14 They're opposed to the recent community  
15 plan that was just implemented.

16 The second point is that when we  
17 invested in Hollywood starting over ten  
18 years ago, it was with a vision that  
19 catalytic projects like Hollywood and  
20 Highland, the W Hotel, the subway, all  
21 were subsidized by city dollars. With  
22 the redevelopment agency gone now, all we  
23 have is private development. And this is  
24 exactly the kind of project that was  
25 envisioned when those projects were,

1           because those were catalytic, in order to  
2           be a catalyst for new private investment.  
3           So here you go. Here it is, right in  
4           front of you. And this is what we need,  
5           because this is what will bring jobs,  
6           sales taxes, TOT taxes, to the city, and  
7           we desperately need that.

8           Thank you.

9           MS. BECKLUND: Hi, my name is Laurie  
10          Becklund. I'm a Dell resident. I'm  
11          speaking in support of this project but  
12          with changes.

13          Briefly, I do approve myself of this  
14          density unless there are other ways of  
15          doing it. I did not unalterably oppose  
16          the high rises.

17          What I wanted to ask you is just  
18          five quick point -- recommend you to five  
19          quick points I think are not being  
20          addressed here.

21          THE CHAIR: This is support?

22          MS. BECKLUND: Yes, I am in support  
23          of this. I'm trying to help make this  
24          happen. Definitely.

25          I think the people from -- I mean,

1 the Dell, but I think people will  
2 realize -- I was part of the neighborhood  
3 meetings and we had to vote on what do  
4 you want. I actually voted for the high  
5 rise. And I appreciate Millennium as a  
6 developer. But some of these things will  
7 not work -- I was just talking to Phil  
8 Aarons about this -- unless we make sure  
9 they're addressed. And two of them  
10 technically are scoping problems. One of  
11 them is, they did not check the ability  
12 to divide a community because of lack of  
13 access here. As you can see, we're  
14 already divided, unfortunately, in two  
15 lanes here. Communities are opposing  
16 this increasingly. There's a reason.  
17 That needs to be examined.

18 Secondly, if you check no air  
19 traffic. There are helipads. I think  
20 that should be looked at. That's been a  
21 problem for years.

22 Mainly, I wanted to ask you to use  
23 your power as visionaries and planners,  
24 not just as project approvers or even  
25 local Hollywood approvers. If you can

1 pretend for a second that we're in the  
2 year 2035, if we leave this -- if we  
3 leave the traffic issues the way they  
4 are, even in the best-case scenario,  
5 there will be no study out of traffic  
6 anywhere in the hills and there will be  
7 no access --

8 THE CHAIR: Ma'am, my impression --  
9 can you stop the clock -- my impression  
10 is that this is actually probably better  
11 suited for the opponents relative --

12 MS. BECKLUND: No.

13 THE CHAIR: -- to what --

14 MS. BECKLUND: I tried --

15 THE CHAIR: -- you're asking for  
16 changes.

17 MS. BECKLUND: -- I tried to do a  
18 public statement, but he said I -- a  
19 general statement, but he said I  
20 couldn't. I -- I'm sorry. I --

21 THE CHAIR: Okay. So you filled out  
22 a general statement card?

23 MS. BECKLUND: No, I -- I asked a  
24 question, and apparently that counted.  
25 But I -- I mean, truly, I can be neutral.

1 I mean, I -- whatever you -- I'll wait.  
2 You tell me. Just --

3 THE CHAIR: Finish your comment  
4 and --

5 MS. BECKLUND: Okay.

6 THE CHAIR: -- we'll start the clock  
7 when you're finished.

8 MS. BECKLUND: I ask you to be  
9 visionary about this. You're -- right  
10 now, as a community, this whole Hollywood  
11 thing is -- is permanently having  
12 gridlock there. I ask you if you have  
13 the cat park at one end and the redoing  
14 of Cahuenga Pass to NBC Universal, to  
15 look at what that is going to look at  
16 with thousands of sensitive receptors,  
17 and one of them in this area, as smog  
18 builds over twenty-two years.

19 Please address that interim thing  
20 for everybody's sake. It's an  
21 opportunity to make Hollywood amazing and  
22 also deal with that.

23 Secondly, I encourage you to think  
24 about jobs that may be lost if the  
25 permeability and the drive-through here



1 is not certain. It's not just hiring  
2 there. It's people who are unable to get  
3 to work in other places because it takes  
4 too long; they can't get there.

5 The last thing is, one of the things  
6 the Hollywood community plan talks about  
7 is preserving local communities. And I  
8 just talked to Phil Aarons about this.  
9 If right now in the community plan,  
10 somebody had edited they're saying into  
11 the community plan saying preserve viable  
12 neighborhoods. Hollywood Dell and some  
13 of these others -- are they viable? If  
14 not, please tell us now.

15 Thank you.

16 MR. MILLER: Good afternoon,  
17 commissioners. I'm Ron Miller, executive  
18 secretary of the Los Angeles Orange  
19 County Building and Construction Trades  
20 Council. We represent 140,000 craftsmen  
21 and women across fifty-two different  
22 affiliated local unions and fifteen  
23 different trades.

24 We support the Millennium Hollywood,  
25 and we urge you to approve today.

1           Hollywood has a great heritage. And  
2           thanks to the hard work and residents and  
3           businesses, there's been a revival in the  
4           last ten years. Now the Millennium  
5           project is here to accelerate that  
6           effort. It's the right project at the  
7           right time. It's transit-orientated. It  
8           will encourage use of the subway.

9           You know, I have many brothers and  
10          sisters in New York, Chicago. They walk  
11          out their door in the morning with their  
12          tool bags slung over their shoulder, and  
13          either walk down the street to a job or  
14          they walk down the street to the subway  
15          station and get on there and go to work.  
16          That's what I have envisioned for LA. I  
17          want my members to be able to sell one of  
18          their cars and -- and be able to live in  
19          a community that they work, or be able to  
20          get on the subway and go to work.

21          So I urge you to approve this  
22          project.

23          Thank you.

24          MR. HALE: Good afternoon,  
25          commissioners. My name is Gene Hale.

1 I'm chairman of the Greater Los Angeles  
2 African-American Chamber of Commerce,  
3 which represents over 400 African-  
4 American businesses.

5 We support this project for two  
6 reasons: one, with the unsolicited  
7 support of the developer to create what  
8 we call commonly known as STEM  
9 scholarships, that would have an  
10 immediate impact on the future workforce  
11 of this -- this region. The second is --  
12 is because of the number of jobs that it  
13 would create, not only for small  
14 businesses but for veterans as well.

15 So we urge you to support this  
16 project.

17 Thank you.

18 MR. HARRIS: Good afternoon. I'm  
19 Bill Harris. I'm the executive director  
20 of Hollywood Community Housing  
21 Corporation. We're a nonprofit developer  
22 of affordable housing for low-income  
23 families, people with disabilities, and  
24 the chronically homeless.

25 I've worked with Millennium

1 Hollywood for the past number of years.  
2 They're supported several of our  
3 community services, directly. I am very  
4 excited and about their donation to LAHD  
5 of 4.8 million dollars, that's over a  
6 hundred units of affordable housing for  
7 people desperately in need.

8 I fully urge you to support this  
9 project and approve it.

10 MR. RIERSON: Good afternoon. Lee  
11 Rierson. I'm a resident of Hollywood  
12 90068 and operated a business employing  
13 about 200 people in Hollywood 90028.

14 I support this project. I think  
15 Hollywood, having lived there and worked  
16 there, has a desperate need for  
17 developments like this. The flat parking  
18 lots and the decrepit, underutilized  
19 buildings that sort of dot the horizon  
20 there, have outlived their uses. And  
21 this kind of development is what we need  
22 to encourage as a community. In my  
23 opinion, and the fact that Hollywood can  
24 and does attract this kind of  
25 development, I think is something that we

1           should take advantage of, and the time is  
2           now, not ten years from now, not when  
3           everything is, you know, perfectly  
4           figured out. And I think that you can  
5           look for an urban environment that has  
6           dead parking lots and abandoned  
7           buildings, and you can drive straight  
8           through that very quickly. I'd rather  
9           have an urban environment that has public  
10          transit that's well used, buildings that  
11          attract class A companies to employ  
12          people in the community and create jobs.  
13          And for that reason, I urge you to  
14          support this project.

15                 Thank you.

16                 MR. SMITH: Good afternoon,  
17                 commissioners. My name is Cliff Smith.  
18                 I'm the business manager for Roofers  
19                 Union Local 36, also a board member of  
20                 the South Central Neighborhood Council.

21                 The Millennium Hollywood project  
22                 will play a vital role in the Los Angeles  
23                 development revival. The project  
24                 construction will create almost 3,000  
25                 much-needed, career-based, construction

1 jobs, which provides stability to every  
2 community in the city. The completed  
3 project will create 2,000 additional  
4 permanent jobs to our residents.

5 The Millennium Hollywood will  
6 generate hundreds of millions of dollars  
7 to the local economy, and half of it will  
8 be onsite. And this transit-oriented  
9 development plan enhances tourism,  
10 business, jobs, and economic growth in  
11 Los Angeles. We strongly encourage the  
12 commission to support this project.

13 Thank you for your time.

14 MR. MEDINA: My name is Galo Medina.  
15 I am a property owner on Hollywood  
16 Boulevard, business owner in Hollywood.  
17 I am on the board of directors for the  
18 Hollywood Business Improvement District,  
19 and I am also born and raised in the  
20 Hollywood Hills.

21 I've seen Hollywood come and go, and  
22 I can tell you that there are not many  
23 companies, investors who are prime to  
24 give one billion dollars worth of  
25 development right now. We have a huge

1 opportunity.

2 We can stay all day and worry about  
3 fifty-five floors, twenty floors, fifteen  
4 floors, green, how much square footage we  
5 have -- but we do have an opportunity.  
6 In the city, it's too easy to let these  
7 things go. We've had months and months  
8 of election talk of growth and jobs and  
9 development, and we finally have an  
10 investor who is ready to do this. Just  
11 please keep that in mind.

12 Thanks.

13 MR. RADACHY: Hello. My name is Ron  
14 Radachy. I'm the executive director of  
15 Oasis of Hollywood, a nonprofit that's  
16 been operating in Hollywood for the past  
17 thirty-four years. So I've been in  
18 Hollywood when it was for better -- lack  
19 of a better term, a sewer, and seen it  
20 coming back to life in the past fifteen  
21 to twenty years with all the  
22 redevelopment.

23 Our building, which we own, is on  
24 Ivar. I'm 130 feet from this project. I  
25 think it's terrific.

1 I work with a lot of youth. Youth  
2 are graduating school, can't get jobs for  
3 all the economic reasons that all have  
4 already been stated. I think it's a  
5 double thumbs up. It will also inspire  
6 other developers to take the old tired  
7 non-historic buildings, retire them, put  
8 up new things. It will continue the  
9 redevelopment that Hollywood and the city  
10 so desperately needs.

11 Thank you.

12 MR. WILLIAMS: Time is thirty  
13 minutes.

14 MS. TILTON: My name is Terri  
15 Tilton. I have worked and lived in  
16 Hollywood for over thirty years. I'm on  
17 the board of directors for Hollywood PAL,  
18 and through my career have been very  
19 involved and on boards of other nonprofit  
20 organizations.

21 This applicant has been a good  
22 corporate citizen. I wholeheartedly  
23 support this project for the  
24 revitalization of our Hollywood is  
25 essential. I've lived through, just as



1 he said, from the -- the rats and the  
2 prostitutes to a -- to a place that's  
3 incredible to live in. Our property  
4 values have gone up as a result of it,  
5 and it's become an incredible community.

6 His enthusi -- I enthusiastically  
7 support him. He has been a huge  
8 supporter of our non-for-profit sector.  
9 And without people like Phil and  
10 Millennium, so much of our youth, so many  
11 of our programs, so much of our non-for-  
12 profit, would be unable to survive.  
13 Please, I endorse this project.

14 MR. BILLY: Good afternoon,  
15 commissioners. My name is Dan Billy.  
16 I'm here representing Bill Waggoner and  
17 the 20,000 members of the Operating  
18 Engineers Local Union Number 12.

19 We make up the equipment operators,  
20 inspectors, and surveyors that work in  
21 the construction industry.

22 We're in support of this project.  
23 We believe it's well planned. We believe  
24 it's a complement to the area, and we'd  
25 like you to move forward on this project.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

Thank you.

MR. CAMPBELL: Good afternoon, commissioners. My name is Scott Campbell. I'm president of Central Hollywood Neighborhood Council, which is just south of this project, starting at Hollywood Boulevard.

At our board meeting on February 25th of this year, we voted to approve this project, support the project at a six to one FAR. Height not to exceed 585 feet, create a subcommittee to include myself and other people that I appointed to work with the developer to establish an agreed-upon public benefits package.

We have had that meeting, and Jerry Neuman has mentioned several of the items that we talked about, but there are a few more that I want to let you know about.

One of them a contribution to the Walk of Fame. Another is to potentially acquire the Little Country Church property. Another is to have an observation deck and a café near the top of one or both of the buildings.

1 Contribution to the Hollywood Central  
2 Park. Contribution to the Franklin Ivar  
3 park. Contribution to creating a dog  
4 park. Contribution to the Hollywood Sign  
5 Trust. Redoing the building, the LAPD  
6 building at 6501 Fountain, particularly  
7 the Fountain side exterior. And we're  
8 hoping to have space for a market in this  
9 new project.

10 Thank you.

11 MR. MASON: Good afternoon,  
12 commissioners. My name is Brandon Mason.  
13 I'm a resident, small business owner, and  
14 active community member in CA13, who  
15 unconditionally supports the Hollywood  
16 Millennium project.

17 While Capitol Records tower has  
18 forever stood as a beacon to visitors  
19 arriving in Hollywood from each direction  
20 to the city, the site has never provided  
21 them the opportunity to interact with the  
22 building itself.

23 THE CHAIR: Can you speak a little  
24 closer to the microphone?

25 MR. MASON: Yes, I'm sorry.

1 THE CHAIR: I'm having a hard time  
2 hearing.

3 MR. MASON: The structure as an  
4 ocean is surrounding land around this  
5 Capitol Records Building, is an ocean of  
6 surface parking lots offering minimal, if  
7 any, chance for our visitors to take in  
8 the sites and enjoy the atmosphere beyond  
9 the stroll on the Walk of Fame itself.  
10 The Millennium Hollywood project will not  
11 only reverse that, but it will invite  
12 interaction with the Capitol Records  
13 tower through the creation of street-  
14 level retail stores, dining, plazas, and  
15 open space for visitors to sit and enjoy  
16 the urban fabric of Hollywood itself.

17 This will result in the creation of  
18 a more public feel to what up to now has  
19 been an isolated private site, bringing  
20 in a new population to energize the area,  
21 and fostering an active streetscape where  
22 none has existed in the past.

23 Thank you very much.

24 MR. CONTRERAS: Good afternoon. My  
25 name is Pablo Contreras. I am working --

1 I am at room service at the Hollywood  
2 Lofts Hotel, and I am working in the  
3 hotel for twelve years.

4 I live in the district as well. My  
5 coworkers and I support the project as  
6 bringing 1,000 good jobs to the  
7 community. Better benefits include the  
8 better living wage and jobs training for  
9 the hotel workers.

10 Thank you.

11 MS. TORRES: Good afternoon,  
12 commissioners. My name's Rachel Torres.  
13 I'm a research analyst for UNITE HERE  
14 Local 11. On behalf of the 20,000  
15 members of UNITE HERE, we wish to express  
16 my strong support for the Millennium  
17 Hollywood project. As one of the many  
18 community benefits this project offers,  
19 UNITE HERE has entered into an agreement  
20 to ensure good jobs for hotel workers.

21 The Millennium Hollywood project  
22 continues a strong precedent of  
23 responsible development in Hollywood,  
24 beginning with the Hollywood and Highland  
25 project. This project will receive no

1 city dollars, nor is it on city land, yet  
2 thousands of good jobs will be produced  
3 for the construction and permanent  
4 employees.

5 In addition, Millennium Hollywood  
6 has joined in partnership with the  
7 Hospitality and Training Academy to  
8 ensure local residents are recruited and  
9 trained for high-quality jobs at this  
10 hotel. The Hospitality Training Academy  
11 is a non-profit institution, and a true  
12 labor management partnership that  
13 provides benefits to both employers and  
14 the employees of the new hotel.

15 The HTA also partners with  
16 educational institutions and community  
17 organizations to provide formal training  
18 to facilitate entry and advancement along  
19 the extensive career ladders within the  
20 hospitality and food service industries.

21 HTA uniquely offers workers the  
22 tools to succeed in a vital, high growth  
23 industry, and provides workplace English,  
24 skills upgrades, vocational classes, and  
25 bridge training to move participants into

1 a job and then a career.

2 And for that, we wish to express our  
3 strong support and encourage the planning  
4 commission to vote in favor of the  
5 project.

6 Thank you.

7 MR. FOLB: Madame President, members  
8 of the commission, my name is Brad Folb.  
9 I'm president of Paramount Contractors  
10 and Developers in Hollywood. We're a  
11 small family business that's built what  
12 used to be considered high rises in  
13 Hollywood starting since the 1950s.

14 I -- I wanted to specifically  
15 address the visual impact of -- of this  
16 project. From the ground-floor level,  
17 this is an area that is underutilized,  
18 and there's very few people visiting.  
19 The Capitol Records Building is a private  
20 office building. With this project,  
21 there's going to be a magnet of activity  
22 from the boulevard going up. There are  
23 hundreds more people a day are going to  
24 be seeing this. Their views may be  
25 obstructed somewhat, but they are going

1 to be able to see it where they're not  
2 seeing it and not getting the benefit of  
3 it now.

4 With regard to the height issue, I  
5 believe some of it is a red herring. The  
6 -- the architect mentioned that at the  
7 higher levels of this -- of these towers,  
8 the maximum floor plate allowed is going  
9 to be 14,000 square feet. If there's two  
10 towers, that's 7,000 square feet. As a  
11 developer, I can tell you that's a very  
12 skinny tower in terms of the whole visual  
13 landscape. Whether it is twenty-two  
14 stories high, as Tom LaBonge, or whether  
15 it's fifty or a hundred stores, the  
16 visual impact of that extra area is just  
17 not going to be that significant relative  
18 to changing the project and making it  
19 squatter and lower.

20 Thank you very much.

21 MR. GUBLER: Good afternoon. I'm  
22 Leron Gubler, president and CEO of the  
23 Hollywood Chamber of Commerce.

24 I think we've all been to great  
25 cities around the world and the United



1 States, and in many cases, we visit those  
2 cities and we ask ourselves, why can't  
3 Los Angeles be more like this? Why can't  
4 we have exciting, vibrant urban areas.

5 Hollywood is one area of Los Angeles  
6 which has tremendous potential to create  
7 an exciting, vibrant urban feel to it.  
8 And as a result, the Hollywood Chamber of  
9 Commerce supports this project. We  
10 believe it moves us forward to attaining  
11 that goal with developers that have the  
12 capability and a vision to achieve that,  
13 to activate the street level, to -- in an  
14 exciting way, near transit, near freeway  
15 on and off ramps. If you can't build  
16 something like this in Hollywood, where  
17 can you build it?

18 Now it seems the major sticking  
19 point for most people is on the height of  
20 the project. And while we don't have an  
21 official position on how high the project  
22 should be, we appreciate what the  
23 developers are trying to do.

24 They're trying to preserve the past  
25 but look to the future.

1           They're saying our best days in  
2           Hollywood are not behind us -- they're  
3           ahead of us. And they're trying to  
4           create a twenty-first century landmark  
5           that changes the paradigm about how  
6           people think about Hollywood, how they  
7           think about urban -- urbanism, which is  
8           what we have to be promoting here in Los  
9           Angeles as we go forward. We're going to  
10          live a livable city and an exciting city  
11          for the future.

12           It's a positive vision for  
13          Hollywood, and it deserves your support  
14          and -- and we ask you to do that.

15           Thank you.

16           MR. AMBROSE: I'm so excited to be  
17          with you today. My name is David  
18          Ambrose, and I'm here representing just  
19          myself. I am a resident of Hollywood and  
20          every single day, I take this Vine Street  
21          right up, drive past these empty parking  
22          lots, and I go to work at an  
23          entertainment company in Burbank.

24           I desperately hope one day to go to  
25          work in one of these buildings, because

1           that's what this building could do. It  
2           could pull us back into Los Angeles. I  
3           truly believe that. That's not an  
4           official commitment; I'm here as a  
5           private citizen.

6           I will also say I bought my house in  
7           Hollywood because it had been abandoned  
8           for a year and a half. I could afford  
9           it, and I spent the better part of two  
10          years improving it and fixing it. I've  
11          lived in Hollywood for nine years. My  
12          house, I think, now has improved the  
13          street. I have worked hard on the  
14          neighborhood council, and every day I  
15          come to these different meetings where we  
16          hear, this project versus that project.  
17          And what I often here is a debate about  
18          good versus perfect. I think this  
19          project is very, very, very good. And  
20          despite all the objections, which are  
21          somewhat valid, I think this project  
22          deserves your support. And as just a  
23          resident of Hollywood, that moved to  
24          Hollywood to go to these kind of places,  
25          I hope you support it.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

Thank you very much.

MR. WILLIAMS: Twenty minutes.

MR. SMITH: Good afternoon. My name is Sam Smith. I'm a thirty-year resident and business owner in Hollywood. I think today is my coming-out day. I have to confess to a thirty-year love affair with the Capitol Records Building.

The kind of vision and innovation that it's going to take for this to be a smart development, I think has been well described today. We spent a lot of time talking about square footage and FARs and intersections and traffic patterns.

But one thing that we haven't talked about is the good fortune of this project. And that good fortune lies in the people that make up the Millennium Partners. They have come to this community, they have invested themselves in it, they are part of the fabric, and they care about it.

I've taken the time to visit some of their other projects. They are as good as people say they are, and they have

1           stuck with them. And when it comes to  
2           having a good neighbor in Hollywood,  
3           that's what I expect, and that's what I  
4           know I will see from Millennium Partners.

5           Please support the project.

6           MS. HOSSAIN: Good afternoon,  
7           commissioners. I'm Tina Hossain here on  
8           behalf of Los Angeles Area Chamber of  
9           Commerce, and our 1,600-member  
10          organizations do strongly support the  
11          Millennium Hollywood project.

12          The Millennium Hollywood project is  
13          important, not just for Hollywood, but  
14          for the entire City of Los Angeles. A  
15          catalytic project like this will boost  
16          the profile of Hollywood as well as the  
17          whole city by creating an iconic new  
18          space. It will create over 7,000 total  
19          jobs during construction and upon  
20          completion, with a positive annual  
21          economic impact of 230 million dollars at  
22          full development.

23          The Millennium Hollywood project  
24          will recapture the public investment made  
25          in LA's transit infrastructure, by

1           appropriately locating density in  
2           immediate proximity to the Red Line, and  
3           encouraging further transit usage by its  
4           residents, workers, and visitors.

5           This project upholds the vision of  
6           the Hollywood Community Plan and meets  
7           the goals for how this historically  
8           important regional center should grow, by  
9           directing development away from  
10          residential neighborhoods and toward  
11          major streets and mass transit.

12          The Los Angeles Area Chamber of  
13          Commerce strongly supports this project  
14          as a worthwhile investment in the future  
15          of our entire city.

16          We thank you.

17          MR. ALALA: Good afternoon,  
18          commissioners. My name is Jesse Ayala,  
19          Allah, and we represent the Sheet Metal  
20          Workers Local 105 and a member of the Los  
21          Angeles and Orange County Business  
22          Construction Trades.

23          Before I proceed, let me thank you  
24          for your (indiscernible) that made  
25          history -- that made history in the City

1 of Los Angeles, and created jobs we need  
2 for all the construction workers, and  
3 created career opportunities for young  
4 men and women and servicemen and women  
5 that serve the country.

6 (Indiscernible) to Apprentice  
7 programs that provided careers with good-  
8 paying jobs and benefits. I'm here to  
9 ask you for your continued support and  
10 pray that will continue to make history  
11 and continue to create opportunities for  
12 young men and women.

13 Thank you for support.

14 Thank you.

15 MR. LEGGIT: Good afternoon. My  
16 name is Hunter Leggit. I'm an architect  
17 and Green Builder here in Los Angeles. I  
18 am in support of the project.

19 I just want to touch on a couple of  
20 quick points. First off, I'd like to  
21 commend the architect and developer for a  
22 beautifully designed project. I think it  
23 will be a phenomenal -- be a phenomenal  
24 piece on the skyline of Hollywood and  
25 also serve to represent an iconic piece

1 of architecture moving forward to the  
2 future.

3 Second, I want to talk a little bit  
4 about the height districts. Hollywood  
5 and Vine has historically been the taller  
6 of the height districts in Hollywood.  
7 When the initial buildings on that corner  
8 and around there, as well as Capitol  
9 Records were proposed, they were much  
10 taller than anyone could imagine at the  
11 time being.

12 In moving forward in revitalizing  
13 Hollywood and increasing density, which  
14 I'm for, I think this -- this project  
15 fits appropriately. Finally, with the  
16 public space and -- and using Capitol  
17 Records Building as a centerpiece for the  
18 project, I know that the -- the  
19 developer's committed to integrating  
20 art -- artwork, music, and -- and  
21 potential technology into a public space.  
22 I think this is vital for the next future  
23 of Hollywood, and I think it will be a  
24 great asset to the -- the cityscape.

25 Thank you.



1 MS. LABELLE: Good afternoon. My  
2 name is Tricia LaBelle. I am a resident  
3 of Hollywood and a stakeholder of fifteen  
4 years in the community.

5 Not only will I have a view of this  
6 project from my home, but I will also  
7 receive the benefits of such a  
8 development in Hollywood that I truly  
9 appreciate what the developers have done.  
10 I visited their locations around this  
11 country. I've seen how they have  
12 improved the quality of life in  
13 communities. There's no doubt between  
14 the jobs and the aspects that they're  
15 bringing to the building, will benefit  
16 Hollywood tremendously.

17 Right now from my home I look at  
18 nothing but short, fat, squatty buildings  
19 and rooftops to see the highline (sic) of  
20 downtown. I appreciate and have actually  
21 designed my backyard to see that skyline,  
22 and I -- I welcome a project like this,  
23 in this scale, so that it does protect  
24 and preserve the Capitol Records  
25 Building, which I think is very valuable

1 and important to Hollywood.

2 These developers not only will just  
3 be building this building, but they're  
4 going to improve the surrounding areas by  
5 curbs and infrastructure that we  
6 desperately need in Hollywood to improve.  
7 I see what downtown has done with the  
8 highrises and the infrastructure of  
9 downtown, and it's far exceeded  
10 Hollywood. We've lost the, I think, the  
11 dynamic of being the entertainment  
12 capital of the world, and we're quickly  
13 losing being a global competitor. I  
14 think this is something that is long  
15 overdue for Hollywood and necessary for  
16 our future, especially for generations to  
17 come long after any of us will live in  
18 this world. So I ask you to please  
19 support this project as it's been  
20 presented.

21 Thank you very much.

22 MR. WILLIAMS: Fifteen minutes.

23 MR. OLIVEIRA: What's the hurry?  
24 We're talking about a project for the  
25 next hundred years, and we got to beat

1 the clock? Give it a break. You people  
2 are listening very well.

3 My name is Joe Oliveira. I'm a  
4 resident, was born and raised in  
5 Hollywood. Hollywood's dead. It's gone.  
6 It's over. They don't make movies here.  
7 They make them in other countries. They  
8 make cartoons in other countries. Hanna-  
9 Barbera used to be here. It's not here.  
10 We're trying to get this city to go  
11 again.

12 Highland Avenue in 1964-65 had a  
13 traffic flow twenty-four hours, 40,000  
14 cars. Today, 270,000 cars. Hollywood  
15 was a junk street until Hollywood and  
16 Highland came in. It was -- right now  
17 6,000 parking spaces. I think Jerry  
18 Aarons (sic) said it all, and that if you  
19 saw the presentation, it's only going to  
20 lift the city. If there are problems,  
21 commissioners, it will be resolved. If  
22 it isn't, you just fix it. You want tax  
23 dollars, you want jobs, you want this.  
24 But you've got these people here that  
25 don't want anything.

1           Mr. LaBonge comes running in,  
2           running out. Ha ha ha. Mr. Garcetti,  
3           when he becomes mayor, he'll change his  
4           mind, because we need this project to  
5           make our town go forward.

6           Thank you.

7           MS. DOLE: Good afternoon. My name  
8           is Kayla, and I literally live two feet  
9           away from the actual boulevard and I  
10          like -- I as well as my friends moved  
11          from other cities to live in Hollywood  
12          for the excitement and the attractions  
13          and to be a part of Hollywood.

14          I currently live in a newly  
15          developed apartment complex, and it's  
16          beautiful, it's safe, it's gorgeous. But  
17          the second I walk out, there's nothing  
18          but lingerie shops or smoke shops or  
19          little, like, souvenir shops, and it's  
20          disgusting. I pay a lot of money for my  
21          rent every single month, and then I get  
22          to live in this place where my  
23          surrounding areas are not only dangerous,  
24          because I'm pretty sure we've had about  
25          three or four shootings within the last

1 six months, but it's dark and it's not  
2 glamorous as it's supposed to be in  
3 Hollywood.

4 I think that by moving forward with  
5 a project like this, it will be a new  
6 landmark within our environment, and it's  
7 going to change our area and the people  
8 that are in it. And you won't see as  
9 many homeless people, you won't be  
10 hearing about shootings. It's going to  
11 lighten our area, which it desperately  
12 needs.

13 I pledge my support for this  
14 project. Thank you.

15 MS. MCGINLEY: Hello. My name is  
16 Nicole McGinley. I'm a resident of  
17 Hollywood, and I fully support this  
18 project.

19 I currently live on Franklin and  
20 Argyle, which is only a few blocks from  
21 Hollywood and Vine, where there are tons  
22 of shops, restaurants, bars anyone my age  
23 would want. The only problem is, I can't  
24 walk there after dark. And -- I'm --  
25 it's just too dark, it's dirty, it's

1           dismal, it's vacant, and it's just awful.  
2           It's too dangerous. And I know plenty of  
3           men who will tell you that they won't  
4           make that walk, either.

5           If I walk down for happy hour, I  
6           can't get a cab home, because it's --  
7           everyone drives away when I tell them  
8           it's just a couple of blocks. If I want  
9           to take the Metro to meet my friends  
10          downtown for dinner, it's scarier to walk  
11          to the station than it is to get on the  
12          Metro, or even to walk around downtown in  
13          a lot of places.

14          This is the perfect project for this  
15          exact specific area, because it's going  
16          to bring foot traffic, it's going to  
17          bring light, it's going to bring  
18          security, and it's going to bring even  
19          more places I can walk to so I don't have  
20          to drive.

21          So not only do I support this  
22          project, but I'm frankly very excited  
23          about it.

24                 Thank you.

25                 MR. HERSH: Hi. My name is Jonathan

1           Hersh. I'm a resident and -- of  
2           Hollywood, and I also work in Hollywood.

3           I support the Millennium Hollywood  
4           project, and ask the commission to do the  
5           same. The Millennium Hollywood will  
6           bring back a significant presence our  
7           city lacks. It will also bring a lot of  
8           foot traffic in the area. I -- I walk to  
9           Hollywood Boulevard from my apartment a  
10          lot, and as she was saying, it's -- it's  
11          not the best place to walk around at  
12          night or during the day there's not even  
13          that many attractions. There's a lot of  
14          tourists and -- and Hollywood tourist  
15          buses constantly, but it's hard to see  
16          why they're there, what they're going to  
17          be looking for, and I think this project  
18          would bring something exciting to the  
19          area.

20                 Thank you.

21                 MR. WILLIAMS: Ten minutes left.

22                 MR. HOLMES: Hello. My name is  
23                 Russell Holmes, and I've lived in the  
24                 hills of Beachwood Canyon for over  
25                 fifteen years. And I am here to tell you

1 I drive by this -- this area every single  
2 day going to work, and the traffic is not  
3 as bad as what you've been hearing. It  
4 was worse where I lived in Austin, Texas.

5 I sometimes hear my neighbors  
6 complain about the tourists stopping to  
7 try to take pictures of the Hollywood  
8 sign. And I try to remind them that  
9 these tourists bring billions of  
10 dollars -- tourists and hospitality to  
11 our city, our local city. And without  
12 that, our economy would be affected, and  
13 my real estate property value would be  
14 affected.

15 In the words of Winston Churchill, I  
16 have to say that's noth -- he says  
17 there's nothing wrong with change if it's  
18 in the right direction. And the  
19 Millennium Hollywood is in the right  
20 direction. It will increase tourism  
21 revenues and it will take us up. And  
22 we've run out of land. We have to go up.  
23 Up is the future of Los Angeles.

24 MS. LEJEUNE: Good afternoon. My  
25 name is Lisa Lejeune, and I work in



1 Hollywood just a couple of blocks away  
2 from the Millennium Hollywood project.

3 I'm here today to support the  
4 project and ask the commission to do the  
5 same.

6 This project will provide countless  
7 new jobs, as everyone has already  
8 mentioned. And it will literally  
9 generate millions of dollars in local and  
10 state revenue that we as Los Angeles and  
11 the State of California need.

12 It artfully preserves the historic  
13 and design significance of the Capitol  
14 Records Building, which is important.  
15 And, finally, its presence will make our  
16 community a safer place.

17 Twenty years ago, I lived in the  
18 Fontenoy Building on Whitley and Yucca.  
19 And I wish a project like this had come  
20 in twenty years ago. I might not have  
21 moved away.

22 Okay. Thank you.

23 MS. STAKENAS: Good afternoon.  
24 Thank you, members of the commission, for  
25 an opportunity to speak. My name is

1 Carol Stakenas. I'm the executive  
2 director of Los Angeles Contemporary  
3 Exhibitions, also known as LACE. We are  
4 the longest running nonprofit  
5 contemporary art space in Los Angeles,  
6 and we've been a member of the Hollywood  
7 community since 1996.

8 I'm here today to speak on behalf of  
9 the board, staff, and artists that we  
10 work with in support of the Millennium  
11 Hollywood project.

12 Just recently, Hollywood was named  
13 as one of the top twelve art places in  
14 the nation. The potential is there, but  
15 it is held down by the lack of  
16 opportunity. With the Millennium  
17 Hollywood project and their stellar  
18 reputation for valuing and supporting  
19 exemplary arts, I'm really looking  
20 forward to seeing what we can do with  
21 their percent for art commission. And  
22 we're committed to helping make it happen  
23 in Hollywood, to really show the vibrancy  
24 of our art place.

25 Millennium Hollywood offers a clear

1 and, yes, bold plan, but it's committed  
2 to making Hollywood Hollywood.

3 Please support this project.

4 Thank you.

5 MS. BROWN: Good afternoon. I'm  
6 Christa Brown. I'm a Hollywood resident,  
7 and I support the Millennium Hollywood  
8 project.

9 The developers have worked with the  
10 community for more than six years, and  
11 created a community benefits package  
12 which enhances the quality of life for  
13 all stakeholders.

14 The open courtyards at Millennium  
15 Hollywood will be a lively, enriching  
16 place, because the developer has taken  
17 steps to ensure that this space will be  
18 enlivened on a regular basis with monies  
19 set aside to pay for the programming of  
20 arts activities.

21 Moreover, those events will be  
22 community oriented, because they will be  
23 done in concert with both the Hollywood  
24 Arts Council and also the Hollywood  
25 entertainment district.

1           I support the Hollywood Millennium  
2 project.

3           Thank you.

4           MR. GROSCH: Good afternoon,  
5 commissioners. My name is Ryan Grosch.  
6 I'm a Hollywood resident, and I'm here to  
7 support the Millennium project.

8           Hollywood -- or I mean, Los Angeles  
9 and the state (ph.) of urban sprawl, has  
10 continued to grow wide, and that's an  
11 old, outdated concept, based on auto  
12 (ph.)-oriented, low-density development.  
13 I mean, this doesn't need to happen.  
14 This is a result of poor planning and  
15 shortsightedness. I mean, if we want to  
16 reduce traffic, pollution, and smog, we  
17 really need to reinvest in our existing  
18 neighborhoods and rebuild these places.  
19 And Hollywood is the perfect place to do  
20 that.

21           This project would provide residents  
22 with the sense of place, creating a  
23 better sense of community in the entire  
24 area, make it safer for everyone to walk  
25 around and travel through. And it's

1 going to be a great place to work and  
2 play, and so I support the project.

3 Thank you.

4 MR. WILLIAMS: Five minutes.

5 MR. JOHNSON: Good afternoon,  
6 commissioners. My name is Kyle Johnson,  
7 and I'm a Hollywood resident.

8 Today I ask that the commission vote  
9 in support of this project, because it is  
10 a catalytic project that continues  
11 Hollywood's renaissance, provides jobs,  
12 housing, and quality office space.

13 I think the parking provided by  
14 Millennium is just right. By unbundling  
15 parking from housing, it allows  
16 Millennium to target an underserved  
17 demographic, people without cars. The  
18 excessive city parking requirements  
19 create what amounts to parking pollution.  
20 Too many parking spaces and parking  
21 levels that exceed project uses.

22 Thank you.

23 MR. MUNOZ: (In Spanish, with English  
24 translation.) Good afternoon. My name  
25 is Raul Munoz. I've been a Hollywood

1 resident for the last twenty-five years.

2 I'm here in support of the  
3 Millennium project. In the last eleven  
4 years, I've had to go out of the city in  
5 order to work. And I have to spend three  
6 hours of my own time traveling to and  
7 from work, and that's time wasted away  
8 from my family.

9 I am in favor, and I really like the  
10 Millennium project, because that's going  
11 to help me work closer to home and allow  
12 me not to be away from the family and not  
13 use my transportation.

14 Thank you.

15 MR. KIRSCH: Good afternoon. David  
16 Kirsch with the Carpenters/Contractors  
17 Cooperation Committee. We're the labor  
18 management organization affiliated with  
19 the Carpenters Union. I don't want to be  
20 the last person here, so I'm just going  
21 to echo all the good things that have  
22 been said about the project and just  
23 emphasize the -- the construction jobs.  
24 A lot of workers are out there,  
25 unemployed, and these are the types of

1 projects that are going to put people  
2 back to work. And this is great for  
3 them, it's great for the community, and I  
4 urge you to approve this project.

5 Thank you.

6 MR. HERNANDEZ: Good afternoon,  
7 commissioners. My name is Alfredo  
8 Hernandez. I'm a founding board member  
9 of the East Hollywood Neighborhood  
10 Council and a founding board member of  
11 the Friends of the Hollywood Central  
12 Park.

13 I'm in full favor of the Millennium  
14 project. I believe that this project  
15 will create a large sum of  
16 (indiscernible) fees that can -- most of  
17 them can be used for the creation of the  
18 Hollywood Central Park.

19 Thank you.

20 MS. SHAHENIAN: Good afternoon,  
21 commissioners. Nicole Shahenian with the  
22 Hollywood Chamber of Commerce and also  
23 proud member of the Friends of the  
24 Hollywood Central Park.

25 I am here to express my support of

1 the Millennium project, and in  
2 particular, let you know how pleased I am  
3 with the open space and the commitment to  
4 community benefits that this project is  
5 going to produce.

6 I also want to second the speaker  
7 before me, in asking that the Quimby fees  
8 for this project be designated  
9 specifically to the Hollywood Central  
10 Park.

11 Thank you.

12 THE CHAIR: How much time is left,  
13 James? We --

14 MR. WILLIAMS: Three minutes.

15 THE CHAIR: There are three minutes.  
16 Are there any other pro speakers?

17 Great. Wow. Thank you.

18 Okay. We are now going to very  
19 quickly, and I -- I failed to mention  
20 that we did have some general comments  
21 cards. And so once we finish with the  
22 forty-five minutes for those who are  
23 opponents to the project, we will allow a  
24 couple of minutes for general comments.  
25 There aren't that many of those cards.



1           So if you will begin to queue  
2 yourself, we will have the exact same  
3 amount of time and the exact same rules.  
4 And I'm hoping that you will be as  
5 judicious as those who came before you  
6 were in policing yourselves relative to  
7 the time you're taking.

8           It is most beneficial to us if we  
9 have all of the points that are out there  
10 to be made, are made, and if you are in  
11 fact echoing somebody's comment that has  
12 been made previously, if you can do that  
13 with brevity and move on to things that  
14 are new. That is what's most beneficial  
15 to us, so we have a full plate to make  
16 our decision with.

17           (Pause)

18           Okay. If our first speaker will  
19 step to the podium, and please begin.  
20 Please state your name for the record  
21 clearly. Thank you.

22           MR. GEOGHAN: My name is Jim  
23 Geoghan. I'm traffic and parking chair  
24 for the Hollywood Hills West Neighborhood  
25 Council, and resident of Whitley Heights

1 for twenty-seven years. My wife and I  
2 were secretary of Whitley Heights  
3 Homeowners Association for six years.

4 When my wife and I lived in  
5 Manhattan, we were three blocks away from  
6 the BMT, the IND, and the IRT subway,  
7 which offered us nine subway lines and  
8 about eleven bus lines. I'm listening to  
9 the words today -- major traffic center.  
10 I guess we're talking about the one  
11 subway line down the street, which ends  
12 up in North Hollywood. If you live in  
13 Tarzana, Van Nuys, Sherman Oaks,  
14 Burbank, Studio City, Valley Village -- I  
15 can go on with fourteen other locales --  
16 you're going to have to drive to this  
17 building. No one's taking the subway to  
18 the Millennium project. And at five to  
19 six or seven o'clock, you're going to  
20 have to drive home. It's just going to  
21 be choking traffic.

22 I'm not naïve. Something's going to  
23 be built there. I just don't want to see  
24 something that's more than half the  
25 height of the Empire State Building.

1 That's all there is to it.

2 I appreciate listening to the  
3 neighborhood councils who have spoken so  
4 far in favor of -- it will receive their  
5 donations from Millennium. And also  
6 the -- the labor union people, the  
7 landowners and the business owners.  
8 If -- if Millennium was going to build a  
9 slaughterhouse, they'd have the same  
10 thing to say -- jobs and money, jobs and  
11 money. A slaughterhouse should be fine.

12 Let's listen to Tom LaBonge, and  
13 let's just make a sensible building here  
14 and make your jobs, but fifty-five  
15 stories. I've -- I've heard they can go  
16 even more to seventy or eighty stories  
17 without -- without the -- the oversight  
18 of you people.

19 Let's not be insane about this. A  
20 fifty-eight-story building of 580 stories  
21 (sic) is just ridiculous. It's a  
22 monstrosity.

23 For the Millennium group, the  
24 Millennium partners, then to tell us,  
25 well, don't worry about it, for where

1           you've lived for twenty-seven years.  
2           We're going to build this monstrosity and  
3           put in bicycle lanes and a bicycle repair  
4           shop. Is there no end to their  
5           arrogance? I can't believe it. It's  
6           just the most insane thing I've ever  
7           heard in this room.

8           Thank you.

9           THE CHAIR: Can I please request  
10          that folks not clap or boo or anything  
11          else, so that we can keep this going as  
12          rapidly and hear the points, please?  
13          Thank you.

14          MR. REZNIK: Madame Chair, my name  
15          is Ben Reznik with Jeffer Mangels Butler  
16          & Mitchell. I'm here representing the  
17          Hollywood and Vine Condominium LLC. It's  
18          the owners and the Hollywood and Vine  
19          Residences Association, known as the W  
20          Hotel Residences right at -- a block  
21          away.

22          My clients support some development  
23          on this site. The problem they have with  
24          what's being proposed is they don't know  
25          what's proposed. They don't know what it

1 is that you might be approving.

2 The difficulty is that you have  
3 before you a zone change with a requested  
4 twenty-two life span, which may or may  
5 not now exist based on the development  
6 agreement being pulled out this very  
7 moment, this very morning.

8 But the request is to permit a  
9 height range from 220 feet to 585 feet.  
10 It's to include potentially 900  
11 residential units, or none at all. It  
12 includes 200 hotel rooms, or none at all.  
13 It includes 215,000 square feet of  
14 office, or maybe a lot more if the whole  
15 project is offices.

16 It includes a master conditional use  
17 permit for alcohol sales, for five  
18 restaurants, cafes, rooftop, et cetera,  
19 but without any occupancy numbers or  
20 locations. I've never seen the city  
21 approve something like that.

22 It may or may not include a health  
23 club. And the final EIR specifically  
24 says that it's the indeterminate nature  
25 of the project description and states

1 that the applicant does not know what it  
2 will build.

3 So if the applicant does not know  
4 what it will build, what is it that  
5 you're being asked to approve today?

6 The difficulty is that there's no  
7 other project in Hollywood, for that  
8 matter in the city, that's been approved  
9 with this minimum level of specificity  
10 without providing for some sort of  
11 subsequent entitlement review. The way  
12 this is being presented is, you're going  
13 to approve this box, and whatever is  
14 built in the future, no one has a right  
15 to review or comment or study or analyze.  
16 And now that the development agreement's  
17 been withdrawn, which was one of the only  
18 tools for some limits, what is it that  
19 you have before you?

20 So based on that, our client is in  
21 opposition.

22 Thank you.

23 MS. POLIFRONIO: Hello. Thank you  
24 for letting me speak. My name is Susan  
25 Polifronio. I'm a thirty-five-year

1 resident and business owner in Hollywood.  
2 I live in the flats, no view, north of  
3 Franklin Avenue north of the Hollywood  
4 Freeway. And I have a business over on  
5 Franklin and Bronson.

6 There are things I really like about  
7 the project. There are things I don't.  
8 I'm not even going to speak to any of  
9 them.

10 What I am concerned about is safety  
11 and traffic movement. And I don't know  
12 if you're aware of the intersection at  
13 Argyle and Franklin Avenue? That's where  
14 you exit on Vine Street -- Vine Street  
15 exit from the 101 going south. You  
16 either get on the 101 or you get on  
17 Franklin. People are coming west on  
18 Franklin that might want to go to north  
19 on the 101. There's a U-turn around  
20 right at Argyle that you have to do to  
21 that. There is one light that allows the  
22 Hollywood Dell to exit anywhere at all,  
23 and that's at Argyle and Franklin. The  
24 only other possibilities of exiting are  
25 at Ivar and Franklin, no light, or at

1 Oden and Cahuenga, also no light.

2 One of the reasons I'm particularly  
3 concerned. In 2006, my husband suffered  
4 with cardiac arrest. He didn't suffer  
5 with it at home, thank God, or in the  
6 ambulance. But he did on the gurney on  
7 the way into the emergency room. That  
8 was 2006. If we come to the present  
9 time, I don't think he would have made it  
10 to Kaiser, which is not that far away  
11 from where we live. So I'm really  
12 concerned about the ability for emergency  
13 vehicles to get in, and for the Hollywood  
14 Dell residents and the other residents  
15 around there to get out, with fires or  
16 other emergencies.

17 Thank you.

18 MS. HOLMES: My name is Mary Holmes.  
19 I've been a resident of Hollywood for  
20 fifty years. My business is here. It's  
21 not true that people that live in the  
22 area don't want any change. We've seen  
23 Hollywood at its worst. We've seen it  
24 improve. It's better than it used to be.

25 People can argue about what is



1 aesthetically pleasing or not, but I  
2 asked a lawyer for Sheppard Mullin's, the  
3 legal definition of aesthetically --  
4 okay, and he said it has to be consistent  
5 with the area, congruent with what's  
6 already going on.

7 A five-year-old could pick out what  
8 is incongruent about those towers. The  
9 idea that you have to build up to be able  
10 to see something that you can already  
11 see, is ridiculous.

12 I want change. I don't want that.

13 Also, people don't know about this.  
14 I ask people every single day that work  
15 and live within a block of where these  
16 are proposed to be built, do you know  
17 about these towers? And they  
18 consistently look at me as though I'm  
19 crazy, because they don't believe that  
20 anybody would approve anything that tall.

21 Your website talks about human  
22 scale. How that is within human scale, I  
23 don't know. I want pedestrian open  
24 places, I want improvement, I want  
25 investment.

1           One more thing. The people in this  
2 line are about ninety percent residents  
3 of the area. The people in the other  
4 line were lawyers, paid workers, some  
5 residents -- I counted ten. So please  
6 consider the difference between who's  
7 invested here and how they're invested.

8           Thank you.

9           MR. VAN DUSEN: My name is Jim Van  
10 Dusen. I'm a forty-three resident of  
11 Hollywood. I'm also on the Hollywood  
12 United Neighborhood Council Board of  
13 Directors.

14           The Hollywood United Neighborhood  
15 Council was not opposed to the plan in  
16 its entirety. Construction and  
17 development is not necessarily a bad  
18 thing. We were in -- we did have a  
19 problem with is that there was no plan to  
20 sink our teeth into. I won't elaborate.  
21 The gentleman in front of me, I think,  
22 did an excellent job of this. But as we  
23 talked to Millennium probably four, five,  
24 six times, and they would never tell us  
25 what they were going to build. So we had

1 a hard time making the recommendation for  
2 our constituents, which runs through the  
3 Millennium project. The Millennium  
4 project's in our neighborhood council.

5 So we were never able to -- we still  
6 cannot tell our constituents what is  
7 being built. We hear about the tall  
8 building or buildings, et cetera, so that  
9 has been our -- our number one problem.

10 The other problem is that they're  
11 telling us about this as being a regional  
12 center, but it's a regional center  
13 without regional planning. And the  
14 planning having to do with traffic and  
15 all the other buildings coming online  
16 around it, and the damage it will do to  
17 the business in Hollywood with increased  
18 traffic that we're already seeing,  
19 choking it off, and companies that are  
20 leaving Hollywood because of this and  
21 more that will leave.

22 And, also, personally, I would just  
23 add as a -- just you might want to take  
24 into consideration this is also a zero-  
25 sum game as far as jobs are concerned.

1           Jobs coming to Hollywood will be coming  
2           to other parts of the city or from your  
3           neighborhood, so it's good for us in  
4           Hollywood. I - I certainly would like to  
5           see that. But it will come from other  
6           areas, and as a -- as a person also looks  
7           for space for companies I work for, their  
8           people will be moving out of, perhaps,  
9           downtown, and moving up there. So it's  
10          again -- it's -- it's -- is it better for  
11          LA just per se? I would say not  
12          necessarily. I think it needs to be  
13          looked at from a regional standpoint.

14                 But the bottom -- and we certainly  
15          were -- the Hollywood neighborhood  
16          council was certainly against the six to  
17          one FAR. We're for 4.5. We could  
18          approve that.

19                 But -- but do look at this as an  
20          overall -- an overall approach, because  
21          this is going to affect more than just  
22          the 500 feet around the project. This  
23          is -- this could affect business  
24          detrimentally in a very big way, unless  
25          it's managed properly.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

Thank you.

MR. WILLIAMS: Thirty-four minutes.

MS. D'ANTONIO: Hi. I'm Joanne D'Antonio. I'm the former safety chair of the Hollywoodland Homeowners Association. And I'm also a member of CERT. This is a emergency response team. And at a Hollywood meeting recently, a member -- a higher-up person in the fire department confessed to us at a -- at a meeting that they really are not equipped to handle emergency response for the Millennium buildings.

So I urge you to address the issues of safety and infrastructure before approving anything. The city has not been able -- they've been actually cutting back on fire and police. And to make this a safe area, we really have to increase the resources and figure out how to permanently increase the resources, because the buildings won't be going anywhere.

Vine and Ivar are hills, so their height -- any height that's built there

1 is going to be higher than it would be if  
2 it were in the flats. So when you look  
3 at the heights of these towers, please  
4 take that into consideration.

5 I also question why there has to be  
6 a specific amount of land usage. In  
7 other words, if you're going to have  
8 plaza levels, why does that require then  
9 that they go up into towers? I mean, you  
10 know, can't -- they can't make a go of it  
11 any other way? It seems to me that the  
12 lower part of it makes more sense than  
13 the tower part.

14 Finally, I want to -- two more  
15 things. One is that most companies that  
16 I know -- I work in the film business, in  
17 television -- and most companies don't  
18 want to be in this sort of building.  
19 They want quiet and convenience and they  
20 don't want to be in a tourist  
21 destination. So I'm not sure what the  
22 occupancy is going to be of these  
23 buildings.

24 I am concerned about that the  
25 parking is not thought out. A woman

1 named Mary Holmes has given a two-page  
2 report that's in your -- she wasn't able  
3 to stay, but it's in your records there  
4 that she's turned in. There's -- I mean,  
5 ten Park & Rides spaces doesn't sound  
6 like enough. To use the TOD idea, the  
7 second -- it takes a second fare to ride  
8 a bus after the subway. So if you're  
9 taking the Metro and then you have to  
10 take the Orange Line, that's two fares.  
11 So maybe we have to rethink how the  
12 transfers work in the city, if you want  
13 people to come on public transportation.

14 Also, for the people who actually  
15 live in Hollywood, there's no Park & Ride  
16 right now for people who don't live in  
17 walking distance of the Metro station.

18 And, finally, it's dangerous to ride  
19 a bike on Vine Street. I've seen people  
20 nearly hit, and I suggest that the bike  
21 shop also have a first-aid station.

22 Thank you.

23 MR. GIRODO: John Girodo  
24 representing Hollywood Heritage. I'm  
25 also a Hollywood resident.

1           For three decades, Hollywood  
2           Heritage has been an advocate of  
3           preservation and protection of  
4           Hollywood's historic resources. We  
5           appreciate some of the mitigation  
6           measures designed to preserve the  
7           historic Capitol Records tower and  
8           Gogerty Building. However, we believe  
9           that this proposed project would  
10          substantively alter the context in which  
11          these buildings gained their  
12          significance. Portions of the project  
13          are grossly out of proportion with the  
14          identified resources, thereby minimizing  
15          them and irretrievably altering their  
16          setting.

17          The project would cause an adverse  
18          change in significance to the Hollywood  
19          Boulevard commercial and entertainment  
20          district. And that district is  
21          recognized in the National Register of  
22          Historic Places, at the national level of  
23          significance.

24          I asked that you review Hollywood  
25          Heritage's submitted letter. It's very



1 concise and focused and very easy to  
2 understand, and I think you'll appreciate  
3 it.

4 Thank you.

5 MR. MADDREN: Hi. My name is Casey  
6 Maddren. I was born in Burbank. I've  
7 lived in LA all my life. I currently  
8 live on Cahuenga Boulevard, north of the  
9 freeway.

10 Transit-oriented development sounds  
11 great. We've been trying it in LA for  
12 years. It isn't working, at least not in  
13 the Hollywood area. We've seen the W  
14 Hotel go up, Sunset and Vine, Jefferson  
15 Hotel -- all near transit centers in  
16 Hollywood. And actually, the population  
17 of Hollywood has decreased significantly  
18 over the last twenty years, and the  
19 traffic has gotten much worse over the  
20 last twenty years. So I'm not seeing  
21 huge benefits from TOD.

22 My main concern is the Cahuenga  
23 Boulevard, which already is severely  
24 overburdened. It's already carrying more  
25 traffic than it should. And in addition

1 to this project, there are several other  
2 projects in the pipeline, as well as a  
3 major pro -- Universal is going  
4 through -- is undertaking a major  
5 expansion, which the city council's  
6 already approved, which is also to affect  
7 the corridor negatively.

8 So I believe there are severe  
9 negative impacts involved with this  
10 project, and in should not be approved in  
11 its current form.

12 Thank you.

13 MR. FINE: Good afternoon,  
14 commissioners. Adrian Scott Fine with  
15 the Los Angeles Conservancy.

16 To date, the Conservancy has not  
17 officially opposed this project, as we're  
18 trying to work with Millennium Partners  
19 to work through some of our concerns, and  
20 we do feel like we're making progress.

21 However, our concerns are to secure  
22 precise safeguards for the historic  
23 resources, regardless of a changing  
24 market, circumstances, or conditions,  
25 changing ownership should that happen in

1 the future, or other factors that will  
2 ultimately determine what is built.

3 To that end and that uncertainty, we  
4 do have a concern about the twenty-two  
5 year period here, and we'd ask for a  
6 reduction to that.

7 Our primary focus has been on the  
8 development regulations. I think we've  
9 resolved several issues along that way,  
10 and we're making some progress. But  
11 there are some outstanding items. A  
12 specific request -- we ask for you all to  
13 impose on this project as a condition is  
14 the required thirty-foot setback  
15 separation between the two-story historic  
16 Hollywood Playhouse, Avalon, and new  
17 construction proposed immediately north  
18 and on the west side of Vine, to ensure  
19 that there's sufficient breathing room  
20 for the lower-scale historic resources  
21 surrounding the project site.

22 The development team is aware of  
23 this request, and has been responsive to  
24 our concerns and we hope to continue to  
25 work with them.

1 Thank you.

2 MS. HEIDEMAN: Good afternoon. I'm  
3 Patty Heideman. I'm a resident, property  
4 owner, taxpayer, registered voter who is  
5 active -- who actively votes each time  
6 around.

7 I -- I'm not representing anyone,  
8 but people like me who live in the  
9 neighborhood and, again, pay my taxes,  
10 I -- I want to say the traffic check, the  
11 safety check, everything that has been  
12 said. I want to question, however, like  
13 others, the nature of this project. It  
14 sounds to me as though the Capitol  
15 Building is being held hostage. That if  
16 we want to see the Capitol Building, we  
17 have to go high. If we don't want to go  
18 high, then we're going to obscure the  
19 Capitol Building.

20 It sounds to me as though we're  
21 being held to a Hobson's choice. It  
22 seems to me there should be another  
23 choice, another development. And I'm not  
24 a lawyer, but I was looking at the  
25 agenda, and I have a question and I don't

1 expect you to answer it. It's just a  
2 question in my mind, and it may be in  
3 other people's mind as well. But the  
4 applicant for item 6 on the agenda of  
5 which we were talking, is also the  
6 applicant for item 7. And if item 7  
7 poses a conflict of interest, how is it  
8 that item 6 does not? As a lay person,  
9 I'm sure a lawyer or someone with a  
10 little bit more savvy in that regard  
11 might have an answer. But as a lay  
12 person looking at the agenda, it looks a  
13 little bit odd to me.

14 I vehemently oppose this project.

15 Thank you.

16 MS. DE MONTE: Well, some visuals --  
17 you had a lot of visuals today.

18 THE CHAIR: You have to speak  
19 directly into the microphone.

20 MS. DE MONTE: I'm sorry. Just to  
21 you for the information here.

22 I am Rosemary De Monte. I am a  
23 resident of Hollywood off and on for over  
24 fifty years. I am talking about this  
25 because the Millennium project is not an

1 island onto itself. It is an  
2 accumulative problem that we're going to  
3 have.

4 All of these -- these different --  
5 the different things are all in the  
6 hopper or are going to be -- are approved  
7 or in the hopper. So that when you're  
8 talking about this 1,459 cars or  
9 something -- that's not exactly the  
10 truth, because right here, where there is  
11 a Franklin and Argyle failed intersection  
12 that cannot be mitigated, is where  
13 everybody is at, that they're building.

14 Now that's -- this all -- all of  
15 these projects represent 6,500 parking  
16 spaces and we know that is not going to  
17 be just 6,500 cars coming into the  
18 neighborhoods. And it's going to be at  
19 least that.

20 Now, also, forget the cars. Out of  
21 sixty-five parking spaces, we also have  
22 tens of thousands of toilets that will be  
23 flushing where none have flushed before.  
24 And it's also with this order that we do  
25 not have enough of now, into a sewer and

1 water treatment infrastructure that does  
2 not work now. And you call this  
3 planning?

4 So I would like to say it also that  
5 the jobs that will be kept -- a lot of  
6 these people I don't think live in Los  
7 Angeles, so that those jobs will come and  
8 go. And the jobs that are going to be  
9 left in this tow -- in these towers, are  
10 going to be jobs that are wonderful. And  
11 I'm not -- I'm happy to have them. But  
12 none of those people will ever be able to  
13 buy any of the condos that are being  
14 built in this city. So that's another  
15 point.

16 Now, also, the towers are going to  
17 be built over an earthquake fault. And  
18 if God forbid the worst scenario happens,  
19 the consequences -- can you live with  
20 those consequences on your -- you know,  
21 on -- with your decision if you do that?

22 And then, the neighborhood council  
23 that is so pro for this, they are over  
24 here. Put those towers in their  
25 neighborhood, and let's see if they would

1           like it. (Indiscernible) says they're  
2           not -- not in my backyard, people at all,  
3           I'm sure. Just us. Us who have it in  
4           our backyard are.

5           And I really do like a lot of what  
6           has -- the Millennium wants to bring to  
7           Hollywood. But I wish, once again, human  
8           scale, and remember, all of this  
9           infrastructure that is not prepared for  
10          all of the these projects, and more that  
11          will be coming because of the Hollywood  
12          Community Plan.

13          Thank you.

14          MS. DODGE: Good afternoon,  
15          commissioners. I'm Marion Dodge,  
16          president of the Hillside Federation,  
17          representing forty homeowners  
18          associations spanning the Santa Monica  
19          mountains.

20          The federation opposes the  
21          Millennium Hollywood project as currently  
22          proposed, because it is out of scale and  
23          character to the recently approved  
24          Hollywood Community Plan. It will cause  
25          an excessive cumulative negative impact



1 on the health, safety, traffic, and  
2 infrastructure of Hollywood and its  
3 neighboring hillside communities.

4 The federation urges the commission  
5 to reconsider the cumulative impacts of a  
6 project of this size in an area that is  
7 already a choke point.

8 We urge the applicant to consider  
9 alternatives with heights of no more than  
10 twenty-five stories and an FAR no greater  
11 than four and a half to one, to  
12 coordinate with the existing buildings in  
13 the historic Hollywood area and reduce  
14 the strain on the neighborhood.

15 Thank you.

16 MR. KESSLER: Good afternoon. My  
17 name is Remi Kessler. I'm a resident of  
18 the Oaks. We are 800 house north of  
19 Franklin, west of Bronson, and east of  
20 Western. We already very concerned with  
21 the access to Hollywood from our  
22 neighborhood, because Franklin has been  
23 almost shut down due to the intersection  
24 of Argyle and Franklin, the access of  
25 101. From what we saw in the report,

1           that access -- the 101, that  
2           intersection, cannot be mitigated. That  
3           means that our neighborhood, we will not  
4           be able to get in, get out, or having the  
5           fireman or the police come in our  
6           neighborhood.

7           We'd like to -- we're not opposed to  
8           the project, but we'd like to have this  
9           commission look for more solutions for  
10          the traffic, and to mitigate the traffic  
11          in our neighborhood.

12          I want to add also one thing.  
13          Promoting mass transit in new  
14          neighborhood is a really good thing, but  
15          traffic is essential to the good health  
16          of Hollywood.

17          Thank you.

18          MR. ZEIGLER: Good afternoon. My  
19          name is Cyd Zeigler. I am a resident of  
20          Nichols Canyon. Been there for a few  
21          years.

22          I want to start by thanking you. I  
23          can't believe that you're all volunteers,  
24          and that you volunteered for this. So I  
25          appreciate that.

1           I also want to thank the Millennium  
2 folks. I mean, their projects are  
3 beautiful, and looking at the  
4 presentation, I want to live in one of  
5 those buildings. I think it looks  
6 beautiful.

7           I think something Tom LaBonge said  
8 is actually the most powerful piece here,  
9 and that is, I want to put my arms around  
10 both sides and find something that works  
11 for both sides. And I think the people  
12 on this side make very valid points.

13           Just one thing that I have not heard  
14 in regards to the height issue, is how  
15 it's going to affect other residents in  
16 the city. And, you know, Runyon Canyon  
17 and Griffith Park and the hiking areas up  
18 there -- this is one of the treasures of  
19 the city, being able to get out of the --  
20 the flats and get up to the hills and see  
21 these vistas. To have these buildings  
22 that are that that high, I -- I think  
23 it's going to affect everybody in the  
24 city. And thousands of people go there  
25 to get away from the city. And to have

1           these right there, blocking the view of  
2           downtown and having people in the flats  
3           blocking the view of the Hollywood sign,  
4           these are some of the treasures of the  
5           city. So I hope you consider that and  
6           find some way to put your arms around  
7           both sides.

8           Thank you.

9           MR. WILLIAMS: Twenty minutes.

10          MR. TUCCI: Hello, commissioners.  
11          Tony Tucci, Hollywood plan community  
12          stakeholder, CD4 stakeholder.

13                 And what an oversight -- no height  
14                 limits for the Hollywood Community Plan.  
15                 So I guess we'll be seeing you guys a lot  
16                 in the future. And -- and what a burden  
17                 to -- to pick a box, maybe the lesser of  
18                 two evils. Did you like the -- the view  
19                 from the skyline, or did you -- did you  
20                 like the -- the view from the street  
21                 corner?

22                 What I really want to ask you guys  
23                 to do, is to please support CEQA and  
24                 define the project. You know, experts  
25                 have questions in the EIR, and if you

1 read a -- a Bloomberg article that came  
2 out today, somebody from the California  
3 Department of Transportation had a  
4 question.

5 But all the versions that I've seen,  
6 they do not mitigate five significant  
7 impacts. So just keep that in mind,  
8 respect CEQA, and if you can't mitigate,  
9 go create. That's my slogan.

10 MR. DURKEE: Good afternoon,  
11 commissioners. My name is Don Durkee.  
12 I'm with the Hollywood Studio District  
13 Neighborhood Council.

14 And I oppose this issue for many  
15 reasons. The traffic is the main one.  
16 And I think you suggested, don't beat the  
17 same drum. But that is what most of us  
18 are -- harms most of us. I live fifteen  
19 blocks, approximately, below the site.  
20 The traffic is horrible now. It's going  
21 to be horrible during construction, and  
22 it's going to be horrible after.

23 And I notice many of the people that  
24 spoke for the project are paid by the  
25 project. Also, I -- I think that people

1           that work on the project are only going  
2           to be there during the project. They're  
3           going to be gone after the project is  
4           completed. There will be personnel that  
5           will stay and work -- work there. But  
6           most of them, the construction workers,  
7           the electrical workers, they'll be out of  
8           there.

9           And the -- the promise of when he  
10          came -- when they came to our PLUM  
11          meeting, each time they said, it would be  
12          bicycle friendly and it would open up,  
13          attract more bicycle riders to the city.  
14          Well, I have a bicycle. I live fifteen  
15          blocks away. Would I go to the gym that  
16          might not be there, or may be there, or  
17          to the hotel, which they're not sure if  
18          it's going to be there? Would I -- would  
19          I ride to the restaurant, which might be  
20          there, or might not be there? I hope  
21          that you'll consider this project and  
22          oppose it.

23                    Thank you.

24                    MS. MULLINS: You're almost  
25                    finished, I think. We're all almost

1 finished.

2 It's been a long day. I almost  
3 forgot my name. I'm Susan Mullins, and  
4 I'm president of the Upper Nichols Canyon  
5 Neighborhood Association. I represent  
6 over 600 residents, 192 kids and still  
7 counting. And many of our neighbors  
8 work, go to Hollywood, their children go  
9 to schools in Hollywood. I myself have  
10 been a thirty-seven-year resident and  
11 worked in Hollywood and in the Hollywood  
12 Hills.

13 So we come to this with a lot of  
14 concern and a sense of interest, even if  
15 we don't live right around the immediate  
16 area.

17 And I was trying to think about what  
18 is it about this project, and so many  
19 people have raised both wonderful reasons  
20 to have it and wonderful reasons to not  
21 have it or to control it. And Mr.  
22 Aarons, who's the co-founder of  
23 Millennium, who prides itself on having  
24 these high-rise skyscraper hotels all  
25 over the country -- he said that this was

1 the right project for Hollywood, because  
2 it is a city, a fantasy, and spectacle.

3 And I kind of bought into that idea  
4 when I saw it. Like my neighbor said,  
5 but, gosh, I could live there.

6 But yet it's not just a city of  
7 spectacle and fantasy. It's a real place  
8 where people live, work, and where the  
9 quality of life is really critically  
10 important. And you've heard all of  
11 those, so I'm not going to reiterate  
12 them. But what I do what to ask of our  
13 Millennium partners and of you and of --  
14 and of those of us who oppose it as it's  
15 conceived, is to really think of this  
16 differently.

17 When we heard -- when Millennium  
18 came to us and made a presentation, they  
19 said it is this or it is a squat building  
20 with -- in which we will have very little  
21 open space. And that just feels like a -  
22 - being put, you know, on a horns of a  
23 dilemma, where there is nowhere to go.

24 And it feels as thought -- and also,  
25 by the way, when we talked about parking



1 and such, they said, we need to be given  
2 all the variances we want, or that's it.  
3 Well, that's, you know, my way or the  
4 highway. And I would urge some creative  
5 thinking where we think about how do we  
6 still have a building that has some  
7 height, whether it's twenty-two, thirty-  
8 eight stories. But also, instead of  
9 having to be squat, we really maintain  
10 that open space that I think is  
11 attractive to everyone. And that's  
12 asking Millennium to consider having  
13 fewer square footage -- fewer square  
14 feet, I guess the word is -- fewer square  
15 feet to use in -- in a way of trying to  
16 find a way to balance the interest of all  
17 the people in Hollywood.

18 So I thank you very much for your  
19 time.

20 MR. MEREDITH: Good afternoon,  
21 commissioners. My name is Tom Meredith.  
22 I have lived in Los Angeles for forty-  
23 eight years, and for the past twenty-five  
24 years, I'm a resident of the Hollywood  
25 Dell, the community that's probably most

1 impacted by the Millennium project.

2 I served tirelessly on the Hollywood  
3 Civic -- Hollywood Dell Civic Association  
4 board, but I don't stop there. I care  
5 very deeply about the neighborhoods  
6 surrounding me and the -- the communities  
7 where my -- myself as well as my fellow  
8 stakeholders live, work, and thrive.

9 So in addition to my work on the  
10 Hollywood Dell Civic Association, I serve  
11 on the boards of both Hollywood Studio  
12 District Neighborhood and Hollywood  
13 United Neighborhood Council.

14 We work tirelessly as volunteers  
15 to -- to really improve city government  
16 responsiveness to local concerns. And  
17 I'm here to speak as a representative of  
18 both those neighborhood councils.

19 Now I'm going to leave all the  
20 issues and concerns about the negative  
21 impact Millennium has on parking and  
22 safety and traffic and height and all  
23 that to my colleagues here, as well as  
24 fellow board members and neighbors and  
25 friends.

1           I just want to go on record, because  
2           there has been some reporting to the  
3           contrary that both Hollywood Studio  
4           District Neighborhood Council and  
5           Hollywood United Neighborhood Council  
6           boards voted non-support of the  
7           Millennium project as proposed. In fact,  
8           Hollywood United Neighborhood Council --  
9           the neighborhood council for which the  
10          project falls within and whose  
11          residents -- whose 19,000 residents are  
12          the community most impacted, unanimously  
13          supported -- voted for non-support. Both  
14          these organizations have been here today  
15          with representatives to offer their  
16          comments and opinions.

17          My final thought I wanted to leave  
18          with the group was I really rebuke the  
19          uninformed comment from the individual on  
20          this side of the room, that that side of  
21          the room is -- not does not want  
22          anything. Nothing could be further from  
23          the truth. We're here for development.  
24          We're here for responsible development.  
25          I appeal to this commission that you

1 follow the lead of Tom LaBonge and Eric  
2 Garcetti and think about it responsibly,  
3 and listen to the community.

4 MR. ZIDE: Good afternoon. My name  
5 is Bill Zide. I'm on the Hollywood  
6 Studio District Neighborhood Council and  
7 on the PLUM committee for that  
8 neighborhood council.

9 We had six hours of consideration  
10 which now seems to pale in comparison to  
11 what you're going through, but six hours.  
12 And we gave it careful thought, and we  
13 considered it, and we chose to vote  
14 against it.

15 We are not anti-development. We're  
16 pro-development. But we're pro  
17 intelligent development -- reasonable,  
18 considered, responsible to the community.

19 Right now, the project as is, is  
20 luxury apartments, or could be. We don't  
21 know; they're not as specific as they  
22 could be. That does not really relate to  
23 Hollywood. It's not really for  
24 Hollywood. It's not really for  
25 Hollywood. They feel if they build it

1           then they will come.

2           But what we should be concerned  
3           about are issues of affordable housing,  
4           of jobs, and this says that it is for  
5           jobs. But most of those jobs will  
6           probably be temporary, non-union, and low  
7           wage. It's not that they're bad jobs,  
8           but that's the reality before us.

9           And, again, an issue that was stated  
10          that you do have to consider is, we are  
11          in a seismic zone. There's not a  
12          question if there will be an earthquake,  
13          but simply when. The worst structure you  
14          can build, according to most people, is a  
15          tall, thin tower. So take that into  
16          consideration, not because it's  
17          architecturally not pleasing. It's not  
18          maybe world class, but it has to be  
19          considered in the reality of where we  
20          live.

21          Another issue -- reality. I worked  
22          for the U.S. Census, as did Tom. Density  
23          went down -- not up, went down in the  
24          last ten years. It will go up, but not  
25          at the rates that seem to be projected.

1 At least that's not how historically it's  
2 been. Occupancy rates were also down.  
3 So the reality is these are the facts  
4 before you. There are numerous  
5 considerations. It's not that we dislike  
6 Millennium and what it's trying to do .  
7 But it needs to be reflective of the  
8 areas it's coming into, and most of the  
9 neighborhood councils with the exception  
10 of one, the one that Laurie is on, voted  
11 against it. So please take heed of what  
12 we're telling you today. And if you  
13 want -- if you think there's no public  
14 consideration in terms of money, take  
15 into account this fact: Each parking lot  
16 that Millennium does not have to build is  
17 worth according to some people,  
18 approximately 20- to 32,000 dollars. At  
19 500 parking spaces, the minimum it's  
20 going to get away with not building, that  
21 translates to I think about fifteen  
22 million dollars. So it's not exactly all  
23 private money if you give it  
24 considerations like these.

25 So please think ahead and take these

1 into consideration. We know it's a  
2 difficult job, and hopefully, we're  
3 coming to the end here.

4 Thank you.

5 MS. (NAME INDISCERNIBLE): Good  
6 afternoon. My name is Nicole  
7 (indiscernible).

8 THE CHAIR: Could you just speak  
9 directly into the mic --

10 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay.

11 THE CHAIR: -- as close as you can  
12 get?

13 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Anyway, I'm a  
14 resident of the Dell, and I'm also on the  
15 HUNC board, although I'm just speaking  
16 for myself.

17 I think that -- well, this gets into  
18 an area that is uncomfortable for me.  
19 I'm not a financier. I'm not a  
20 developer. At any rate, I feel that  
21 potentially there's a much smaller but  
22 equally beautiful and reasonably  
23 profitable project somewhere smaller  
24 in -- inside what is being proposed,  
25 which I'm not sure exactly, but -- and

1 I'm not trying to be rude about it.

2 At any rate, it seems to me from the  
3 bleachers that no one's really trying to  
4 get there, and that upsets me. With all  
5 due respect, I felt that the staffers  
6 seemed almost like advocates for this  
7 project. And I'm not sure how that  
8 that's proper.

9 You know, I don't -- I've been in  
10 lots of meetings with the representatives  
11 of the developer. They're very nice. I  
12 don't ask them questions like, how much  
13 did you pay for this land, and was the  
14 zone too high to begin with? I don't  
15 know we got to this place where  
16 supposedly these options, all of which to  
17 me are much too large, you know, are  
18 nothing, and I don't want nothing. So,  
19 again, I really think there's -- I hope,  
20 I don't know for sure, I hope there's  
21 something really positive that could  
22 come, but I'm -- you know, I can't get  
23 into that. It's not my place, but it is  
24 your place. It's the city's place. You  
25 know, for a world-class city, then it's



1 not rude to ask questions like that.  
2 It's not rude to say, what -- what do we  
3 really want. And then -- and I would  
4 say, as far as, you know, the commission  
5 itself, you know these questions of  
6 conflict of interest are, I think, very  
7 complicated, and I don't know what I  
8 think about them. But I -- I really hope  
9 that you will dig deep and think  
10 independently what do you think is right,  
11 and -- and do that.

12 Thank you.

13 MR. DYER: Hi. My name is Brian  
14 Dyer. I'm a thirty-three-year resident  
15 of Hollywood. I want to thank you all  
16 for not yawning while I talk, since  
17 you've been sitting for so long.

18 My main concerns are, one, is  
19 safety. I'm the one who handed this out  
20 to you earlier. The EIR for both this  
21 project and the Hollywood Community Plan  
22 stated and used a 2000 in the Hollywood  
23 Community Plan and a 2002 report. The  
24 2000 plan was done by Dolan. Dolan was  
25 subsequently hired by the Metro to do a

1 study out at Century City. There he  
2 determined that that fault line was  
3 active and Century City and the subway  
4 station had to be moved. (Indiscernible)  
5 stood behind that decision.

6 The Hollywood Community Plan said,  
7 when it was reported to them, they said  
8 that that was inferred by that report.  
9 Three years after the community plan was  
10 passed, we had earthquake epicentered in  
11 Beverly Hills of 3.3.

12 That western touchdown of the  
13 Hollywood faultline, which runs  
14 underneath Yucca and that is claimed to  
15 run .5 miles -- .4 miles north in the  
16 EIR.

17 I would just like to present this.  
18 This has taken off of Professor Dolan's  
19 field trip that he takes USC students and  
20 he takes other international students  
21 around, from around the world, to show  
22 the Hollywood fault line. This scarp  
23 goes up between Yucca up to Franklin.  
24 It's a fast rise. It's where two plates  
25 were thrust up. That's 246 feet away

1 from the Capitol Records Building.

2 We are sitting on an active fault  
3 line that can trigger the Hollywood  
4 fault. FEMA -- the worst area that FEMA  
5 is looking at nationally is Southern  
6 California for earthquakes. It's not for  
7 hurricanes. It's not for other things.  
8 We have the Hollywood Hills just to the  
9 north of Hollywood. We have four north  
10 and south corridors -- La Brea, Highland,  
11 Cahuenga, Vine -- funneling into the  
12 Caguenga Pass. If anything happens  
13 south, we're doomed. The California  
14 Bureau of Land Mines said if we have a  
15 6.6 or 6.3 earthquake, the Hollywood  
16 Freeway, just where the cat park wants to  
17 be built, will collapse and will not be  
18 useable for three days while they try to  
19 get people out and try to reopen that 101  
20 freeway.

21 So what are we going to do in case  
22 of an emergency when we have  
23 transportation -- as stated before, the  
24 California Department of Transportation  
25 has sent you a letter contesting what it

1 says in the EIR of the -- of the  
2 Millennium project.

3 And the other thing I would like to  
4 say, nowhere in this is planned for  
5 Hollywood Boulevard street closures.  
6 We've had five in the month of March,  
7 including the Academy Awards marathon.  
8 We continually have Hollywood Boulevard  
9 closed to --

10 MR. WILLIAMS: Two minutes.

11 MR. DYER: -- and what does that do  
12 for traffic?

13 Thank you very much for staying  
14 awake.

15 MS. SILLINS: Good afternoon,  
16 commissioners, I want to thank you for  
17 your service. My name is Stacy Sillins,  
18 and I am vice president of the Nichols  
19 Canyon Neighborhood Association.

20 A lot of my friends had to leave,  
21 and a lot of people are on spring break  
22 right now, as you guys know. And a lot  
23 of people wanted to come down and talk  
24 about this.

25 The one thing that I -- there's a

1 lot of say, but I'll just keep it short  
2 so these guys can go. The one thing that  
3 I find disingenuous about a lot of what's  
4 happening is that nobody is against  
5 development. What we really want is  
6 responsible development. And like my  
7 friend Susan said is how can we work  
8 together to find a way to make it so that  
9 we're all happy.

10 I am a New Yorker. I know how to  
11 live in New York. I've taken the subway  
12 home, stopped at the market on my way,  
13 went home, where I've gone back out.  
14 This doesn't really do that. It just  
15 seems that the density will be really  
16 bad.

17 But we need to find a way to make it  
18 happen for everybody. My husband's in a  
19 union. We want jobs. We need a lot of  
20 money coming into Hollywood, so that we  
21 can all stay and be happy.

22 But I really do want to give these  
23 guys time, and thank you.

24 MS. WILLIAMS: Good afternoon, long-  
25 suffering commissioners. I'm Lou

1 Williams, and I live in the neighborhood  
2 just above where the Millennium project  
3 would go in. And I want to say that I,  
4 too, was very impressed by the pictures.  
5 It's like the magical city of Oz. I  
6 could see myself with tinkling glasses on  
7 that observation deck, looking down on  
8 tiny little Hollywood.

9 And then, all of a sudden, it kind  
10 of squished down and it leaned ominously  
11 over the sidewalks. And I woke from my  
12 dream, and I thought, well, they have to  
13 do that. If we can't have them high,  
14 because we need the density, and then I  
15 thought, oh, no, we don't. I have been  
16 beguiled by so many density projects in  
17 the years -- over thirty-two -- that I've  
18 lived in the area, that I see the whole  
19 trajectory.

20 For instance, all over Hollywood,  
21 TrizecHahn had to sell Hollywood Highland  
22 to CIM for a 450-million-dollar loss.  
23 Hollywood Vine has only been able to sell  
24 29 of its 143 condos after three years.

25 I could go on. Hollywood Western,

1 still after ten years, cannot rent the  
2 commercial space directly over the  
3 entrance to the -- to the subway.

4 We see the pollution. We see the  
5 impact on our infrastructure. We see  
6 people moving out, not moving into  
7 Hollywood, and we see traffic --

8 THE CHAIR: Can I suggest that you  
9 allow the final speaker to have thirty  
10 seconds and --

11 MS. WILLIAMS: So, okay. Quickly,  
12 I'm just saying, you look at all of that,  
13 and you say, how do we fix this? Why  
14 don't we build even bigger next time?  
15 Listen, we're not winning from this, but  
16 somebody is winning, and that's what I  
17 wonder why does it keep happening?  
18 There's got to be a winner somewhere, and  
19 it's not the community and it is not the  
20 environment.

21 THE CHAIR: Thank you.

22 MS. WILLIAMS: Thank you.

23 THE CHAIR: The last thirty seconds.

24 MR. NELSON: Hi. I'm Jim Nelson.  
25 I'm an architect and a real estate

1 developer. I'm the president emeritus of  
2 Laurel Canyon Association. I'm a  
3 founding member of Bel Air-Beverly Crest  
4 Neighborhood Council. I'm a thirty-year  
5 member of the Hillside Federation. I  
6 spent fifteen years as the treasurer of  
7 Hollywood Heritage.

8 I have worked on the development of  
9 Hollywood for thirty-three years. I came  
10 here to develop Hollywood.

11 Today is one of the most amazing  
12 things I have ever seen. It's the  
13 rebirth of Hollywood. Everything that  
14 you all said --

15 THE CHAIR: Sir, if you're not on  
16 the microphone, we can't hear you, and  
17 I'm going to --

18 MR. NELSON: -- if we think every --  
19 everything that you all said is true,  
20 this will create jobs. It will create  
21 sales tax. It will create parking  
22 revenue. I know that for a fact. I  
23 built Universal CityWalk.

24 THE CHAIR: Okay.

25 MR. NELSON: 600 dollars it's worth



1 for revenue. Take six percent of that in  
2 the sales tax, the parking tax, all of  
3 that.

4 THE CHAIR: I appreciate the --  
5 time. Unfortunately, I'm going to have -  
6 cut you off --

7 MR. NELSON: Okay. I'm going to  
8 take --

9 THE CHAIR: -- but I do appreciate  
10 the service.

11 MR. NELSON: -- I'm going to beg two  
12 paragraphs.

13 THE CHAIR: I'll give you --

14 MR. NELSON: However --

15 THE CHAIR: I'll give you one  
16 paragraph out of extreme generosity.

17 MR. NELSON: -- however -- however,  
18 this project as currently configured and  
19 designed, is no CityWalk.

20 THE CHAIR: Sir, I'm going to have  
21 to cut you off. I appreciate your time  
22 and effort here.

23 MR. NELSON: Bulky -- bulky --  
24 forbidding --

25 THE CHAIR: I'd like to call. I'm

1           sorry, sir, thank you.

2                   MR. NELSON:  -- bulky, forbidding.

3                   THE CHAIR:  And out of fairness, the  
4 rules have been set.  I really do  
5 appreciate what you have to say, but I'm  
6 going to have to cut you off.  I'm sorry  
7 to have to do that, out of fairness to  
8 the entire body.  But thank you.

9                   I mentioned that there was going to  
10 be folks for general comment -- excuse  
11 me, I don't appreciate that either.

12                   Juan Aguilar submitted a card for  
13 general comment?

14                   Okay, he's not here.

15                   So what I'd like to do is go through  
16 a list of what we have identified  
17 together.

18                   Yes, I need to close the public  
19 hearing and public comment period first.  
20 And then -- which I've just done -- and  
21 now I want to go through a list that I've  
22 been trying to keep a tally, and I  
23 presume that my fellow commissioners have  
24 as well.  So I'll go through what I have.  
25 If there are things that I've missed,

1 please alert me.

2 I'd like to take a five-minute  
3 break, and then call staff back up and  
4 see if we can have you respond to the  
5 list that we have here, and continue with  
6 our own deliberations.

7 Okay? So this is what -- we're not  
8 on break yet. It's not on, for some  
9 reason. Okay. No, we're -- okay? It's  
10 not on.

11 Yeah, it's pushed.

12 Okay. I'm sorry. We're not taking  
13 our break just yet. I want to go through  
14 the list, and then we'll take our break.  
15 So that will give staff some chance if  
16 there's an opportunity for them to  
17 clarify something in the meantime.

18 So, there were several comments  
19 regarding the lack of specificity in  
20 defining the project. And I'd like to  
21 have staff help us to understand their  
22 position relative to kind of an open-  
23 ended possibility relative to what could  
24 occur on the site. So it could be  
25 office, it could be -- so to give some

1 sense of your understanding of defining  
2 the exact project.

3 There were several comments relative  
4 to height, obviously, and removing the D  
5 limitation was something I also saw in  
6 several of the letters. And I want to  
7 state for the record that we did in fact  
8 receive a volume of letters from folks,  
9 and we did have an opportunity to review  
10 them, so people know that.

11 The averaging of the floor area and  
12 increasing the massing to have some sense  
13 of understanding of how that is justified  
14 from staff's point of view.

15 The traffic congestion -- there were  
16 a number of comments relative to traffic  
17 studies, and also to particular  
18 intersections. And I know you went over  
19 some of that, but to clarify now that  
20 you've heard what the comments are  
21 relative to traffic congestion.

22 Related to that, there were some  
23 concerns about emergency access, and I  
24 think that also was a traffic-related  
25 concern. But where, for example, in the

1 EIR is that dealt with, and if  
2 inadequately so, for us to have a  
3 discussion about that.

4 There was mention of parking. And I  
5 think for my own satisfaction, and I  
6 think for my own satisfaction I'd also  
7 like to have the shared and reduced  
8 parking justifications explained a little  
9 more clearly for us. And particularly as  
10 it relates to some of the uses there,  
11 like the fitness club, for example, the  
12 reduction. And if there are  
13 opportunities around traffic demand  
14 management, for parking and for traffic  
15 congestion, if there are some  
16 opportunities there. I think we heard  
17 some from the applicant. I'd like to be  
18 able to explore those options.

19 There were several comments about  
20 noise and light and outdoor venues, and  
21 the roof deck, the upper floors, and the  
22 impact on surrounding communities.

23 There were some comments about --  
24 again, this is sort of related to a  
25 specificity question, but around going

1 forward, if we're going to be approving  
2 alcohol sales, is there opportunity for  
3 the community to engage in that at a  
4 later point. Is that something that  
5 we're giving a blanket approval to? What  
6 exactly are we approving relative to  
7 alcohol?

8 There were questions about the  
9 setback on the Hollywood Playhouse, the  
10 thirty-foot setback. There were also  
11 questions about the community plan, and I  
12 think it would just be helpful for us to  
13 know where the community plan update  
14 stands and how your analysis relates or  
15 doesn't relate to the community plan  
16 update.

17 And there were also questions about  
18 earthquake safety, and how and where  
19 that's analyzed in your report.

20 And there wasn't a discussion of,  
21 but something this commission has had  
22 previous policy-based discussions around,  
23 is proximity to freeway. And so how  
24 close they are to the freeway, relative  
25 to air quality standards and things that

1 we've been concerned about.

2 That is the list that I have. Did I  
3 miss things?

4 MR. LESSIN: Commissioner Lessin.  
5 One of the other things that was  
6 discussed in the applicant's presentation  
7 was a series of community benefits. Hard  
8 for us to keep track, because we were  
9 going very, very quickly. But which one  
10 of those can actually be conditioned and  
11 have a nexus to the project, and which  
12 one are sort of an outside parties'  
13 agreement with them?

14 THE CHAIR: Okay.

15 MR. LESSIN: So if we can hit those,  
16 I'd appreciate it.

17 THE CHAIR: So I think that we --  
18 oh, I'm sorry. Barbara?

19 MS. ROMERO: I just --

20 THE CHAIR: Commissioner Romero.

21 MS. ROMERO: Barbara Romero  
22 speaking. A real -- an understanding on  
23 what's actually going to be, not only  
24 what are -- what's going to be mitigated.  
25 It seems hard to -- there was one

1 appendix that I think lists all the  
2 transportation infrastructure mitigation.  
3 And if you guys can articulate that and  
4 summarize it, I guess, for us. And when  
5 people talked about the key vantage  
6 points that were just elaborating on that  
7 for me, because it looks like the key  
8 vantage points -- yes, just to describe  
9 that and how it relates to the viewshed  
10 and --

11 THE CHAIR: Okay.

12 MS. ROMERO: Thank you.

13 MR. PERLMAN: Commissioner Perlman,  
14 Dana Perlman. That's what you said. It  
15 sounds very (indiscernible) like.

16 Just a couple of points. One, in  
17 your original presentation, you talked  
18 about floor area averaging between the  
19 sites. I have a concern about how the  
20 sites are linked, and perhaps you can  
21 address that to make sure that if we're  
22 doing with floor averaging, if one side  
23 is developed -- another side is sold, how  
24 we are protected. Those sorts of issues.

25 Similarly, with respect to the



1 conditions, and this is both for you and  
2 for the applicant. That the proposed  
3 conditions that the applicant  
4 mentioned -- the community benefit  
5 conditions, how those are tied to both  
6 sites, both locations.

7 There was a mention by the applicant  
8 that there would be no super graphics or  
9 signage, which is very much appreciated.  
10 But also mention of a very large video  
11 screen, and I didn't know what  
12 discussions had been regarding what sort  
13 of content would be on the screen, in  
14 addition to the illuminosity -- I think  
15 it's the right word -- of the screen for  
16 its impact on the neighborhoods.

17 And, finally, one of the speakers  
18 raised a question regarding water  
19 treatment and the additional impact on  
20 the city's existing sewage and water  
21 treatment facilities, and what these two  
22 towers might add in that regard.

23 Thank you.

24 THE CHAIR: And one final -- I think  
25 I'd like us all to also have some

1 clarification about the length of time  
2 for the entitlements. There were several  
3 different time periods that were  
4 suggested in public comment, and I'd like  
5 for the public and us to have assurances  
6 about how long these entitlements run.

7 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: The only  
8 thing left on my list is the Metro passes  
9 and discount parking. And that's one  
10 item that was brought up. I didn't  
11 understand.

12 THE CHAIR: So some of the traffic  
13 demand management opportunities that were  
14 mentioned, I think, by the applicant.  
15 And I think some of -- definitely, in  
16 some of the letters as well that we  
17 received, and what the opportunities are  
18 there. And not --

19 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: And, also,  
20 there's one concern, you know, if you're  
21 building such a huge complex. There's  
22 utilities that needs to be addressed from  
23 the sea water, electricity, and all that  
24 thing, you know. Where that thing will  
25 be incorporated, and how that thing comes

1 into play with it.

2 MS. IBARRA: So is your question to  
3 find additional information about where  
4 the discussion is with respect to  
5 utilities and infrastructure?

6 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes.

7 MS. IBARRA: Okay.

8 THE CHAIR: Commissioner Romero?

9 MS. ROMERO: And I think for me  
10 personally, I wanted to just better  
11 understand the implications in not having  
12 a development agreement, what things  
13 we're actually going to get and not get  
14 now that we won't have a development  
15 agreement. Just in generally.

16 THE CHAIR: So I think one way to  
17 add some clarity to that, is what are the  
18 development restrictions and requirements  
19 that are included with your report that  
20 had nothing to do with the agreement.

21 MS. IBARRA: Okay.

22 MS. ROMERO: Thank you.

23 THE CHAIR: Does that clarify it?

24 MS. ROMERO: Thank you.

25 THE CHAIR: Okay. So I think we

1 have a very voluminous list, and we're  
2 not done yet. So we will take a five-  
3 minute break, and we will return.

4 (Recess)

5 THE CHAIR: We're back.

6 So, Luci, we gave you a voluminous  
7 list, but we have the utmost faith in  
8 your capabilities. So why don't we dive  
9 in. Where would you like to start?

10 MS. IBARRA: Let me start by first  
11 reiterating why the planning department  
12 recommends that this project be approved.

13 The property is located in a very  
14 urban area. It is zoned for high  
15 intensity and high density uses,  
16 consistent with the regional center land  
17 use designation, with the commercial zone  
18 and the height district.

19 This property has historically had  
20 no height limit, and with the  
21 implementation of the CRA's overview  
22 through the redevelopment process, has  
23 allowed historically a four and a half to  
24 one FAR, and up to a six to one FAR  
25 through its own process.

1           That was all captured with the  
2           community plan update. And so with that  
3           and previous cases that have been  
4           approved with an FAR of six to one, we're  
5           recommending approval because it's  
6           similar in location to transit-oriented  
7           development and land-use designation in  
8           its zones.

9           Moving forward, there was a question  
10          with respect to the development  
11          regulations and the land-use equivalency.  
12          Those exhibits were attached to both the  
13          CPC case, the 2008 case with respect to  
14          the entitlements and the site development  
15          of the project before you, as well as a  
16          development agreement that is no longer  
17          on the table.

18          With that said, there's assurances  
19          provided to you in those development  
20          regulations as well as the land-use  
21          equivalency, that have been attached to  
22          CPC 2008-3440, as Exhibit C and D, I  
23          believe.

24          THE CHAIR: And so those -- that  
25          which you're speaking of being attached,

1 are --

2 MS. IBARRA: They're exhibits, and  
3 they're included in the conditions of  
4 approval that the development be  
5 developed in substantial conformants with  
6 those exhibits.

7 THE CHAIR: And they go above and  
8 beyond what are classic design standards  
9 and --

10 MS. IBARRA: It goes above and  
11 beyond, and it's actually much more  
12 restricted than what is allowed based  
13 strictly on what the zone would permit.

14 THE CHAIR: Okay. So we didn't have  
15 to go anywhere outside of what is before  
16 us today in order to have those  
17 assurances.

18 MS. IBARRA: In order to find those,  
19 no. They're attached as exhibits to the  
20 CPC case.

21 Additionally, to address the  
22 ambiguity further, the advisory agency  
23 approved a tract map, as I mentioned  
24 before, that addressed the 492  
25 residential units, the hotel, the

1 restaurant, the retail, and the fitness  
2 club space, as well as the office space.

3 In the event that the applicant  
4 chooses to modify the project, the  
5 condition is that the project still needs  
6 to substantially conform with the  
7 development regulations and the land-use  
8 equivalency. Those are conditions of  
9 that tract approval. In the event that  
10 they want to change that, they have to  
11 follow a tract map modification and  
12 substantiate why it's still in  
13 conformance with those development  
14 regulations and the land-use equivalency.

15 Anything above and beyond that would  
16 trigger an additional or a new CEQA  
17 analysis.

18 THE CHAIR: And to your  
19 understanding, is there any precedent for  
20 something like this? I think the  
21 perception on the part of many of the  
22 public is this is an unprecedented open-  
23 ended kind of possibility here about  
24 could or couldn't get built.

25 MS. IBARRA: Right. Well, so the

1 development regulations give you a set of  
2 objectives and standards that give you  
3 assurances as to what the setbacks would  
4 be, what the height would be, what the  
5 massing of the structures would be,  
6 depending on the scenarios and then the  
7 land uses and the intensity of the land  
8 uses permitted.

9 Now, it's not uncommon for us to  
10 have presented projects to you where  
11 we've imagined that it would be  
12 consistent with the EIR only for the  
13 project applicant to come back or a new  
14 owner to come back with a substantially  
15 smaller project. And that's out of our  
16 realm. They can do that, and that's  
17 allowed.

18 So it's not so different than what  
19 we've experienced in the past, where the  
20 applicant comes back for a different  
21 project on the same site.

22 THE CHAIR: So the EIR captures then  
23 the -- or analyzes the potential impacts  
24 at --

25 MS. IBARRA: Right.



1 THE CHAIR: -- kind of the maximum  
2 build-out at --

3 MS. IBARRA: So what you see in the  
4 development regulations has been analyzed  
5 in the EIR. And the -- right.

6 THE CHAIR: So does everybody have  
7 Exhibit C so you have an understanding of  
8 what the development regulations are,  
9 what's in it? It really goes through an  
10 if -- then -- if this, then that, kind of  
11 scenario.

12 MS. IBARRA: Right. And it's not  
13 different than when we have other  
14 projects and we know we're going to get  
15 built, we say it -- we always say it  
16 substantially conforms to Exhibit A,  
17 which usually refers to a site plan.

18 Generally, there are issues that  
19 come up, so if, you know, a fire hydrant  
20 that modifies a setback or something to  
21 that effect, that you plan for and the  
22 applicant would come back. And if it  
23 triggers a plan approval, it triggers a  
24 plan approval. The triggers track that  
25 modification map. There's a process for

1           that.

2           THE CHAIR: So I think I understand  
3           that relative to some of the design  
4           specifics. What about some of the use  
5           specifics?

6           MS. IBARRA: So the uses are  
7           dictated by the land-use equivalency that  
8           just also attached. So in exchange for  
9           certain uses -- so in the event that they  
10          want to reduce their residential to  
11          increase another portion of the uses,  
12          that is dictated by the calculation  
13          called out for in the land-use  
14          equivalency, which limits them to the  
15          peak hour trips that are highlighted and  
16          service thresholds for the development.

17          THE CHAIR: So the assurance then  
18          that you're offering or that you're kind  
19          of arguing in favor of, is that they  
20          cannot go over particular thresholds that  
21          have been analyzed, irrespective of what  
22          combination of uses ends up in the final  
23          project?

24          MS. IBARRA: Correct. And if they  
25          do, they have to come back and analyze

1           it, correct.

2           UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Can they go  
3 to zero?

4           MS. IBARRA: Excuse me?

5           UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Can they go  
6 to zero? Have no hotels and do all  
7 residential?

8           MS. IBARRA: Yes, they can, so long  
9 as they meet -- so long as they satisfy  
10 the traffic thresholds that are  
11 identified. Although the general plan  
12 limits residential uses, so that in order  
13 to build residential, you have to have at  
14 a minimum a zero and a half to one FAR of  
15 non-residential uses. So there has to be  
16 some --

17          THE CHAIR: So we're not going to  
18 get one hundred percent residential in  
19 any scenario.

20          MS. IBARRA: Correct.

21          Okay.

22          THE CHAIR: Does anybody have any  
23 other questions relative to that?

24          Okay.

25          MS. IBARRA: There was a question

1 with respect to the floor area averaging  
2 and the unified development. So our  
3 recommendation for you was to approve  
4 that. And just to reiterate what's  
5 stated in the code, the code can define a  
6 project as a unified development under  
7 Section 1224W(19), because it is a  
8 combination of functional linkages such  
9 as pedestrian or vehicular connections.  
10 It's characterized by common  
11 architectural and landscape features,  
12 which constitute distinctive design  
13 elements of the development, and is  
14 composed of two or more contiguous  
15 parcels or lots of record separated only  
16 by a whole -- by a street or an alley.  
17 And in this case, the development  
18 regulations provide you that assurance  
19 the project will be developed as a  
20 unified development, that the development  
21 regulations are tied together for both  
22 parcels -- the east and west parcels, and  
23 that the bisection is Vine Street, with  
24 the plazas linking and providing that  
25 midblock connection between the two

1 sites. And for that reason, it allows  
2 for the floor area averaging across the  
3 two parcels, so long as the project is  
4 developed as one, and that's where the  
5 development regulations reinforce that  
6 aspect.

7 THE CHAIR: So can you help me to  
8 understand that relative to some  
9 potential sequencing, and the potential  
10 for kind of alternative owners,  
11 ownership? What is our certainty  
12 relative to that unified developed and  
13 them being tied together?

14 MS. IBARRA: So a lot of the  
15 conditions are contingent on the  
16 effectuation of other conditions. So,  
17 for example, the tract map conditions --  
18 any changes to -- say they develop the  
19 west site, and then they decide that they  
20 can't develop the east site. The  
21 conditions associated with the Qs and the  
22 Ts attached to the parcels are present in  
23 both. So in the event that a new  
24 developer comes or should Millennium not  
25 be able to perform on the second, the Qs

1 and the Ts are still embedded in that  
2 property for the other site.

3 THE CHAIR: Commissioner Perlman,  
4 did you have a question around that?

5 MR. PERLMAN: Yeah, I guess what I  
6 still don't understand is that while the  
7 Qs and Ts are embedded, if there's an  
8 exchange of floor area between the two,  
9 would it -- could a new owner on one  
10 parcel somehow get away from the fact  
11 that they have traded away some of their  
12 floor area to the other parcel?

13 MS. IBARRA: Well, that rules would  
14 make it difficult to sell, right? I  
15 mean, if someone had already used the  
16 majority of their floor area on one, but  
17 that's the due diligence that someone  
18 would have to come in, in order to  
19 perform on that parcel.

20 MR. PERLMAN: So it does -- it runs  
21 with the land and so it would restrict  
22 the subsequent purchaser.

23 MS. IBARRA: The Ts and the Qs run  
24 with the land, correct.

25 MR. PERLMAN: Okay.

1 MS. IBARRA: And if they wanted to  
2 do something entirely different, that's  
3 what -- that's where the project would  
4 return to you, and it's possible.

5 MR. PERLMAN: And, similarly -- if I  
6 could just have one second -- with  
7 respect to the proposed public benefit  
8 conditions, could those also run with the  
9 land so they run with both parcels  
10 evenly?

11 MS. IBARRA: The benefit conditions  
12 can be the condition at your discretion,  
13 so that they can be effectuated at the  
14 issuance of the first building permit  
15 associated with the project. So it's not  
16 specific to either one or both parcels.  
17 It could be the first of any particular  
18 permit associated with that development.

19 MR. PERLMAN: Great. Thank you.

20 MS. IBARRA: Um-hum.

21 THE CHAIR: Other questions relative  
22 to this point?

23 Okay?

24 MS. IBARRA: Moving on to the  
25 conditional use permit for the alcohol

1 sales, there is a condition in here that  
2 speaks to requiring individual vendors  
3 associated with this development to apply  
4 for their separate permits, so that they  
5 can receive site-specific conditions as  
6 it relates to their use before the zoning  
7 administrator.

8 THE CHAIR: So there is an  
9 opportunity then for the public to engage  
10 in a process relative to --

11 MS. IBARRA: Correct. The plan  
12 approval process requires a hearing for  
13 conditional use permits.

14 THE CHAIR: So we are in effect  
15 saying that alcohol can happen, but how  
16 it happens is going to be subject to --

17 MS. IBARRA: The plan approval  
18 process.

19 THE CHAIR: Did you have a question,  
20 Mr. (indiscernible)?

21 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It's fine.

22 THE CHAIR: Okay.

23 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Fine.

24 THE CHAIR: Thank you.

25 MS. IBARRA: As to the length of the



1 entitlements, I know there was some  
2 confusion as the results of the removal  
3 of the development agreement. The  
4 rights -- the time to use the  
5 entitlements is therefore now limited by  
6 what was allowed for in the code, and  
7 that is six years. And it could be  
8 potentially extended further on the tract  
9 map, should they start to file their  
10 final map. And so that would extend  
11 those -- the rights associated with the  
12 vesting tract map.

13 MS. ROMERO: So you're saying it  
14 goes from twenty-two years to six years?

15 MS. IBARRA: It goes to six years,  
16 because the intent of the development  
17 agreement would allow the applicant to  
18 vest those rights for an additional  
19 amount of time in exchange for community  
20 benefits. Now that that is off the  
21 table, they're just what the code allows,  
22 and that's to six years.

23 THE CHAIR: Commissioner Perlman?

24 MR. PERLMAN: I'm sorry. But if  
25 they were to record a map, I thought I

1 heard you say it, then (indiscernible)?

2 MS. IBARRA: Right. If they record  
3 the final map, that gives them additional  
4 time.

5 MR. PERLMAN: How much?

6 MS. IBARRA: They get thirty-six  
7 months with the tentative, and I think  
8 they can -- I know that state law can  
9 sometimes over -- can extend the life of  
10 the final maps, or in the event that  
11 there's economic downturn. So I can't  
12 say what the exact limit is right now,  
13 but I know that the last one was, I think,  
14 six years -- five or six years  
15 additional.

16 MR. PERLMAN: So if you say through  
17 six --

18 MS. ROMERO: So potentially twelve?

19 MR. PERLMAN: -- it could be twelve?

20 MS. ROMERO: Potentially twelve?

21 MS. IBARRA: Potentially twelve.

22 MR. PERLMAN: Okay, thank you.

23 THE CHAIR: And relative to that,  
24 although I didn't mention it, I did see  
25 in a number of the letters that we

1 received on the record, there were  
2 questions about the timing of the tract  
3 approval and the advisory agency's  
4 determination preceding our deliberations  
5 on this, and some questions about whether  
6 that was the legitimate kind of  
7 sequencing of the process. Can you just  
8 speak to that so I understand what the  
9 objection might have been --

10 MS. IBARRA: Right.

11 THE CHAIR: -- and why you did not  
12 think it was --

13 MS. IBARRA: The advisory agency  
14 indicated at the hearing on the 19th that  
15 it moved, or was inclined to approve the  
16 tract map. And it did, with its decision  
17 which was rendered at the 22nd. That  
18 tract was conditioned to include  
19 provisions that the project be developed  
20 in substantial conformance with the CPC  
21 case before you, and it also referenced  
22 at that time the development agreement.  
23 We embedded the development regulations  
24 in the land-use equivalency, because we  
25 thought that was important to both of

1           those CPC cases. In the event one did  
2           not go through, we would still be able to  
3           capture it in the other.

4           So the tract map did include  
5           references to the development regulations  
6           and the land-use equivalency program in  
7           both CPC cases.

8           The advisory agency's findings were  
9           based on the subdivision map act, which  
10          typically requires that the advisory  
11          agency find consistency with the general  
12          plan and the zone and the land-use  
13          designation, along with the  
14          characteristics of the development of the  
15          project in the surrounding community.  
16          And it chose to approve it, based on  
17          those findings.

18          THE CHAIR: And so it doesn't -- as  
19          was implicated, I think, in some of the  
20          letters, it doesn't presume our decision?

21          MS. IBARRA: No, it's subject to  
22          your approval.

23          THE CHAIR: Okay. I thought if I  
24          could walk away, but I can't.

25          Okay. Let's go to the next issue

1           then, yeah.

2           MS. IBARRA: We've asked that the  
3           applicant speak more to the technical  
4           issues with their consultant, the traffic  
5           consultant. DOT was not able to continue  
6           to stay here for the remainder of the day  
7           on this hearing, and so we've asked that  
8           the traffic consultant come forward to  
9           speak to your issues with respect to the  
10          mitigation measures. And I understand  
11          that the applicant itself would like to  
12          add additional measures associated with  
13          the traffic demand and the traffic  
14          mobility conditions of the project, to  
15          beef up that portion. We believe there's  
16          a nexus for that, and I think they wanted  
17          to speak to that on the record. And so  
18          while we're having the traffic consultant  
19          address the traffic-related issues, maybe  
20          they can do that simultaneously and  
21          answer your concerns.

22          THE CHAIR: And if we can ask you to  
23          come back after they presented that --

24          MS. IBARRA: Of course.

25          THE CHAIR: -- to get your sense

1 about that. So if somebody from the  
2 applicant team can come up and --

3 MR. LESSIN: But --

4 THE CHAIR: -- speak to -- oh,  
5 sorry, Commissioner Lessin.

6 MR. LESSIN: Commissioner Lessin.  
7 Luci, one more thing. As we go through  
8 this with the traffic consultant, things  
9 that you agree with, that you can part of  
10 your recommendation. If you can sort of  
11 keep track of those --

12 MS. IBARRA: Okay.

13 MR. LESSIN: -- so that we don't  
14 have to redo this at the end?

15 MS. IBARRA: Okay, sure.

16 MR. LESSIN: Okay, thank you.

17 MR. NEUMAN: Members of the  
18 commission, Jerry Neuman, representing  
19 Millennium Partners, here with -- I have  
20 with me the traffic consultant from Crain  
21 & Associates, to discuss some of the  
22 questions that you have raised relative  
23 to our traffic analysis and how that was  
24 performed. And I wanted to add some  
25 light on some of the questions relating

1 to our traffic impacts, as well as  
2 provide some of the additional TDM --  
3 traffic demand management plans that we  
4 have requested to be included as part of  
5 our community benefits.

6 First, I'd like to walk you through  
7 the various studied intersections that  
8 were included as studied intersections  
9 within the EIR, and note to you a couple  
10 of things that I think are important for  
11 your deliberations.

12 In the thirty-seven intersections  
13 that were studied, ultimately there were  
14 five that were deemed to be unmitigated  
15 as -- or have a significant impact prior  
16 to mitigations of the project.

17 THE CHAIR: Yeah, I think we're  
18 trying to avoid blocking the view of  
19 folks, so we can see it there.

20 MR. NEUMAN: Okay.

21 THE CHAIR: That's perfect. Thank  
22 you.

23 MR. NEUMAN: After the project to  
24 the six-to-one FAR was established and  
25 mitigations applied, the number of

1 unmitigated intersections went down to  
2 two intersections. And in fact, we do  
3 have two intersections -- one at Cahuenga  
4 and Franklin, and one at Vine and  
5 Hollywood -- that are continuing to be  
6 unmitigated, mostly due to the fact that  
7 they are highly trafficked intersections  
8 to begin with.

9 THE CHAIR: Can you repeat what  
10 those two were again?

11 MR. NEUMAN: Those two were Cahuenga  
12 and Franklin, and Vine and Hollywood.

13 MR. PERLMAN: Excuse me. Can you  
14 identify what the other three were that  
15 were removed, and maybe can you explain  
16 how they were removed with the increased  
17 (indiscernible)?

18 MR. NEUMAN: When mitigations were  
19 applied? I'll ask the traffic engineer  
20 to come up and walk you through those  
21 three intersections and what specific  
22 mitigations were applied.

23 MR. PERLMAN: Okay, thank you.

24 MR. NEUMAN: I do think it's  
25 important to note that as we studied a



1 project of less density of four and a  
2 half to one FAR, the number of  
3 unmitigated, significantly impacted  
4 intersections were three. So from that  
5 perspective, at our mitigation, we are  
6 still below the number of impacted  
7 intersections.

8 Now there could be applied  
9 intersections -- applied mitigations to  
10 those as well, which we think may bring  
11 it down to one. So really at the end of  
12 the day, it was a difference of one  
13 intersection by virtue of getting the  
14 additional density around transit, which  
15 we feel is very important.

16 From a traffic demand management  
17 standpoint -- oh wait, before -- do we  
18 have those -- that information? The  
19 three intersections that were mitigated?

20 MS. SHEA: For ongoing visual  
21 conditions?

22 MR. NEUMAN: Yeah, your name?

23 MS. SHEA: Oh, sorry. My name is  
24 Helen Shea (ph.). I'm a traffic engineer  
25 working on this project. The three

1 mitigated intersections for under  
2 existing conditions is Argyle Avenue and  
3 the Franklin Avenue at freeway northbound  
4 on ramp. And the second one is Cahuenga  
5 Boulevard and the Hollywood Boulevard.  
6 And then the third mitigated impacts are  
7 at Vine Street and the Sunset Boulevard.

8 THE CHAIR: And so the first one,  
9 Argyle and Franklin, is the one that was  
10 mentioned, I think, in public comment  
11 relative to the freeway on ramp?

12 MS. SHEA: I -- yes, we have  
13 proposed physical improvements at that  
14 intersection. So it's the northbound and  
15 two left-turn lane, and the one right-  
16 hand lane, and the southbound, one left  
17 to through, and the one right-turn lane.  
18 And then we're also going to do some  
19 signal upgrade.

20 Besides that, for overall  
21 mitigation, we have TDM plan, we have  
22 Hollywood area alternative mode lane  
23 transfer funds (ph.), we have signal  
24 system upgrades to the whole area, which  
25 is the funding to DOT. Then they go

1           decide which part is better for the  
2           signal upgrade.

3           And also we have signals that -- I'm  
4           sorry, intersections (indiscernible)  
5           improvements just as I mentioned for that  
6           intersection.

7           THE CHAIR: All right. So just -- I  
8           mean, for our own edification, this is in  
9           the kind of analysis that was provided  
10          for us relative to the EIR and the  
11          mitigation sections. These are all  
12          things that are listed for us on the  
13          mitigations.

14          MS. SHEA: It is.

15          MR. PERLMAN: If I could -- excuse  
16          me, Commissioner Perlman. In reviewing  
17          the mitigation information that was  
18          provided, it seems to me, and correct me  
19          if I'm wrong, that one of the mitigations  
20          is relying upon the new community plan  
21          which modifies some of the highway  
22          classes. In other words, expecting  
23          someone else is going to be widening some  
24          of the roads. Of the three mitigated  
25          intersections -- or the mitigations that

1           you did to calculate on those three  
2           intersections -- Argyle and Franklin,  
3           Cahuenga and Hollywood, Vine and Sunset.  
4           Are those all as a result of improvements  
5           or investments that are being done by the  
6           applicant, or by someone else?

7           MS. SHEA: The applicant.

8           MR. PERLMAN: They are. Okay.

9           MS. SHEA: Yeah.

10          MR. PERLMAN: Thank you.

11          MR. NEUMAN: Again, Chairwoman --

12          THE CHAIR: You wanted to clarify  
13          the TDM?

14          MR. NEUMAN: -- yeah, well,  
15          Chairwoman, just again relative to the  
16          specific question Argyle and Franklin, we  
17          have provided mitigation measures at that  
18          specific site intersection, which has  
19          reduced it below significant level. That  
20          said, in working with the community and  
21          having discussions with the community, we  
22          continue to try to look at that  
23          intersection to see if we can move it  
24          beyond the mitigation that we have done,  
25          and are in discussions with Caltrans on

1 additional improvements that might be  
2 able to take place there as a community  
3 gesture more than anything else. And we  
4 think that there are additional work that  
5 we can do directly with Caltrans on that,  
6 so we will continue to work on that.

7 And to the extent that you feel that  
8 it's necessary to have a condition  
9 requesting us to continue that work,  
10 happy to have it. Because while we think  
11 it's not -- we've already mitigated the  
12 intersection. It's not a direct  
13 mitigation, but it is an important aspect  
14 for people within the hills -- that live  
15 up in the Hills, that they want to know  
16 the safety of that area.

17 MS. ROMERO: Great. And so that  
18 means it's nexus (ph.), so it can be  
19 included as a condition?

20 MS. KHORASANEE: Adrienne  
21 Khorasanee, city attorney's office. Yes,  
22 for any of the additional conditions that  
23 are about to be discussed, you'll need to  
24 do the same analysis, does it have a  
25 nexus. And I'm thinking that as we go

1 through them, and as you start to decide  
2 which entitlements you want to condition  
3 and what conditions you want to impose,  
4 staff can assist with making those nexus  
5 findings where there are none.

6 Obviously, those will be unenforced  
7 voluntary conditions.

8 THE CHAIR: Okay. So we want Luci  
9 to comment on the ability for us to make  
10 the findings relative to that nexus,  
11 particular about working with Caltrans  
12 and that intersection?

13 MR. NEUMAN: Relative to the traffic  
14 demand management specific items, they  
15 were included in my initial remarks, all  
16 of our TDM requests. If you want me to  
17 go back through those at a slightly  
18 slower pace, I'm happy to do that.

19 THE CHAIR: I think I have a list of  
20 them. And so maybe if I go through the  
21 list, and if we have questions about them  
22 in specific and we might to then put that  
23 forward to staff relative to again this  
24 finding a nexus question. The list that  
25 I generated relative to that was a

1           circulation shuttle?

2           MR. NEUMAN: Yes.

3           THE CHAIR: So that is shuttling  
4 between where and where, and the amount?

5           MR. NEUMAN: That is an on-demand  
6 shuttle or on-call shuttle that will be  
7 available to bring people that will go up  
8 into the Hills to provide residential  
9 community -- people within the  
10 residential community a shuttle service  
11 to come down to Hollywood Boulevard to  
12 either enjoy the Hollywood Boulevard  
13 area, or to go specifically to our  
14 project. For instance, if they wanted to  
15 have a monthly pass and park there, we  
16 would have a shuttle that would bring  
17 them down to their car so they did not  
18 have to keep their car up in the Hills.

19           So it's an on-demand shuttle, first,  
20 and then, second, it is a shuttle that  
21 takes people within the greater Hollywood  
22 area, basically bounded, as I understand  
23 it, by Western, La Brea, Santa Monica,  
24 and Franklin, or the Hills.

25           THE CHAIR: And the idea here

1 relative to nexus and findings, I presume  
2 is that this helps us about this traffic  
3 issue, as well?

4 MR. NEUMAN: Yeah, we believe  
5 there's a nexus to the -- and I think  
6 it's important when the applicant says  
7 that there's a nexus, that helps in your  
8 findings. We believe there's a nexus,  
9 because to avoid general congestion in  
10 the area and to promote the idea of  
11 better circulation, both for our project  
12 and the community, this is an important  
13 element that allows that to happen.

14 THE CHAIR: And the figure that I  
15 heard I thought was 250,000, relative to  
16 that. Is that something that happens  
17 annually? How does --

18 MR. NEUMAN: The 250,000-dollar per  
19 year operational cap. We believe --

20 THE CHAIR: Cap.

21 MR. NEUMAN: -- it's the cap.

22 THE CHAIR: For the circulation  
23 shuttle provision, so it's up to that  
24 amount?

25 MR. NEUMAN: Up to 250,000 dollars.



1           It's an up-to amount. We've priced it,  
2           and we think that's what the general cost  
3           is to run the shuttle from that area.

4           THE CHAIR: There was also some  
5           discussion of bicycle amenities,  
6           something this commission has been  
7           particularly interested in. I know  
8           there's skepticism about whether bikes  
9           are really going to take over our  
10          streets, but I think that we want to  
11          facilitate that happening, should it. So  
12          can you speak to the bicycle amenities  
13          plans that you have?

14          MR. NEUMAN: We have a number of  
15          bicycle amenity plans. As you note from  
16          a nexus standpoint, the staff  
17          demonstrated the biking area that flows  
18          through Hollywood and adjacent to our  
19          project. We want to participate in  
20          people wanting to have easier living, if  
21          you will, through biking, both from a  
22          health standpoint and from the mobility  
23          standpoint. And from that perspective,  
24          we are providing bike stations, bike  
25          areas. We are also providing a minimum

1 of at least a 200-square-foot bicycle  
2 repair service kiosk that will be  
3 guaranteed for fifteen years. There will  
4 be additional space for bike facilities  
5 in -- in a bike, so that there's pads  
6 that people can utilize to repair their  
7 own bikes. And we will have equipment  
8 for people to utilize or have free access  
9 to -- to use to repair the bikes  
10 themselves. We'll have bike facilities  
11 within -- bike storage facilities within  
12 the area, bike garage-type elements. And  
13 that is part of our design standards.

14 MR. PERLMAN: Oh, can I ask --

15 THE CHAIR: Mr. Perlman?

16 MR. PERLMAN: I'm sorry.

17 THE CHAIR: That's okay.

18 MR. PERLMAN: We'd also like to see  
19 a commitment that should there be a local  
20 vendor providing shared biking like they  
21 do in some other cities, that you would  
22 agree to --

23 MR. NEUMAN: We absolutely agree to  
24 that.

25 MR. PERLMAN: -- set up parking?

1 MR. NEUMAN: It's something we  
2 promoted in other projects, and we love  
3 that idea. Much like we like the Zipcar  
4 which --

5 MR. PERLMAN: Exactly.

6 MR. NEUMAN: -- I think Commissioner  
7 Freer is going to get to in a minute.

8 MR. PERLMAN: Great, thank you.

9 THE CHAIR: Okay? I also heard from  
10 discussion about linkages to the public  
11 transit that exists currently. Can you  
12 speak to --

13 MR. NEUMAN: Yeah, there was a  
14 number of items related to linkages, and  
15 for the most part, there are a number of  
16 transit areas that exist from the bus to  
17 the Metro station. And there are certain  
18 pedestrian pathways that are currently  
19 traveled, and we will be creating  
20 additional pedestrian pathways as you saw  
21 by the through areas that we've  
22 guaranteed for the project.

23 For that, we have committed to  
24 install directional pedestrian route  
25 signs, signage showing pedestrian routes

1 to all public transportation points  
2 within a four-block radius of the project  
3 from a walkability standpoint. We will  
4 additionally provide 10,000 dollars to  
5 the Department of Transportation for the  
6 installation of directional signage at  
7 the DASH access point nearest the  
8 project, and 25,000 dollars for Metro  
9 directional signage for pedestrian routes  
10 between public transportation access  
11 points and the project.

12 THE CHAIR: And so the idea here is  
13 to provide a little bit more foundation  
14 for folks to be able to use the public  
15 transit coming to and from your  
16 development, but others who are coming in  
17 the surrounding areas as well.

18 MR. NEUMAN: Correct. From within  
19 our development and from without, we  
20 think it's important that people  
21 understand and have access to where  
22 transportation linkages are. And that as  
23 part of that, it promotes greater  
24 mobility from our project as well as  
25 people to our project.

1 THE CHAIR: Okay. And is that --  
2 when you indicated those two numbers,  
3 some others you've talked about as caps,  
4 is that -- that's a flat provision?

5 MR. NEUMAN: It's a feat (ph.) for  
6 the payment of the creation of the  
7 signage.

8 THE CHAIR: Okay. And there was  
9 something that I didn't quite understand,  
10 but a parking tracking system -- is that  
11 like an app? Can you explain what that  
12 is?

13 MR. NEUMAN: There are -- there's a  
14 number of elements to it. One, it's a  
15 50,000-dollar contribution for the  
16 Department of Transportation's Express  
17 Park program, and that's part of their  
18 new meter technology. And what that does  
19 is it provides a central management  
20 system for real-time guidance to folks to  
21 identify where parking is available. Our  
22 parking structure will participate in  
23 that, and it will also be available for  
24 other parking within the area. And so  
25 the idea has always been that you

1           consolidate into a central system all the  
2           parking within a geographic area, in this  
3           case Hollywood, and that people as they  
4           come into the area can easily identify  
5           where parking is. You can either do  
6           it -- a parking availability when you  
7           leave as part of a computer program, or  
8           there's an app that's being developed for  
9           it.

10           THE CHAIR: So I had some of it  
11           right. You also mentioned something  
12           about the Metro connections and Vine  
13           Street, but I didn't quite understand  
14           that.

15           MR. NEUMAN: The -- when the Vine  
16           Metro station along with Hollywood and  
17           Highland -- so Vine and Hollywood Metro  
18           station and Hollywood and Highland Metro  
19           station, were created, there was only one  
20           portal created for those stations. And  
21           in our case, the closest one -- almost  
22           half -- not even a half block away -- is  
23           the Metro access portal at Hollywood and  
24           Vine. But it exists at the southeast  
25           corner of Hollywood and Vine.

1 Metro also created what they call  
2 knockout panels within their system that  
3 allows access to other corners. But  
4 there's been an undefined either cost or  
5 mechanism by which one can access those  
6 entry points. What we are proposing is  
7 that we provide a study which shows how  
8 much it would cost, and where those  
9 access points are and how they can best  
10 be developed to gain additional access  
11 into the Metro system.

12 THE CHAIR: Is that not something  
13 that Metro would have already studied?

14 MR. NEUMAN: One would believe that  
15 they have. In the event that they don't,  
16 which we have asked them for, we are  
17 happy to help with that.

18 THE CHAIR: Okay.

19 Yes, Commissioner Perlman?

20 MR. PERLMAN: Assuming that there is  
21 a study, or if there isn't and you  
22 conduct a study, what commitment is the  
23 developer prepared to make to actually  
24 construct the portal?

25 MR. NEUMAN: Unfortunately, as we

1 understand where the portals are, they  
2 don't exist on any property that we own,  
3 so our ability to construct them or even  
4 to cause the construction of them, is  
5 very minimal. But our ability to help  
6 you identify those opportunities for when  
7 new development happens, is significant.  
8 So --

9 MR. PERLMAN: What about  
10 contributing to the construction?

11 MR. NEUMAN: We don't even know  
12 their defined amount yet. I mean, so if  
13 there's a question as to that, certainly,  
14 we can consider it. But at this point,  
15 we have no idea whether it's a large  
16 number, small number, and what  
17 participation we would have to have. And  
18 given the nexus in terms of -- it's  
19 really it's not on our property, that's a  
20 little bit more difficult for us to  
21 reach, too.

22 MR. PERLMAN: Well, I understand.  
23 Neither is the DASH area or where you're  
24 giving 25,000 to Metro for signage at  
25 Metro, it's a way to facilitate the



1 actual construction of the portal so that  
2 more people will be able to access the  
3 Metro system, including, hopefully,  
4 tenants who might be enjoying your  
5 property.

6 MR. NEUMAN: So if -- let me just --  
7 I'm trying to think this through from  
8 that standpoint. A part of our issue is,  
9 one, we would never control the  
10 construction, so to have a condition on a  
11 matter that we don't control because  
12 Metro does, and neither do you control  
13 that, is all in the -- I'm sorry, it's  
14 all in the hands --

15 THE CHAIR: I thought we controlled  
16 it all.

17 MR. NEUMAN: -- with all due  
18 respect, it is in the hands of another  
19 agency. I'm not exactly sure where I  
20 would, one, make that donation, if you  
21 will, or that contribution. And I'm not  
22 sure if and when it could be held and  
23 happen for a period of time, and who  
24 would utilize it. So what we do control  
25 is our ability to identify the

1 opportunities and your ability to impose  
2 that opportunity on people that own the  
3 property, if they want to do it, or  
4 request it from Metro. So I'm just  
5 trying to -- if we can figure out a  
6 mechanism to make it work --

7 MR. PERLMAN: Well, let -- I'd love  
8 to hear what Luci has to say about this.  
9 You know, one of the things that we  
10 struggle with in the city -- we've heard  
11 a number of people talk about that there  
12 is not enough access to the Metro system,  
13 and it's not expanded enough in large  
14 part because there's insufficient  
15 resources. So if additional resources  
16 can be dedicated to that future use, that  
17 might be something of interest.

18 MS. IBARRA: The limitation we have  
19 with respect to the Metro portal is that  
20 you have the Hollywood Walk of Fame that  
21 might be impacted by any construction,  
22 and you also have private property along  
23 Hollywood Boulevard -- that section of  
24 Hollywood Boulevard and that portion of  
25 Vine Street, where we don't have the

1 property owners' consent or current even  
2 awareness of that even being an issue.  
3 And so what you can do as part of the  
4 condition with respect to this portal, is  
5 express that this study analyzing any  
6 mitigation or necessary environmental  
7 analysis, and that it expands the  
8 potential cooperation of these property  
9 owners with respect to maybe  
10 encroachments or something to that effect  
11 into their property.

12 But that wasn't analyzed in the EIR,  
13 so it would be difficult at this time to  
14 kind of require that that be conditioned  
15 on the project at this point.

16 THE CHAIR: So you're concurring  
17 that the opportunity is limited to a  
18 study?

19 MS. IBARRA: Right. and you can  
20 expand that study to include additional  
21 analysis with respect to any impacts with  
22 respect -- you know, traffic noise,  
23 construction, relative to the Metro  
24 portal study.

25 MR. PERLMAN: Okay.

1 THE CHAIR: Okay?

2 MR. PERLMAN: All right. Thank you.

3 THE CHAIR: Something else that the  
4 commission in other cases has been  
5 interested in is the provision of Metro  
6 passes. I thought I heard something  
7 relative to that, as well. Again, this  
8 is in the direction of trying to get  
9 folks out of cars and onto transit.

10 MR. NEUMAN: Indeed, you did hear  
11 that. We had committed to provide an  
12 area for our residents to acquire Metro  
13 passes, and that for our tenants and  
14 their employees, we will purchase at a  
15 minimum of a hundred Metro passes -- we  
16 will purchase a hundred Metro passes to  
17 be provided to our tenants and their  
18 employees, as well as the residents.

19 THE CHAIR: Is that a one-time  
20 hundred?

21 MR. NEUMAN: No, on an ongoing  
22 basis. It will be a condition that we  
23 will maintain and want reviewed as an  
24 annual program for -- we'll go -- we've  
25 been fifteen years. We would accept it

1 as a fifteen-year condition.

2 MS. ROMERO: Can I ask if you can  
3 specify a commitment for the residents?  
4 Because you're specifying for your  
5 employees, but I don't -- is it a  
6 discounted rate or is it a free pass --  
7 Metro pass?

8 MR. NEUMAN: We're providing a  
9 hundred free passes. Now --

10 MS. ROMERO: For employees, or for  
11 residents and employees?

12 MR. NEUMAN: Residents and  
13 employees.

14 MS. ROMERO: Okay, so it's a hundred  
15 for --

16 MR. NEUMAN: A hundred free passes.  
17 If you want to ask us to do it for a  
18 specific group, we're happy to do that.

19 MS. ROMERO: I was just want -- I'm  
20 trying to get a sense of it was combined  
21 a hundred for both groups --

22 MR. NEUMAN: Yeah.

23 MS. ROMERO: -- or if there was a  
24 separate -- if there was one specific  
25 number for your employees and one number

1 for residents, too. Because that's what  
2 I heard from residents is that in order  
3 to utilize this, they're going to have to  
4 drive down to the Metro.

5 MR. NEUMAN: Although we have  
6 residents.

7 THE CHAIR: Yeah, I thought --  
8 that's my supposition --

9 MR. NEUMAN: They're for our  
10 residents.

11 THE CHAIR: -- was this resident was  
12 speaking to residents within the --

13 MS. ROMERO: Within the --

14 THE CHAIR: There was some other  
15 things that you were talking about  
16 relative to --

17 MS. ROMERO: Neighboring --

18 THE CHAIR: -- commuters.

19 MR. NEUMAN: Those will come up.

20 THE CHAIR: That I think was a  
21 separate --

22 MS. ROMERO: -- that's separate.

23 MR. NEUMAN: That will come up in  
24 the next one.

25 THE CHAIR: Yeah, I don't think that

1 was about -- but --

2 MS. ROMERO: I think it's a -- I  
3 mean, I think that alleviates some of the  
4 traffic congestion. I'm just wondering  
5 if that's something worth considering.

6 MR. NEUMAN: So making those passes  
7 available to a broader community, is that  
8 the question?

9 MS. ROMERO: Yeah, like, for  
10 example, when I lived in Toluca Lake, you  
11 know, part of the homeowners group -- if  
12 you paid into the fee, then you got  
13 twelve parking passes for Universal, and  
14 you only used -- you know, everybody got  
15 them if you paid part of it. So it was  
16 an incentive for us to go to Universal,  
17 because there was a pass, but you had to  
18 be part of the -- the association. I  
19 don't know if it --

20 MR. NEUMAN: Well, then let me make  
21 a -- I'm going to offer a suggestion  
22 given the next item that I think you're  
23 going to cover. We have offered ten  
24 parking spaces for, in effect, a Park &  
25 Ride at a discounted rate.

1 MS. ROMERO: Okay.

2 MR. NEUMAN: Right?

3 MS. ROMERO: That might --

4 MR. NEUMAN: At a ten percent  
5 discounted rate. We could take ten of  
6 the hundred and also link that to a free  
7 Metro pass for people who take advantage  
8 of that Park & Ride. So that Park & Ride  
9 not only comes with the -- that parking  
10 space not only comes with a discounted  
11 parking space, but it also comes with a  
12 free Metro pass. So ten of the Metro  
13 passes get assigned there, and there will  
14 be ninety others for employees and  
15 residents of ours.

16 MS. ROMERO: And residents of your  
17 actual --

18 MR. NEUMAN: Of our actual project.  
19 Would that --

20 MS. KHORASANEE: Adrienne  
21 Khorasanee, city attorney's office. I  
22 just will (ph.) interrupt to remind you  
23 that when you're looking at the nexus and  
24 you're looking how to link these  
25 conditions to the entitlements --



1 MS. ROMERO: Yes.

2 MS. KHORASANEE: -- you need to look  
3 at the impacts that the development has  
4 and -- so in this case, you know, tying  
5 it to a broader community, we're looking  
6 to mitigate the traffic impacts of  
7 increased trips because you're got more  
8 residents, you've got more employees.  
9 You know, I fear that we might be going a  
10 bit afield of that, so just --

11 THE CHAIR: My -- my kind of own  
12 opinion about that, and I'm sure there  
13 are others who have them, is that part of  
14 where this discussion was initiated was  
15 in discussion of the unmitigatable  
16 intersections.

17 MS. KHORASANEE: Sure.

18 THE CHAIR: And that this is an  
19 opportunity to potentially get folks onto  
20 transit, such as those intersections  
21 would be --

22 MS. IBARRA: Exactly.

23 MS. KHORASANEE: But in light of the  
24 analysis, the reason they're  
25 unmitigatable is because of the existence

1 of this development and not people who  
2 are already there, separate from this  
3 development. So I'm just tying it back  
4 to why this development is having the  
5 impact on the environment, and how to  
6 mitigate those impacts.

7 THE CHAIR: Fellow commissioners?

8 MR. PERLMAN: Dana Perlman. I'd  
9 have to respectfully disagree with the  
10 city attorney. I do think that it says  
11 this can help to mitigate the impact on  
12 the traffic of this project by reducing  
13 additional vehicular traffic on the  
14 roads. Whether it's through an offered  
15 condition of discounted parking for ride  
16 sharing, or anything of that nature, I  
17 think it will have a lower impact on the  
18 overall number of cars, which we're  
19 looking at the trip count. Which is the  
20 trip count which adds to existing  
21 traffic, so if we can --

22 MS. KHORASANEE: But, again, the  
23 CEQA is predicated on the impacts on the  
24 environment by this project. So --

25 MR. PERLMAN: Um-hum.

1 MS. KHORASANEE: -- it's -- if you  
2 imagine that you're looking at impacts  
3 with this project not existing, that's  
4 not germane. With this project what  
5 impacts does it have, how to mitigate it.

6 MS. ROMERO: So if there's going to  
7 be a development, there's going to be  
8 more traffic going in, you know, into the  
9 Argyle -- you know, to the Franklin -  
10 Argyle northbound 101. So the people who  
11 live up, who are coming down, are going  
12 to be impacted, because now you're adding  
13 more traffic. If you're taking -- trying  
14 to encourage taking people off, you know,  
15 in using the shuttle and encouraging them  
16 to use the Metro with these -- I just  
17 don't understand how it doesn't -- it  
18 impacts their --

19 THE CHAIR: Commissioner Lessin?

20 MR. LESSIN: Yeah, it's just another  
21 country heard from. I'm much more  
22 comfortable with the residents, and if  
23 it's split between residents and  
24 employees there. They're the ones that  
25 we really are trying to get onto the

1 transit. They live, they transit, they  
2 don't need a car. I think that has a  
3 bigger impact than any of these other  
4 things that we're discussing.

5 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: And I think  
6 that's a clear nexus.

7 THE CHAIR: I think something else  
8 that we might want to --

9 MR. NEUMAN: If can offer a nexus?

10 THE CHAIR: Yes, please.

11 MS. KHORASANEE: Thank you.

12 MR. NEUMAN: Part of the reason --

13 THE CHAIR: And I want to hear from  
14 Luci, too. I think you might have  
15 something to say about this, but -- go  
16 ahead.

17 MR. PERLMAN: She stood up.

18 MR. NEUMAN: Part of the reason for  
19 the discounted rate in parking is because  
20 we are providing community amenities, and  
21 so we are bringing people down into our  
22 project and that is part of our traffic  
23 analysis of people coming to our project  
24 to utilize the community amenities. From  
25 our perspective, if that is part of the

1 impact, also providing them ability to  
2 then go elsewhere and not promote  
3 additional impact on the streets, creates  
4 the nexus for us, and that's why we think  
5 it's appropriate.

6 THE CHAIR: I think I'm convinced by  
7 that analysis, but --

8 MS. IBARRA: Right. I think it's a  
9 policy in general that we're trying to  
10 incentivize residents to take advantage  
11 of their proximity to Metro and major  
12 transit centers. To that end, we've  
13 conditioned the project so that the  
14 parking, with respect to residential  
15 units, be sold and/or leased separately  
16 from the unit. We can condition this to  
17 prioritize that these passes be given to  
18 those residents who choose to forego the  
19 parking component associated with the  
20 sale or lease. We believe it's in the  
21 best interest of the project in  
22 furthering transit-oriented development  
23 if we incentivize residents to take  
24 advantage of this provision as is  
25 associated with the development. And,

1 also, this has been vetted by DOT, and  
2 they're comfortable with this.

3 THE CHAIR: Yeah. I think the rub  
4 is coming when we're talking about two  
5 different resident populations, and I  
6 think that everybody here is comfortable  
7 relative to the residents of the project.  
8 The rub is coming with residents who are  
9 not living in the project, but are  
10 approximate to the development. And I  
11 think we've of two minds relative to  
12 that.

13 MR. NEUMAN: So we would again  
14 suggest that ninety -- as I think as Luci  
15 just described, ninety of the passes be  
16 reserved for residents who take advantage  
17 of the disconnected (sic) parking program  
18 and don't actually acquire parking  
19 spaces, and ten of them be used for those  
20 folks who are coming to utilize the  
21 benefits of their project and then from  
22 there go to other places.

23 MS. ROMERO: And I thought in your  
24 presentation, or someone's presentation,  
25 you alluded to zip codes -- some zip

1 codes.

2 THE CHAIR: I think the next --

3 MR. NEUMAN: The next.

4 THE CHAIR: -- item, I think, is  
5 that I had on my list. Did you want to  
6 continue on this subject, please?

7 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I have a  
8 question that probably doesn't impact,  
9 but I'm interested in knowing. The  
10 passes are they something that the  
11 resident comes and gets daily?

12 MR. NEUMAN: No, it's a monthly  
13 pass.

14 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: They're a  
15 monthly pass.

16 MR. NEUMAN: It's a Metro pass.

17 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: So they may  
18 or may not be using it, but just getting  
19 a monthly pass.

20 MR. NEUMAN: Presumably, if they are  
21 not -- I think that the linkage that Luci  
22 described is a great one, because if they  
23 have chosen not to have a car --

24 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: right.

25 MR. NEUMAN: -- it's a good idea for

1           them to have a Metro pass.

2                   UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER:   Okay.   All  
3           right.

4                   THE CHAIR:   So I also heard  
5           something relative to -- excuse me,  
6           monthly parking leases?   And I think  
7           that's the item that's related to  
8           residents who are proximate?   Is that  
9           correct?

10                   MR. NEUMAN:   That's what we --  
11           again, that was the linkage that I just  
12           made.   We agree to have ten --

13                   THE CHAIR:   Okay.

14                   MR. NEUMAN:   -- spaces --

15                   THE CHAIR:   Got it.

16                   MR. NEUMAN:   -- put aside so that  
17           people that are not within the project or  
18           are outside the project that want to come  
19           to use the project benefits, maintain a  
20           car on the project and have a lease of  
21           the space at a ten percent discount, and  
22           also providing additional incentive for  
23           that to happen of having that Metro pass  
24           connected.

25                   THE CHAIR:   Got it.   So can you



1 speak then to the one relative to the zip  
2 codes?

3 MR. NEUMAN: We've offered two  
4 additional discounted parking ideas,  
5 where we have prov -- people who come and  
6 want to use the Metro can come back with  
7 a Metro pass and have used the public  
8 parking that is available. We would give  
9 them a ten percent discount on parking.  
10 So if you've taken a Metro, you come  
11 back -- you've parked the car, shopped at  
12 our place, then taken the Metro down to  
13 Hollywood and Highland and come back, and  
14 you can show you have a Metro card and  
15 we'll give you a ten percent discount on  
16 your parking. That's item number one.

17 Item number 2 is local area  
18 residents who want to take advantage and  
19 are not participating in those parking  
20 spaces -- those ten parking spaces, but  
21 yet want to use the services that we  
22 provide, whether it be the health club or  
23 any of the retail facilities, that they  
24 will also have a ten percent discount if  
25 they show ID that they live within --

1           there were two zip codes, and I'm sorry.  
2           I'm not remembering them at the moment.  
3           But I will give those to staff.

4           THE CHAIR: Okay. And so the idea  
5           there relative to this question of nexus  
6           is --

7           MR. NEUMAN: That, again, those are  
8           trying to incentivize people to utilize  
9           both transit and area and our facilities  
10          as part of their shopping experience and  
11          maintaining their residency in Hollywood,  
12          so that they're not going offsite and  
13          utilizing the roads.

14          THE CHAIR: Got it. Okay. So I  
15          think that --

16          UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Is that a  
17          good thing or a bad thing?

18          THE CHAIR: Help me to understand  
19          your perspective.

20          UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah.

21          THE CHAIR: Commissioner  
22          Hovaguimian.

23          MR. HOVAGUIMIAN: Is that a good  
24          thing or a bad thing, because --

25          MR. NEUMAN: I'm sorry?

1 MR. HUVAGUIMIAN: Is that a good  
2 thing or it's a bad thing, because we're  
3 just increasing more traffic to the  
4 project? You know, by incentivizing  
5 people to come in and park there. So  
6 you're creating more cars to come in and  
7 you're creating more traffic. And how  
8 that will affect those junctions, you  
9 know, that will -- will be traffic when  
10 you're incentivizing more people.

11 MS. KHORASANEE: Adrienne  
12 Khorasanee, city attorney's office.  
13 Maybe if I can articulate the nexus  
14 differently, that I'm seeing here, is  
15 that by virtue of the fact that this is  
16 going to be a shopping destination, it is  
17 attracting people to the site anyway.  
18 And, so, offsetting the traffic and  
19 mitigating the traffic impact, is  
20 providing those people that are coming,  
21 because it exists, with a means to use  
22 Metro and encouraging them to use transit  
23 at a discounted rate.

24 Is that right -- would that be  
25 jibing with what your purpose is?

1 MR. NEUMAN: That works with a --

2 THE CHAIR: The idea is if they're  
3 going somewhere else and they get on  
4 Metro, they're going to receive a  
5 discount on their parking at the original  
6 destination.

7 MR. HUVAGUIMIAN: But you're  
8 increasing the traffic at this location.

9 MS. IBARRA: I think the  
10 assumption --

11 THE CHAIR: The assumption is  
12 they're going to be going somewhere else  
13 in their car.

14 MS. IBARRA: -- based on what has  
15 been said --

16 THE CHAIR: In a car.

17 MS. KHORASANEE: In a car.

18 MR. HUVAGUIMIAN: And you're not  
19 invite -- you know, he can go and park  
20 somewhere else in Hollywood, and take the  
21 Metro. Now you're bringing it to your  
22 property to take the Metro.

23 MR. NEUMAN: We are very --

24 MR. HUVAGUIMIAN: You're increasing  
25 here.

1 MR. NEUMAN: -- we're proximate to  
2 the freeways and to a lot of transit  
3 areas, and because of our proximity to  
4 the Metro station, I think what you've  
5 described is the ability for people to  
6 park and then have direct access, is  
7 appropriate. So --

8 MR. HUVAGUIMIAN: It's good for your  
9 business, but I don't know if it's good  
10 for the traffic.

11 MS. IBARRA: Just to reiterate, I  
12 have a concern with this one as well. I  
13 think if they're not using transit, they  
14 shouldn't take advantage of this discount  
15 here. The project is in proximity  
16 enough. I think if you can identify a  
17 nexus with adjacent apartments that maybe  
18 don't have parking and they'd like to  
19 lease one, I think that can be satisfied  
20 with the Metro commuters and the  
21 shared -- the monthly parking leases that  
22 are available to local area residents.

23 THE CHAIR: Okay, so that I think in  
24 your response to that, then I may have  
25 confused myself about what this was

1 actually achieving. I thought this was  
2 about people who parked there and used  
3 transit to go somewhere else, that there  
4 was -- there were two different ones?

5 MS. IBARRA: Right, there's two  
6 different ones. And so we would recommend  
7 that you just keep the ones for Metro  
8 commuters, and that's good. That will  
9 address concerns about promoting transit  
10 use and also providing that discount to  
11 those users that actually use the Metro.

12 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: So the second  
13 one was purely a discount for folks --

14 MS. IBARRA: It's just a discount  
15 for people who live in the area and park  
16 there, and I --I wouldn't --

17 MR. LESSIN: And that can be their  
18 own business issue.

19 MS. IBARRA: Correct.

20 MR. LESSIN: Sorry, Commissioner  
21 Lessin.

22 THE CHAIR: Okay. I think that was  
23 what I heard from the TDM possibilities  
24 that were offered. Is there something  
25 that I missed?

1 MR. NEUMAN: Yeah, there were two  
2 other ones that I think are important.  
3 The last one was the zip -- actually,  
4 just really one, the Zipcar one, where we  
5 offered to have ten parking spaces within  
6 the non-residential area reserved for  
7 Zipcar or something like Zipcar, where it  
8 would be a temporary utilization of a  
9 car, and we would make sure that that is  
10 operational or not and functional with a  
11 company that will operate it.

12 THE CHAIR: Okay.

13 MR. NEUMAN: We would also suggest  
14 in that, that that be subject to an  
15 annual review, just so that we can  
16 demonstrate its success.

17 MR. PERLMAN: This is Commissioner  
18 Perlman. I had a note that there was  
19 something about the study for median on  
20 Vine Street.

21 MR. NEUMAN: Yeah. Whether  
22 that's -- I didn't go back. When I said  
23 two and then I only did one, it's because  
24 as I looked at the median that was really  
25 an aesthetic issue from our standpoint.

1           The community had requested that the --  
2           we study the idea of a median. I think  
3           both from aesthetic standpoint and a  
4           traffic calming standpoint, so we were  
5           going to offer up that. We think it's  
6           important that that median be studied.  
7           Whether we do that as a traffic demand  
8           management condition or as a sense of  
9           aesthetic and the connectivity -- you  
10          know, create a better connectivity or a  
11          life connectivity, to answer your  
12          question about unified developments, so  
13          that as you walk across the street. It's  
14          irrelevant to us, but it's something that  
15          we have offered to the community, and  
16          that they have asked for, and that is the  
17          study of whether medians would be a good  
18          idea on Vine Street.

19                 THE CHAIR: So I think we'd want to  
20                 get Luci to weigh in on whether or not  
21                 this -- the median on Vine, offers TDM  
22                 opportunities, or is it more about  
23                 aesthetics?

24                 MS. IBARRA: You know, I understand  
25                 that this is something that the community



1 has wanted, but it's not something that  
2 I'm aware that DOT has vetted. And so I  
3 can't speak to whether or not it's  
4 appropriate to condition as it relates to  
5 this site.

6 THE CHAIR: Commissioner Perlman?

7 MR. PERLMAN: Could I make a  
8 suggestion then that perhaps the  
9 condition be that the applicant would  
10 work with LADOT on a study for a median  
11 and proceed in accordance with LADOT's  
12 conclusions regarding such median?

13 MS. IBARRA: Right, and so the  
14 language can be similar to that for the  
15 Metro portal, and that it would include  
16 analysis of any mitigation or --

17 MR. PERLMAN: Exactly.

18 MS. IBARRA: -- environmental  
19 impacts associated. Okay.

20 THE CHAIR: Okay.

21 MR. NEUMAN: That would conclude the  
22 traffic demand management portion. As I  
23 suggest, there are other additional  
24 community benefits that we were going to  
25 talk about. And at some point after

1 staff has done going through your issues,  
2 we'd like to address those.

3 THE CHAIR: All right. Thank you.

4 Luci, I think we're ready to  
5 continue going through our list. I don't  
6 know where we stood with that.

7 MR. FRAIJO: Good afternoon,  
8 commissioners. My name is Alfred Fraijo.  
9 I'm a land use attorney, Sheppard Mullin,  
10 representing the applicant.

11 We have a couple of items that you  
12 raised that we wanted to ask some of our  
13 CEQA consultants to answer, in  
14 particular, the shade and shadow issue  
15 that was raised -- noise and light issue,  
16 rather. And so we have someone that can  
17 speak to that point.

18 THE CHAIR: Okay. And I want,  
19 then -- Luci, you're comfortable with  
20 coming back to help us to understand what  
21 their responses are and what our kind of  
22 obligations are or aren't potentially  
23 with that? So this is relative to  
24 obviously, this has something to do with  
25 height, if it's shade and shadow. But,

1 also, I think you said something about  
2 relative to noise, is that correct?

3 MR. FRAIJO: Yes, that's correct.  
4 That was the item that was raised and  
5 it's an area of study in the CEQA  
6 document, so we wanted to just briefly  
7 summarize that and address any potential  
8 questions.

9 THE CHAIR: Thank you.

10 MR. PARKER: Good afternoon. My  
11 name is Shane Parker. I'm with Parker  
12 Environmental.

13 Just responding on -- first on the  
14 aesthetics question, there was a question  
15 about light and glare with regard to  
16 signage. I believe that was the question  
17 asked of us.

18 The draft EIR has as a performance  
19 measure part of the project description,  
20 the design standards that provide very  
21 specific metrics for foot-candles and  
22 lumens to be -- to ensure that we don't  
23 have spillover lighting into the  
24 community.

25 So those metrics are within the

1 design guidelines, the development  
2 standards, and they can be enforced  
3 through site plan review and they can  
4 enforced through the operation life of  
5 the project.

6 With respect to -- to noise, if you  
7 can just remind me what the specific  
8 question was on the noise?

9 THE CHAIR: I think it was about --  
10 well, there were some in letters relative  
11 to construction, but there was some  
12 questions about the observation decks and  
13 the noise relative to the surrounding  
14 community from uses that were going to be  
15 occurring in outdoor spaces.

16 MR. PARKER: Right. Again, the  
17 design standards have mitigation -- well,  
18 design features to mitigate noise --  
19 plexiglass barriers on -- on podiums, and  
20 setbacks from podiums. But, in general,  
21 we assess the noise environment in the  
22 area to be generally above the standards  
23 recommended in the general plan, so we  
24 had excessive ambient noise levels  
25 already existing within the area.

1           THE CHAIR: And, so, let's translate  
2           that into a little bit more English. I  
3           suspect what that means is that the noise  
4           that is already generated by uses that  
5           are in the area is at such a level that  
6           this is not going to --

7           MR. PARKER: Right. It would not --  
8           it would not exceed -- the project's  
9           operational noise volumes would not  
10          exceed the ambient noise levels in the  
11          area. And to the extent that we  
12          evaluated the positioning of A-Trak  
13          equipment, we have performance-based  
14          measures again to make sure that we can  
15          measure the noise after the fact to make  
16          sure that they are clearly not audible at  
17          offsite uses. And that -- that, too,  
18          would go for outdoor -- outdoor event  
19          areas.

20          THE CHAIR: Yeah, my sense from  
21          hearing from the community and reading in  
22          their letters, that there was the most  
23          concern -- there was concern about  
24          construction noise, but there was also  
25          concern about the uses that would be

1 associated with those outdoor  
2 activities -- that are amenities that are  
3 going to be provided, I think, by the --

4 MR. PARKER: Music --

5 THE CHAIR: -- music, amplification,  
6 et cetera. And so, those were analyzed?

7 MR. PARKER: They were, and with  
8 respect to that, we looked at the  
9 podiums, and we looked at the position of  
10 the towers. And in a lot of cases, the  
11 positioning of the towers would provide a  
12 buffer between the residential uses,  
13 especially to the north of the project  
14 site. Because the podiums were on the  
15 south side, and the towers were oriented  
16 to the north.

17 THE CHAIR: Okay.

18 Luci, did you want to speak to that?

19 Thank you.

20 MS. IBARRA: Luci Ibarra, with the  
21 planning department.

22 Just to remind you that this project  
23 is located in Hollywood, maybe one  
24 blocks, two blocks south at most from the  
25 U.S. 101 freeway. It is in proximity to

1 a lot of live music and entertainment  
2 venues, so there is a lot of ambient  
3 noise already within the project area.

4 The EIR did analyze this, and  
5 determined that the significant impacts  
6 are with respect to construction noise.  
7 Again, any outdoor -- the outdoor  
8 restaurants serving alcohol and things of  
9 that nature would be going through the  
10 plan approval process. And so additional  
11 mitigations or conditions can be imposed  
12 for each individual use as it comes  
13 before the zoning administrator, as it  
14 deems appropriate.

15 THE CHAIR: And how are noise kind  
16 of issues relative to these types of  
17 uses, generally dealt with from at the ZA  
18 level?

19 MS. IBARRA: At the ZA level, they  
20 consider security, lighting. They  
21 consider, you know, the floor plan, the  
22 location of the bar with respect to the  
23 patio and the entrances and things of  
24 that nature. And it's all based on --  
25 they have to provide a floor plan when

1 they submit their application, and it  
2 gets vetted through the plan approval  
3 process, which requires a hearing.

4 THE CHAIR: And what about uses in  
5 the plaza? There was something that  
6 suggested there were going to be  
7 performances, et cetera, in the plaza.

8 MS. IBARRA: Right. So if you  
9 recall the plaza, between the west and  
10 the east site, are within the project.  
11 So they're bordered on both sides by  
12 physical improvements, either existing or  
13 proposed. And so those would be -- the  
14 sound would be for the most part  
15 maintained within that plaza area.

16 THE CHAIR: Are there any questions  
17 relative to this?

18 Can you say a little bit about how  
19 construction noise is going to be  
20 mitigated and tempered?

21 MS. IBARRA: There are standard  
22 construction-related and mitigation  
23 measures that are included in the EIR.  
24 And these are also ones that are vetted  
25 by building and safety, and the grading



1 division and the zoning division. And  
2 there's a mitigation monitoring plan that  
3 requires that these mitigation measures  
4 be implemented, and they're going to be  
5 regularly monitored by our building and  
6 safety department as an ongoing basis  
7 during construction.

8 And these are -- the EIR  
9 acknowledges that there is going to be  
10 significant potential impacts with  
11 respect to construction noise as a result  
12 of this project. It acknowledges that  
13 irrespective of the amount of mitigation  
14 that you impose, these impacts are going  
15 to be present. But the mitigation  
16 measures that are in there, are the most  
17 possible, feasible mitigation measures  
18 that are available to address these kinds  
19 of impacts.

20 But your statement of overriding  
21 considerations when you certify the --  
22 recommend to certify the EIR, will speak  
23 to the benefits that outweigh these  
24 impacts.

25 THE CHAIR: Okay. Are there any

1 questions relative to that?

2 MS. IBARRA: And while we're on the  
3 mitigation measures and the impacts to  
4 services, I just wanted to state that the  
5 EIR did -- the EIR when it's circulated  
6 is sent to all of our agencies -- DWP,  
7 fire, police, building and safety grading  
8 and zoning. It's also sent to -- during  
9 the EIR processes as well, during the  
10 tract map review process. So we get  
11 conditions from them in addition to the  
12 recommended mitigation measures. So  
13 after implementation of the mitigation  
14 measures, then with the conditions that  
15 were imposed in the tracts as well as in  
16 the Ts that are associated with the CPC  
17 case, it was determined that there would  
18 be less than significant impacts with  
19 respect to schools, libraries, police,  
20 and fire, wastewater, and, I believe, in  
21 the water -- water supply. And so those  
22 were determined to be less than  
23 significant.

24 And I know there was a concern about  
25 that. But the agencies did review the

1 project based on the scope of the EIR,  
2 and that's what was determined.

3 THE CHAIR: So were there some kind  
4 of determination, for example, that from  
5 the fire department, that the additions  
6 of this was going to make their response  
7 times kind of impossible? That's that  
8 something that they would have called out  
9 at that point?

10 MS. IBARRA: I can ask my staff if  
11 there's an actual response, but if it  
12 was -- it was determined less than  
13 significant, and it was included in the  
14 environmental and the fire department  
15 reviewed that, then that was based on  
16 their decision or their response to what  
17 the draft EIR concluded.

18 And, in addition, I just want to  
19 state that their conditions with respect  
20 to the tract did include those provisions  
21 that the distance between the public  
22 right of way and the door in terms of  
23 access for emergency purposes, those are  
24 included in the conditions.

25 THE CHAIR: Okay. What were the --

1 we're looking at a --

2 MR. NEUMAN: This --

3 THE CHAIR: -- list of the fire  
4 stations?

5 MR. NEUMAN: Jerry Neuman, yeah. I  
6 meant Jerry Neuman, vice president for --  
7 in terms of the fire department's  
8 analysis, they identified the  
9 distribution of their fire stations,  
10 which you're seeing here on the map, and  
11 is also contained in the environmental  
12 document. And that distribution shows  
13 that they have sufficient capacity within  
14 that area to not diminish their response  
15 times. And that was --

16 THE CHAIR: I just wanted to clarify  
17 that they had in fact reviewed this.  
18 That was the point at which they would  
19 have kind of signaled --

20 MS. IBARRA: Right.

21 THE CHAIR: -- some challenge. They  
22 didn't --

23 MS. IBARRA: Correct.

24 THE CHAIR: -- through the EIR.

25 MR. HOVAGUIMIAN: You know, I think

1 this --

2 THE CHAIR: Commissioner  
3 Hovaguimian.

4 MR. HOVAGUIMIAN: -- George  
5 Hovaguimian. I think the response was  
6 right. The question was the access to  
7 it, not the availability of the fire  
8 station, but the access to the project.  
9 That was the concern.

10 THE CHAIR: So relative to traffic  
11 and some of the other things that we were  
12 talking about, about the traffic demand  
13 management then, or addressing that  
14 nexus, I think?

15 MR. HOVAGUIMIAN: Okay.

16 THE CHAIR: I mean, I think that's  
17 the hope that we have here. Not that,  
18 we're, you know, predetermining what the  
19 outcome -- we're going to have some  
20 discussion about all of this. But --

21 MR. NEUMAN: As I -- as we  
22 understand their --

23 THE CHAIR: Jerry.

24 MR. NEUMAN: Jerry Neuman, I'm  
25 sorry. Jerry Neuman. As we understand

1           their analysis, part of the reason why  
2           the distribution is important because it  
3           shows multiple access points and multiple  
4           resources. And then within the  
5           Environmental Impact Report, it  
6           identifies specific numbers of trucks and  
7           resources within each area that in the  
8           event of an emergency, they have -- they  
9           can pull from a variety of different  
10          areas to maintain response time.

11           THE CHAIR: Thank you.

12           So I'm just checking in to see where  
13          we are relative to the list.

14           MS. IBARRA: If I can just speak to  
15          the earthquake-related issue?

16           THE CHAIR: Please.

17           MS. IBARRA: The project was vetted  
18          by the Department of Building and Safety  
19          Grading Division. They did require  
20          additional analysis of the project, and  
21          the applicant did perform that. The  
22          building and safety department  
23          conditioned this grading, I should say --  
24          the building and safety grading division  
25          of the department conditioned this to

1           require additional boring, because the  
2           existing car rental business on the  
3           project site, they couldn't bore on that  
4           particular parcel, because there was a  
5           functioning business and they couldn't  
6           interrupt their services.

7           So, building and safety for the  
8           first part agreed that there was no  
9           reason for concern. The project itself  
10          is located outside of the fault study  
11          zone, but they reserved their full  
12          approval of the project on that analysis  
13          because they wanted to wait until the car  
14          rental services -- there's an Enterprise  
15          rental service on that property -- to  
16          just complete the boring, just to be  
17          comprehensive prior to their building  
18          permit issuance.

19          THE CHAIR: So there's a potential  
20          that they could be not satisfied by  
21          what's found through that process?

22          MS. IBARRA: The way that they  
23          conditioned it was that it's conditioned  
24          on these three things, and it's all  
25          related to boring on that particular

1 parcel. And that's the only thing  
2 prevents the project from moving forward.  
3 But that of course would have to go  
4 building and safety at their  
5 satisfaction.

6 THE CHAIR: Okay. So they have, to  
7 their satisfaction as a part of our --

8 MS. IBARRA: It's conditioned in the  
9 tracts --

10 THE CHAIR: -- decision.

11 MS. IBARRA: -- and it's included in  
12 the Ts.

13 THE CHAIR: Okay. Where do you  
14 stand with your list, Luci? Mine is a  
15 jumble.

16 MS. IBARRA: My list is like this.  
17 There's no order to it.

18 THE CHAIR: So mine looks like it,  
19 as well. I know there were some issues  
20 relative to the thirty-foot setback at  
21 the Hollywood Playhouse, the freeway  
22 adjacency, the community space.

23 MS. IBARRA: Right. And our Sergio  
24 Ibarra had additional measures he wanted  
25 to include in the development regulations



1 to further inform the development of this  
2 site with respect to the triangulation to  
3 maintain views of Capitol Records, and  
4 I'll have him come up here to speak to  
5 that.

6 THE CHAIR: So this is relative to  
7 some of the height and view concerns that  
8 were expressed?

9 MR. IBARRA: Sergio Ibarra, planning  
10 department. So we have four recommended  
11 changes to the development regulations.

12 The first one being that the  
13 development regulations shall be amended  
14 to require an observation area or viewing  
15 deck accessible to the public for all  
16 buildings that include a hotel component.  
17 And that would be Section 8.4 of the  
18 development regulations.

19 The second would be that Section  
20 8.2.2 through 8.2.5 shall be amended to  
21 reference the correct figures as follows:  
22 Figures 6.1.2(a)1-2 through 6.1.2(d)-2,  
23 shall become figures 8.1.1, 8.1.2, 8.1.3,  
24 and 8.1.4.

25 THE CHAIR: Now I know what it

1 sounds like when I call cases, with all  
2 the letters and numbers. Can we try that  
3 one more time, and then can you tell me  
4 what that really is?

5 MR. IBARRA: These figures are  
6 reference to open space diagrams that I  
7 presented, that show the forty-degree  
8 angle. And it's just an error that was  
9 done in development regulations. They  
10 referenced the wrong tables, and we're  
11 correcting that error so that the  
12 development regulations show that they  
13 have to abide by the forty-degree angle  
14 that they can't develop on, to preserve  
15 views.

16 And speaking to that Section 8.2  
17 grade level open space standard, shall  
18 include the following language: That the  
19 open space for the project shall be  
20 developed to figures 8.1.1, 8.1.2, 8.1.3,  
21 and 8.1.4, whereby open space cannot be  
22 developed north of the forty-degree  
23 demarcation line shown in each diagram in  
24 order to preserve key vantage points of  
25 Capital Records.

1           So, as of now, these diagrams are in  
2           the development regulations, but there is  
3           no written language that says they shall  
4           develop according to these diagrams. So  
5           we just want to clarify --

6           THE CHAIR: Okay. So this gives us  
7           assurance that what we were looking at  
8           relative to the angles to the Capitol --

9           MR. IBARRA: Right.

10          THE CHAIR: -- Records Building, are  
11          in fact preserved, and preserved and  
12          attached to the correct exhibits, as --

13          MR. IBARRA: Exactly. That's  
14          exactly right.

15          THE CHAIR: Thank you.

16          MR. IBARRA: And the final one would  
17          be that Section 10.4.1 of the development  
18          regulations shall be amended to read as  
19          follows: Bicycle parking shall be  
20          provided per ordinance number 180386,  
21          which is the recent bicycle ordinance  
22          that was passed.

23          THE CHAIR: Yes. Commissioner  
24          Perlman?

25          MR. PERLMAN: Sergio, I'm not sure

1 if this is directed to you or Luci. Two  
2 things -- one was I had a question  
3 before, perhaps you can help address. A  
4 gentleman -- the engineer addressed it  
5 regarding the restrictions on the sign as  
6 far as the lighting brightness of it, the  
7 sign that's in the public space down  
8 below. But there was no comment on what  
9 sort of restriction there is as far as  
10 content, whether it can be advertising  
11 for anything offsite?

12 THE CHAIR: So I think maybe one way  
13 to deal with this is a broader  
14 conversation about sign regulations and  
15 what is or isn't kind of included.

16 MR. PERLMAN: I was going to go to  
17 that for my next one, from the signage --

18 THE CHAIR: I think this would  
19 probably be included in that.

20 MR. AARONS: Phil Aarons, could I  
21 maybe address the issue?

22 MR. PERLMAN: Sure.

23 MR. AARONS: I believe the  
24 conversation is about one of the public  
25 areas where we suggested there would be a

1 video screen. The video screen is not  
2 meant to be a commercial sign. It won't  
3 be used as a commercial sign in any way.  
4 It's meant to be part of the future arts  
5 programming for the public plazas. It  
6 will be lit and no differently than the  
7 screen -- for, as you can see, this was  
8 the occasion for showing the Hollywood  
9 movie, Chinatown.

10 But from our perspective, there will  
11 be no excessive light, no commercial use,  
12 and no sound.

13 MR. PERLMAN: Okay.

14 MR. AARONS: The sound will flow  
15 completely through Wi-fi and available  
16 only to people and available only to  
17 people through their smartphones and  
18 headsets. It's part of the sort of  
19 social networking that we're trying to  
20 bring to this plaza.

21 MR. PERLMAN: Great. So you're  
22 comfortable with the restriction that  
23 there would be no commercial use for the  
24 video screen?

25 MR. AARONS: I am.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER:

Commissioners, (indiscernible) Grozani,  
(ph.), of (indiscernible). As you know,  
we have a long history of time, place,  
manner restrictions that can be upheld.  
And I think that for us to condition  
content here would be inappropriate.

But I do want to just turn to staff  
and ensure this is part of the one  
percent art or the arts development?

MR. AARONS: No, it's simply part of  
the voluntary programming of the public  
open spaces for use for arts programming.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay.

MR. AARONS: But's not a  
requirement.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: So it's  
separate from what would go to cultural  
affairs.

MR. AARONS: Absolutely.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay.  
Because cultural affairs will have their  
own --

MR. AARONS: Yes.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: --

1 limitations that they'll impose on those  
2 projects, but here again, time, place,  
3 manner is appropriate, content would not  
4 be. I think that, you know, if you're --

5 MR. PERLMAN: I'm thinking back to  
6 another project that was recently before  
7 us, where we were able to put a  
8 limitation on advertising for any sort of  
9 offsite usage.

10 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Which project  
11 was that?

12 THE CHAIR: Universal.

13 MR. PERLMAN: It's Universal.

14 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Offsite. Was  
15 there any sign district?

16 THE CHAIR: I mean, the thing is, it  
17 could have been commerc -- I think we  
18 have to be wary how far down that path we  
19 go, because it could then be --

20 Because we don't have a sign  
21 district here.

22 THE CHAIR: -- onsite.

23 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We have a  
24 different animal here.

25 MR. PERLMAN: Okay. Well, then, let

1 me go to the next thing while we're at  
2 this, although it does appear that in the  
3 development rights, there is -- there's  
4 supposed to be a supplemental use  
5 district? No, this is -- this is subject  
6 to the Hollywood sign. It's supplemental  
7 use district. There's a reference in  
8 here to a high-rise sign twenty-four feet  
9 from the top of the building?

10 MR. AARONS: Yes, those were user-  
11 identification signs, if we were  
12 fortunate to find a commercial tenant for  
13 the potential office use, then there  
14 would be an identification of that use  
15 for purposes of building identification  
16 and recognition.

17 THE CHAIR: So I think it would be  
18 helpful, Luci, if you can kind of help us  
19 relative to how this marches with our  
20 other policy discussions about signs?  
21 And particularly, I guess, the sign  
22 district in Hollywood.

23 MS. IBARRA: The project isn't  
24 asking for any exceptions from the  
25 Hollywood supplemental signage use



1 district. So it would be regulated by  
2 that process. There are limitations that  
3 have already been vetted before you with  
4 respect to signage. They're not asking  
5 for any exceptions. In the event that  
6 they do, they would have to come before  
7 the commission to kind of substantiate  
8 those requests, but they haven't been  
9 included in the EIR because they're -- as  
10 to know, they're complying with that  
11 requirement.

12 THE CHAIR: And relative to those  
13 adopted regulations on signs, what are  
14 the possibilities for this internal plaza  
15 screen? I understand the intent of the  
16 developer. We have to think about the  
17 possibilities.

18 MR. AARONS: I would accept a  
19 restriction, as I said, to the use we've  
20 identified. It's not a Trojan horse  
21 screen. It's a screen for the display of  
22 Chinatown and LA Story, and other movies.  
23 We're closing our parking lots later this  
24 month to do a bike-in movie, which we're  
25 excited about. That's the goal of what

1 we're trying to do, to build a sense of  
2 community among the residents and local  
3 people from Hollywood since it's so close  
4 to transit.

5 So that would be the goal, and if  
6 there's a restriction imposed, we're  
7 happy to respect that restriction.

8 THE CHAIR: Yeah, I think we're  
9 being told we can't do a restriction --

10 MR. AARONS: Okay.

11 THE CHAIR: -- so I wanted to get  
12 you to say it just as many times as  
13 possible.

14 MR. AARONS: Excellent. I guess I  
15 said it many times, and I'll say it  
16 again. Thank you.

17 MR. IBARRA: Sergio Ibarra of  
18 planning department. We had one more  
19 recommendation for changes to the  
20 development regulations. And currently,  
21 a viewing podium is required at 550 feet  
22 or greater, but we feel that there is a  
23 hotel built, that would be more  
24 compatible use and it would be compatible  
25 with the entertainment -- with other

1 hotels in the city that have viewing  
2 podiums. So we want to change the  
3 language to that in the event that a  
4 hotel is built, a viewing deck shall be  
5 built on it, to satisfy the 550-foot or  
6 greater requirement of having the viewing  
7 podium.

8 THE CHAIR: So that's adding to what  
9 you just presented to us about the --

10 MR. IBARRA: Previously said. So in  
11 the place of having a viewing podium at  
12 550 foot or greater, you can have it in  
13 the hotel. And you wouldn't build two;  
14 you would just build one at the hotel.

15 THE CHAIR: Still subject to the  
16 same sort of whatever design requirements  
17 are --

18 MR. IBARRA: Exactly.

19 THE CHAIR: -- associated. Okay.  
20 The thirty-foot setback with the  
21 Hollywood Playhouse, I have left. And I  
22 think that we do want to make sure that  
23 we have time to deliberate all of this,  
24 and particularly, I think there was a lot  
25 of concerns about traffic volume, height,

1 and we want to be able to talk about all  
2 those.

3 MS. IBARRA: Correct. So my  
4 understanding is that in the developer's  
5 ongoing efforts to work with the  
6 community and adjoining property owners,  
7 they've been willing to make additional  
8 concessions to development regulations  
9 with respect to the Playhouse. And I  
10 think maybe one other, with respect to  
11 the two frontages, maybe one side had a  
12 setback and then the frontage along --  
13 was it Vine?

14 And they're going to speak to that,  
15 and that will also be included in the  
16 amendments that we're proposing to the  
17 development regulations.

18 MR. FRAIJO: Alfred Fraijo, thank  
19 you. It really relates to the ongoing  
20 discussions we've had with Hollywood --  
21 LA Conservancy, rather, on the issues  
22 related to the cultural resources in  
23 Hollywood. Adrienne Finehost (ph.) spoke  
24 before you -- indicated that we've been  
25 in ongoing discussions about this

1 opportunity to really set a ground floor  
2 setback from Avalon, which is adjacent to  
3 the west side, and that southern  
4 boundary. And so what we're doing is,  
5 agreeing to that setback, so that it  
6 conforms with the setback regime that  
7 really we have in relationship to Capitol  
8 Records, another cultural resource  
9 within -- within our project, and  
10 certainly in relation to the overall  
11 spatial separation from the podiums. And  
12 so we're willing to commit that as a  
13 regulation within the design guidelines  
14 and standards.

15 And what we've done is prepared a  
16 series of graphics consistent with that  
17 commitment, that I'd like to submit to  
18 you, the department and commission, for  
19 the record.

20 THE CHAIR: Thank you.

21 Was there anything that we -- yes,  
22 please, Commissioner Perlman?

23 MR. PERLMAN: Yes, sorry. I had a  
24 question regarding infrastructure impact  
25 on water treatment.

1 THE CHAIR: She said --

2 MR. PERLMAN: Did she?

3 MS. IBARRA: Right.

4 MR. PERLMAN: I apologize.

5 MS. IBARRA: It's okay. The EIR did  
6 analyze impacts of water, wastewater,  
7 water treatment, all that, and they  
8 determined that it was less than  
9 significant.

10 MR. PERLMAN: Thank you.

11 MS. IBARRA: Um-hum.

12 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Did we talk  
13 about the shared parking?

14 THE CHAIR: No, we didn't. That's  
15 just what I was going to come to.

16 MS. IBARRA: The shared parking --

17 THE CHAIR: The shared parking,  
18 explaining the shared and reduced, you  
19 know, why and how from 1.5 -- 2.5 to 1.5?

20 MS. IBARRA: Right. So the  
21 residential parking as per policy, and it  
22 has impacts for city planning commission,  
23 is for projects that are located near  
24 transit and that are part of mixed-use  
25 developments, particularly those that

1 include office, are permitted exceptions  
2 that are expressly written in the code to  
3 kind of accommodate locations near  
4 transit, or that the jobs - housing  
5 balance is kind of reflective of that.

6 So our recommendation is to support  
7 it based on the numerous exceptions that  
8 are provided in the code for projects of  
9 this nature that are mixed use and that  
10 further encourage the active use of  
11 transit opportunities in the vicinity.

12 THE CHAIR: So the idea being, if I  
13 can find a parking space easily, what's  
14 my incentive to get on a train?

15 MS. IBARRA: Correct. And the other  
16 thing, too, is that a lot of the uses  
17 that are onsite, like the retail, the  
18 restaurant, the fitness club, there's a  
19 general acceptable expectation that  
20 residents who live there are more likely  
21 to use the fitness club onsite than they  
22 are to get in their car and travel  
23 offsite to do so, to do the same thing.

24 THE CHAIR: So because there's a  
25 fitness site underneath me, I'm not going

1 to go to a different gym, I'm going to go  
2 to that gym. And the assumption is the  
3 parking that would be associated with a  
4 gym will be decreased because of that?

5 MS. IBARRA: Right. And also the  
6 demand for certain uses shifts during the  
7 day. So for example, the fitness club  
8 use is more likely to be used either  
9 early in the morning or in the post-work  
10 hours. So there's no need to park at  
11 code for the fitness club, when it won't  
12 be used for a big chunk of the day. And,  
13 you know, the other uses as well -- the  
14 restaurant and the retail and things of  
15 that nature.

16 THE CHAIR: How do you respond to  
17 what I saw in some of the letters about  
18 folks are going to be coming home to this  
19 residence at the same time that folks are  
20 going to be coming to the gym here? And  
21 so in fact the parking will be utilized  
22 at the same time.

23 MS. IBARRA: Well, you have  
24 residents that either or forego parking  
25 altogether because they live at the site.



1           Alternatively, you probably have  
2           residents who live within a six-block  
3           radius that would use these amenities  
4           without having to go into their car, just  
5           because the transit at this juncture is  
6           just so convenient.

7           And so that is our response, and  
8           frankly, it furthers your practice of  
9           encouraging the over-parking of projects  
10          that are located in regional centers that  
11          are so close and so heavily serviced by  
12          public transit amenities.

13          THE CHAIR: Okay. So reinforcing  
14          this notion of local surveying --

15          MS. IBARRA: Correct.

16          THE CHAIR: -- uses and proximity.  
17          Commissioner Romero?

18          MS. ROMERO: I have a question  
19          regarding people who work on the site.  
20          Where are they going to be parking?

21          MS. IBARRA: So the parking does  
22          accommodate -- it does reflect all of the  
23          uses that are on the site. And it's the  
24          shared parking -- so every use is an  
25          exclusive use of the parking. All the

1 parking will be shared, based on the  
2 demand of that particular use. So people  
3 who work there presumably might have  
4 taken the train, or people who live  
5 there. Those exceptions that are  
6 permitted and are reflected in the code,  
7 and it's informed by the arrangement.

8 MS. ROMERO: So they're going to  
9 be -- I think I -- is there going to be  
10 any offsite parking that's going to be  
11 designated for some of the people that  
12 work there who --

13 MS. IBARRA: There's no offsite  
14 parking proposed.

15 MS. ROMERO: So you're just  
16 counting, making sure -- it will be  
17 determined -- you're going to be  
18 determining based on the use of how much  
19 parking space is needed during the  
20 mornings, middle of the day, and evening.  
21 And you think it's going to be covered.

22 MS. IBARRA: Well, we won't be  
23 monitoring that. We won't be going in  
24 there to say, oh, you didn't -- you  
25 didn't take the train.

1 MS. ROMERO: No, but you're going --  
2 the uses are going to dictate.

3 MS. IBARRA: Right.

4 MS. ROMERO: Yeah.

5 MS. IBARRA: Correct.

6 THE CHAIR: Are there other  
7 questions relative to the parking?

8 Mr. Neuman?

9 MR. NEUMAN: Jerry Neuman. I just  
10 wanted to add some additional clarity to  
11 that issue, and the question that you  
12 asked about the percentage of parking.  
13 Because it was a question that was  
14 raised.

15 We are parking the project to code  
16 for the uses, with the exception of the  
17 health club. The reason we are seeking  
18 the --

19 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER:  
20 Variance.

21 MR. NEUMAN: -- variance on the  
22 health club is because city policy, and  
23 your policy has been to allow a reduction  
24 in parking for health clubs when they're  
25 associated with office, because of

1 exactly what was being asked -- that  
2 people in office are going to maybe go  
3 use the health club at the same time that  
4 people and residents are coming home, and  
5 it keeps that offset from happening in  
6 terms of -- in terms of traffic demand.

7 Unfortunately, it always talks about  
8 -- the policy is directed when the health  
9 club and the office are located on the  
10 same site. And currently there's a  
11 possibility that the health club will be  
12 located on one side of the street, and  
13 the office on the other. And if that  
14 happens, we're seeking that variance.  
15 But the reality is that there's one set  
16 of parking space -- you know, we have  
17 parking on either side, but we analyze  
18 the parking on the full project.

19 Then the question came up relative  
20 to the percentage -- the actual number of  
21 parking spaces we've analyzed on a  
22 residential basis and whether or not  
23 we've met the city policy for condo at  
24 2.5 spaces per unit on a condo basis.

25 The city code actually provides for

1 parking -- to be in condos to be at 2.25.  
2 And then the city has adopted an  
3 additional policy which adds another  
4 quarter space.

5 What we have done is we've provided  
6 parking at the code-required parking at  
7 2.25 for all of the condominiums that  
8 we're provid -- in the project.

9 What we've done, though, in order to  
10 address some of the traffic demand  
11 issues, is we, as you've indicated,  
12 segregated the parking from the units, so  
13 that they are acquired separately. And  
14 in order to accomplish that, in doing the  
15 count and in the analysis, we analyzed  
16 1.75 parking per condominium unit as a  
17 reserve space, and an additional half  
18 space as a guest space as part of the  
19 general population, because those are  
20 ones that could be done separately, that  
21 can be acquired separately.

22 But the total number of spaces that  
23 are there are the 2.25 per condominium  
24 unit. The interesting thing is we've  
25 also analyzed that on a -- as if the

1 project was all condominium, so that if  
2 we did a mix of apartment and  
3 condominium, we have in effect  
4 overanalyzed the parking or oversupplied  
5 the parking.

6 THE CHAIR: Are there other  
7 questions regarding to parking?

8 So I think that exhausts the list,  
9 yes? So -- I'm sorry. What was that?

10 Oh, okay. So I think it's up to us  
11 now to deliberate and I think that we owe  
12 it to the public, and I think for our own  
13 satisfaction to have some discussion  
14 about the issue that came up the most,  
15 which was relevant to the height of the  
16 project. And staff's perspective on  
17 that, I think was one about what we were  
18 allowing to occur as we got thinner and  
19 taller.

20 And so I'd like to hear what  
21 commissioners have to say about that, I  
22 think.

23 Are there concerns relative to the  
24 height, I'll rephrase the question?

25 MR. PERLMAN: Okay. I'll go first.

1 This is Commissioner Perlman.

2 I have to say first of all, I  
3 greatly appreciated the public,  
4 especially those who are remaining at  
5 this late hour. The public's  
6 participation in this and input and their  
7 passion for the issues on both sides --  
8 and these are not easy issues, and when  
9 we look at development and change, it's  
10 not always easy to accept things that  
11 look different from how they are now.

12 This is a dramatic change to what  
13 the current situation is. I'm very  
14 familiar with the area, having lived in  
15 LA my entire life. A couple of things  
16 resonated with me. One was the parking  
17 lots around there, that are not in good  
18 shape, the buildings around there that  
19 are not in good shape. The fact that  
20 most of the development in Hollywood is  
21 gone on the western end and not on the  
22 eastern end, because developers for some  
23 reason are not investing significantly on  
24 the eastern end.

25 And the difference being having, I

1 think someone said, short, fat towers  
2 versus tall, slender towers. It seems  
3 some of the developments in the past few  
4 years that have taken the approach of  
5 being shorter have not been as successful  
6 in many respects. My own personal view  
7 is because they do not provide vistas  
8 that are very pleasing to look out over  
9 rooftops and parking lots or at  
10 neighboring buildings, as opposed to  
11 actually having a view of something  
12 that's attractive.

13 I do like the idea that these are as  
14 slender as they are, the 7,000-square-  
15 foot plan at the top floors is very  
16 small. I have to say, the height is --  
17 it's troubling, but I think that's part  
18 of the future. I think that's where the  
19 city is going. And while I appreciate  
20 that some of the residents think that TOD  
21 is not successful, or has not been  
22 successful, I think that's what we need  
23 to do. That's the only way we're going  
24 to improve traffic and reduce the  
25 vehicles on our roads. And to put a



1 large development like this right at the  
2 heart of transit and in the transit hubs  
3 that we have there, I think is very  
4 important.

5 THE CHAIR: Other commissioners? I  
6 didn't mean to kind of narrow you to the  
7 issue of height. If there are other  
8 things that you want to discuss relative  
9 to this -- there were concerns about  
10 density and all the other things that  
11 we've talked about relative to community  
12 benefits, as well.

13 Commissioner Hovaguimian?

14 MR. HOVAGUIMIAN: Yeah, this is  
15 Commissioner Hovaguimian. I'm going to  
16 look at it from also from the perspective  
17 of a developer, also. It's not just the  
18 community, because community and  
19 developers, they go hand in hand. And,  
20 you know, they have both to be  
21 successful, I know for the project to  
22 make any sense.

23 And, like Commissioner Perlman said,  
24 if you want to do a project and a project  
25 of this magnitude and, you know, you want

1 to invest so much money in a  
2 neighborhood, you need the developer --  
3 development to be successful. And  
4 probably one way I'm looking at it, and I  
5 realize that's what they did, the way  
6 they keep on explaining, their situation  
7 is to have a project that provides much  
8 more than what the standard project  
9 provides. And that is a view. You know,  
10 when you look at an B sites, the  
11 entertainment and everything else,  
12 restaurants and entertainment, in order  
13 for the hotels and for the restaurant,  
14 for the condominiums or for the office  
15 buildings to be successful, they are  
16 doing something else that it does not  
17 exist in a neighborhood. That is  
18 providing a view, like we were  
19 discussing. Somebody was trying to buy a  
20 house, and they did not even -- it took  
21 them like seven days to go through  
22 escrow. They walked in, they saw it, the  
23 view, and they said, we're ready to buy  
24 it. So they put the money in and they  
25 bought it in seven days.

1           And I do believe that this  
2           particular developer is trying to put the  
3           emphasis on the view, and tried to when  
4           you walk into their condominiums, when  
5           you walk into their -- you know, office  
6           buildings, the minute you see that view,  
7           you are in love with that premises and  
8           you stay there.

9           So I do believe that's what one of  
10          their major point of their success of  
11          their project is relying on. I really  
12          don't see any problem with it. I don't  
13          really see a big thing in it, especially  
14          in a neighborhood that needs this  
15          development so bad.

16          There's people that can go on --  
17          that's my view.

18          THE CHAIR: Commissioner Lessin?

19          MR. LESSIN: Yeah, I want to get  
20          back out of the weeds here -- just  
21          another minute, just because I'm not sure  
22          that I have a good handle on the screen.  
23          Can we talk about where it is and how  
24          it's conditioned now?

25          MR. AARONS: Yes. Where it is in

1 terms of physical location?

2 MR. LESSIN: Yes.

3 MR. AARONS: yes. So as you can see  
4 from the photograph, it's in the plaza  
5 that will be created by what was just  
6 described as a new setback from the side  
7 of the Avalon. And we made that gesture  
8 to do the -- that was fine back there,  
9 guys. There -- the idea was that the  
10 Avalon, the historic Hollywood Playhouse,  
11 is a historic structure. And the LA  
12 Conservancy stepped forward and said, we  
13 really want the building to read as a  
14 full building to the extent we can. And  
15 even though we had initially expected to  
16 build right up against the sides, we  
17 respected the Avalon. So we took that  
18 newly created plaza, and we simply put an  
19 arch-related screen on the non-Avalon  
20 side of it for use occasionally during  
21 situations where we might want to show a  
22 movie.

23 MR. LESSIN: Thank you for the  
24 diagram. That helps --

25 MR. AARONS: Great.

1 MR. LESSIN: -- a tremendous amount.  
2 My issue was is it viewable from offsite?

3 MR. AARONS: No, it may be modestly  
4 viewable from the sidewalk as you walk by  
5 the Avalon, but it won't be visible  
6 otherwise. It's on the wrong side of the  
7 down side, and it's not -- it's  
8 sufficiently in.

9 MR. LESSIN: So I guess now to city  
10 attorney. How do we differentiate from  
11 what they're offering to a billboard?

12 MS. KHORASANEE: Well, again,  
13 even -- well, I would say this. I  
14 understand that you're worried about what  
15 conditions you can place on it? And,  
16 again I would take it back to time,  
17 place, manner. We don't have the sign  
18 situation here that we've had in other  
19 cases where you've been looking at a sign  
20 district and that kind of thing. Because  
21 this is within that other Hollywood sign  
22 district.

23 But here, you don't have to like the  
24 screen. And if you said no screen, that  
25 would be certainly part of the

1 conversation. But in terms of the  
2 content, you're limited.

3 MR. AARONS: And that certainly --  
4 this was a gesture meant to activate a  
5 public open space. If it creates more  
6 issues than it needs to --

7 MR. LESSIN: Actually --

8 MR. AARONS: -- I could take it  
9 away.

10 MR. LESSIN: -- I like the idea.

11 MR. AARONS: Okay.

12 MR. LESSIN: This is Hollywood. I  
13 think it's a really good plan. I am  
14 worried about the potential for what it  
15 could be.

16 MR. LOGRANDE: Michael LoGrande for  
17 the record. They would have to come into  
18 secure a permit, and if the permit would  
19 state that it's not a sign, basically it  
20 would allow for what it is, which is a  
21 video projection monitor for the purposes  
22 of showing movies. So if they issue the  
23 building permit, right now it's a  
24 prohibited use to have an offsite digital  
25 sign. So if they came in for that, and

1 the inspector came out, it wouldn't allow  
2 it to become a sign. And if they ended  
3 up Coca-Cola shows up one day, and it's a  
4 stagnant Coca-Cola sign, we could send  
5 enforcement personnel out there to cite  
6 them, and there's penalties and what have  
7 you. So there's -- they would not be  
8 able to obtain even be able to obtain a  
9 proper permit to do that, so it would be  
10 an illegal use if they tried to do that,  
11 which I know their intention is not to do  
12 that. But there are safeguards in our  
13 process.

14 MR. LESSIN: I understand. Yes,  
15 because I don't want to recommend that we  
16 take it away from them, because I think  
17 it's a good planned thing. It makes  
18 sense where it is. I just don't want to  
19 it to be abused. So, thank you. That's  
20 helpful.

21 MR. AARONS: Paper and paint, thank  
22 you, Michael.

23 THE CHAIR: Commissioner Romero? Do  
24 you have comments or not? We're -- I  
25 think we're wrapping.

1 MS. ROMERO: We're wrapping.  
2 Did we hit the community space?

3 THE CHAIR: Oh, we did not,  
4 actually.

5 That's on my list.

6 THE CHAIR: Yes, the community space  
7 was offered, and we're not clear if there  
8 is a nexus for that relative to our  
9 discussions.

10 Thank you for that.

11 I've got a list.

12 MS. IBARRA: With respect to land  
13 use, it would be difficult for us to  
14 create a nexus with the community space.  
15 I understand that it's important to the  
16 community, but I think that the way that  
17 it was previously provided for and the  
18 conditions was to include it as part of  
19 the hotel development and that it would  
20 be available to communities wanting to  
21 use that space. I think they can still  
22 continue to do that, and they can maybe  
23 manage that. There's just nothing in our  
24 Hollywood Community Plan zone that would  
25 substantiate requiring 1,200 square feet



1 of community space to be rented at a fee  
2 with a calendar that we can't -- we have  
3 no mechanism to enforce.

4 THE CHAIR: Okay.

5 It is what it is.

6 THE CHAIR: Commissioner Romero, did  
7 you want to --

8 MS. ROMERO: I had a -- the one  
9 question clarification in terms of the  
10 transportation infrastructure is what we  
11 agreed on, that we would have a meeting  
12 that they would help resolve all the  
13 outstanding issues in terms of going over  
14 some of those mitigations? I'm -- I mean  
15 I'm fading. I'm trying to remember.

16 THE CHAIR: I think -- I had a list  
17 of traffic demand management efforts, one  
18 of which was to continue to work with  
19 Caltrans around that particular  
20 intersection. And we were going to  
21 encourage those conversations to  
22 continue. Is that the conversation  
23 you're speaking of?

24 MS. ROMERO: Yeah, and I guess  
25 that's one -- good. And then the second

1 one, in terms of the MTA portal, what was  
2 the conclusion on that? Because --

3 THE CHAIR: That was --

4 MS. IBARRA: Right. So the traffic  
5 demand management plan as other transit  
6 demand management plans that are vetted  
7 by DOT include a variety of options that  
8 the applicant can use to kind of  
9 implement these mitigations so see with  
10 their traffic impacts. So what happens  
11 is that they go and they're monitored by  
12 DOT with respect to how successful those  
13 mitigations are. And if one or two are  
14 determined not to be working, there's a  
15 menu of additional items that they can  
16 draw from to kind of address those  
17 concerns. And that's an ongoing  
18 monitoring program.

19 With respect to the transportation  
20 benefits that you discussed earlier, we  
21 recommend that you condition those so  
22 that -- to ensure that they're  
23 implemented at the very least with the  
24 initial development of this project.  
25 That each one of these be conditioned to

1 be provided prior to the issuance of the  
2 final certificate of occupancy for the  
3 project as a whole. So does it matter  
4 what site is developed first?

5 And the bicycle amenities plan, that  
6 the project be conditioned to meet the  
7 vice coordinates as it is now, with a  
8 provision of 200 square feet of bicycle  
9 repair space. And that's to be included  
10 in the -- prior to the C of O for the  
11 project -- the final C of O.

12 And then additional language with  
13 respect to your Vine Street Metro  
14 connection, and the other study that you  
15 proposed for the Vine Street medians.  
16 For that study to analyze any potential  
17 environmental impacts.

18 MS. ROMERO: So, and I lost the -- I  
19 don't remember the conversation in terms  
20 of the MTA portal that we said --

21 MS. IBARRA: The study would be  
22 provided prior to the issuance of -- let  
23 me see, it's --

24 MS. ROMERO: My question, why can't  
25 they provide funding? Don't you guys

1 have a current easement? Isn't there a  
2 current easement mechanism that --

3 MS. IBARRA: There are knockout  
4 panels, but this project and the  
5 environmental analysis for this project  
6 did not account for any construction-  
7 related impacts to the Walk of Fame,  
8 construction-related impacts to --

9 MS. ROMERO: I'm sorry. We already  
10 said that, but I didn't catch it.

11 MS. IBARRA: No, it's okay. So the  
12 project before you didn't account for any  
13 CEQA-related impacts that might be  
14 associated. So the study that you're  
15 offering me now as a condition would  
16 address any potential CEQA-related  
17 impacts, as seceded with that.

18 MS. ROMERO: Okay.

19 THE CHAIR: So I wanted to take my  
20 bite at the apple, relative to the issues  
21 that I think were most contentious. And  
22 I definitely appreciate the input of the  
23 appellates, and I read all of those  
24 letters. And attempted, as best I could,  
25 to incorporate in my questions attention

1 to the issues that were lifted up. And  
2 for myself, in weighing how I was feeling  
3 about it and really throughout the  
4 process of the conversation here today,  
5 was most concerned about the issues that  
6 you lifted up. That is, is this an  
7 appropriate place for density? Is this  
8 the appropriate density? And the  
9 conversation about traffic demand  
10 management was in that direction for me.  
11 That's why I wanted to ensure that we  
12 were pressing around those issues,  
13 because if we're saying this is about  
14 putting density next to transit, we have  
15 to ensure that that transit it going to  
16 be used, that it's going to be  
17 accessible, that it's going to be, you  
18 know, providing what we claim it is.

19 Relative to the height, I think that  
20 I have been convinced and it took  
21 convincing, relative to what happens as  
22 you go up in height. That, in fact, the  
23 things that many community members  
24 expressed as benefits that they wanted to  
25 preserve, were actually best preserved by

1 the taller towers. I think I saw  
2 somebody's language in a letter of the  
3 two tall chopsticks. So, I'm not eating  
4 with them, but the two tall chopsticks --

5 And I also understand the concern  
6 that the community presented that are we  
7 being presented with a narrowed set of  
8 options, and we're being -- you know,  
9 we're being told that we have to decide  
10 between these two options. And are there  
11 options that aren't on the table at all?  
12 And to me the options that were not on  
13 the table at all, I'm also convinced, are  
14 probably not options that are going to  
15 come here if we were to say no to this,  
16 either.

17 And that this is the type of  
18 development that we are pushing forward  
19 with. I think that Hollywood as a  
20 regional center is the place where this  
21 kind of density and development does, in  
22 fact, belong, and I understand that we  
23 have to be sensitive to the fact that  
24 there are existing communities, as we go  
25 along that path.

1           And I have come to a point where I  
2           am convinced that that sensitivity has  
3           been addressed. I think that there is  
4           still some ways to go, relative to things  
5           that are not under our purview. I wish  
6           that there were all sorts of -- is nexii?  
7           nexuses? Don't tell my students that I  
8           don't know the plural, but if there are  
9           multiple places of nexus to be made that  
10          we can't make, I'm hoping that there are  
11          other venues where that can be brought to  
12          the table. And I urge the community to  
13          keep pressing on that.

14                 There are certain things that are  
15                 within our kind of purview, and I hope  
16                 that we have pushed as far as we can  
17                 within our purview. I think there's  
18                 further to push, and I encourage that  
19                 pushing to happen, and sites and  
20                 locations, and before bodies that have  
21                 the ability to do it where we don't.

22                 And so -- yes, please. I'm not  
23                 going to, so go ahead. Yes -- no.  
24                 Commissioner Perlman?

25                 MR. PERLMAN: There's one more thing

1 I wanted to say, and that is because some  
2 of the appellants, both in their written  
3 submissions and in their oral statements,  
4 as well as I believe one of the members  
5 of the public representing -- one of the  
6 lawyers representing one of the  
7 communities, brought up that they felt  
8 that there was so much uncertainty with  
9 the project and it was such an ill-  
10 defined project. And that we did not  
11 have sufficient information with which to  
12 reach a decision.

13 And I have to say that in my  
14 experience, based on the record, I think  
15 we have more than sufficient information.  
16 I think the developmental regulation  
17 guidelines which were appended to the  
18 staff submission report, were very  
19 thorough and comprehensive. The traffic  
20 mitigation efforts and the other  
21 mitigation points that were in the  
22 reports were very thorough. So I just  
23 want to make clear for the record that  
24 from where I sit on this commission, we  
25 have had a very adequate, complete record



1 with which to make a decision.

2 And, so, I'm prepared to try to come  
3 up with a motion.

4 THE CHAIR: We're -- the city  
5 attorney?

6 MS. KHORASANEE: So, I think James  
7 or when you make your motion, James needs  
8 to call each item, because you're going  
9 to vote separately since you have appeals  
10 and then you have the entitlement.

11 THE CHAIR: We have two votes. The  
12 first is on item number 5, which is the  
13 appeal, whether we want to grant or deny  
14 the appeal. And item number 6 is the  
15 recommendation relative to the proposed  
16 project. And to remind folks that there  
17 are five of us, so this is a bare quorum.  
18 So we need to consider that as we're  
19 moving forward.

20 MR. PERLMAN: Commissioner Perlman,  
21 my motion would that with respect to item  
22 5 -- and I don't have my agenda to  
23 specify exactly what that is, but yes,  
24 item 5, which are the six appeals,  
25 although I believe one was withdrawn by

1 AMDA College. But the six appeals that  
2 were submitted in writing, my motion is  
3 that we deny the appeals.

4 THE CHAIR: So that's to support  
5 staff's recommendation to deny the  
6 appeals?

7 MR. PERLMAN: That is correct.

8 THE CHAIR: Oh, we have some  
9 clarification?

10 MS. IBARRA: No, that's -- that's  
11 fine. I just wanted for the second  
12 appeal -- I mean, for the second case,  
13 CPCC-2008-3440, just to reiterate there's  
14 changes to the development regulations --

15 THE CHAIR: Yes.

16 MS. IBARRA: -- and some  
17 typographical errors that we're making  
18 to -- corrections that we're making to  
19 some of the conditions. So I just want  
20 to make sure that that goes on the  
21 record.

22 THE CHAIR: Yeah, I think we have a  
23 whole list of things that we'll want to  
24 go through.

25 There's a motion.

1 MR. LESSIN: Commission Lessin, I'll  
2 second.

3 THE CHAIR: And a second, James, can  
4 you poll the commission on item 5,  
5 please?

6 MR. WILLIAMS: Certainly.  
7 Commissioner Perlman?

8 MR. PERLMAN: Yes.

9 MR. WILLIAMS: Commissioner Lessin?

10 MR. LESSIN: Yes.

11 MR. WILLIAMS: Commissioner  
12 Hovaguimian?

13 MR. HOVAGUIMIAN: Yes.

14 MR. WILLIAMS: Commissioner Romero?

15 MS. ROMERO: Yes.

16 MR. WILLIAMS: Commissioner Freer?

17 THE CHAIR: Yes.

18 MR. WILLIAMS: Motion carries.

19 THE CHAIR: Now moving to item 6?

20 MR. LESSIN: I am willing to make an  
21 attempt with Luci's help on item 6. So  
22 if we can sort out what is part of  
23 staff's recommendations of these items,  
24 so that it's clear? Is that the easiest  
25 way to do this?

1 THE CHAIR: I actually have what I  
2 think is a list. Let me give a try, and  
3 see where we stand. There were several  
4 items relative to traffic and traffic  
5 demand management. And I'll go through  
6 what that list is.

7 We also had discussions about the  
8 design regulations --

9 MS. IBARRA: Um-hum.

10 THE CHAIR: -- and there were  
11 several technical corrections, as well as  
12 one that I don't know if it qualifies as  
13 a technical correction relative to the  
14 observation --

15 MS. IBARRA: Observation deck.

16 THE CHAIR: -- desk, so there were  
17 three -- two that I think were technical  
18 corrections. That one, and then there  
19 was one relative to bike parking as well.

20 MS. IBARRA: Correct. And then  
21 also, the applicant provided an exhibit  
22 with respect to the setbacks to  
23 accommodate the Playhouse --

24 THE CHAIR: Yes.

25 MS. IBARRA: -- Hollywood Playhouse.

1 THE CHAIR: -- and we wanted that to  
2 go into the design guidelines as well.

3 MS. IBARRA: Right. And the  
4 applicant submitted a letter dated today,  
5 asking for typographical corrections to  
6 the conditions associated with the  
7 alcohol use permit.

8 THE CHAIR: And those were all minor  
9 technical corrections.

10 MS. IBARRA: Correct.

11 THE CHAIR: They were not  
12 changing --

13 MS. IBARRA: It doesn't change the  
14 plan approval process that we're  
15 requiring for the project.

16 THE CHAIR: I just want to make sure  
17 that was on the record. And so for the  
18 traffic and traffic demand management  
19 issues, there was the encouragement that  
20 we were providing to continue to work  
21 with Caltrans around the Argyle and  
22 Franklin intersection, and the freeway on  
23 ramp intersection, in particular. The  
24 provision of the shuttle, and the  
25 frequency and amount that was mentioned.

1 The bike amenities and sharing, and the  
2 provision of the bike kiosk. I'm not  
3 sure what this is --

4 MS. IBARRA: Bikes -- bicycle  
5 repair space.

6 THE CHAIR: Bicycle repair, yes.  
7 The attention to linkages and the  
8 directional route signs within a four-  
9 block radius, the DASH signage linkages ,  
10 and those to the Metro, as well. The  
11 parking tracking, the Express Park  
12 program, and the 50,000 dollars that was  
13 going to be submitted for that. The  
14 portal study that we that we were going  
15 to encourage the study. We understood  
16 the limitations about what we were going  
17 to be doing with that, but to see what  
18 the environmental impacts were relative  
19 to that.

20 Is that correct? Is that how to  
21 best state it?

22 MS. IBARRA: Correct. Um-hum.

23 THE CHAIR: To provide for sale the  
24 Metro passes, and there were -- we wanted  
25 to ensure that residents and employees

1           were included in that, that it was in  
2           fact a fifteen-year program, and that  
3           there were -- I guess we didn't actually  
4           resolve this.

5           MS. IBARRA: I would just leave it  
6           as a condition and not include a time  
7           limit on it.

8           THE CHAIR: Okay. I want to make  
9           sure that it's not a one-time -- as it  
10          read currently, I think it could be  
11          interpreted as you buy a hundred passes,  
12          and you've done what you (ph.) --

13          MS. IBARRA: Okay, so the language I  
14          have here is one paragraph, but it speaks  
15          to two things. One is the provision of  
16          a machine that would allow for the sale  
17          of Metro passes to onsite residents, and  
18          tenants and employees of the project.

19          THE CHAIR: Yes.

20          MS. IBARRA: Separately, though,  
21          there's the provision of a hundred Metro  
22          passes, and we can parcel these out as  
23          separate conditions. So that one is to  
24          provide a kiosk onsite, and it will stay  
25          three.

1 THE CHAIR: Yes.

2 MS. IBARRA: And the other one is a  
3 provision of a hundred Metro passes for  
4 residents, and with priority given to  
5 residents that forgo parking at the site.

6 MR. LESSIN: Commissioner Lessin.  
7 So it's a hundred Metro passes per month?

8 MS. IBARRA: Per month -- per month?  
9 Per month. Correct.

10 MR. LESSIN: All right. That's what  
11 I understood.

12 THE CHAIR: And, so, are you  
13 suggesting that we leave that into  
14 perpetuity?

15 And I think that we -- resident --  
16 is that strictly residents, or is that  
17 residents and employees that would have  
18 the --

19 MS. IBARRA: It's stated here as  
20 residents and tenants of the project.

21 THE CHAIR: Okay. And that also  
22 then includes the incentive for those who  
23 live in, not to use, right? The ten  
24 percent discount for using the Metro?

25 MS. IBARRA: The parking right



1 spaces? Well, we skipped the parking  
2 leases for Metro commuters. There's the  
3 provision of the minimum of ten spaces  
4 for parking right purposes --

5 MR. AARONS: Parking right, yes.

6 THE CHAIR: Yes.

7 MS. IBARRA: -- and then the daily  
8 discount for Metro commuters, right?

9 THE CHAIR: Yes.

10 MS. IBARRA: And that's the ten  
11 percent. And then the shared vehicle  
12 parking service with --

13 THE CHAIR: Yes.

14 MS. IBARRA: -- a minimum of ten  
15 parking spaces for that.

16 THE CHAIR: right. And then we were  
17 also were offering encouragement to the  
18 applicant to work with LADOT around the  
19 median on Vine.

20 MS. IBARRA: You mean the median  
21 study?

22 THE CHAIR: The median study, sorry,  
23 on Vine. And I think that rounds out the  
24 list that I have. Is there something  
25 that we're missing relative to traffic?

1 MR. LESSIN: I didn't check off  
2 Zipcars.

3 MS. IBARRA: That's part of the  
4 shared parking --

5 MR. LESSIN: Okay.

6 MS. IBARRA: -- service --

7 MR. LESSIN: All right. Got it.

8 MS. IBARRA: -- that we've just  
9 discussed.

10 THE CHAIR: Okay. The technical  
11 corrections were to several figures, to  
12 make sure --

13 MS. IBARRA: Right.

14 THE CHAIR: -- that the forty-degree  
15 views.

16 MS. IBARRA: To make sure that the  
17 figure illustrations correspond to the  
18 numbering of the open space requirements  
19 with respect to that forty-degree  
20 triangular view. The other one was the  
21 observation deck. To ensure that the  
22 observation deck be provided within the  
23 hotel or elsewhere, so a little more  
24 flexibility as to where the placement of  
25 the observation deck goes.

1 THE CHAIR: Okay. So requiring one,  
2 and then offering --

3 MS. IBARRA: And then the --

4 THE CHAIR: -- the specificity about  
5 where it would be should --

6 MS. IBARRA: Correct.

7 THE CHAIR: -- a hotel come on  
8 board.

9 MS. IBARRA: Correct. And then the  
10 setback that was provided. The figure  
11 changed that was provided by the  
12 applicant to correspond to the agreement  
13 that was made with the adjacent and the  
14 Hollywood Playhouse --

15 THE CHAIR: Yes.

16 MS. IBARRA: -- I think it was? To  
17 provide a greater site or setback against  
18 their building, and then against Vine  
19 Street.

20 THE CHAIR: And then, there was some  
21 discussion about the bike plan? Was that  
22 already within the -- is that what we  
23 were talking about? I have bike plan on  
24 my list, and I don't think it was one  
25 (ph.) --

1 MS. IBARRA: So, one of the transit  
2 benefits was to require that the project  
3 include in the development regulations be  
4 consistent with the bicycle ordinance.

5 THE CHAIR: That's it.

6 MS. IBARRA: And then the 200 square  
7 feet.

8 MR. LESSIN: Bike ordinance.

9 THE CHAIR: It was the ordinance.

10 MR. LESSIN: And -- Commissioner  
11 Lessin -- the reason we're doing that is  
12 because this was submitted prior to the  
13 implementation of that ordinance?

14 MS. IBARRA: Yes, it was  
15 submitted -- it was vesting submitted  
16 prior to the implementation of the  
17 ordinance.

18 THE CHAIR: I think that this is the  
19 list. Do you want to continue with your  
20 motion?

21 MR. LESSIN: I will make the motion  
22 to approve staff -- go ahead, you have  
23 something?

24 MS. IBARRA: Correct, as well as the  
25 corrections to the letter that was

1 submitted with respect to the conditional  
2 use permit conditions, as spelling out  
3 the types of establishments, and then  
4 just some typographical error to  
5 correspond to the other conditions in  
6 that.

7 THE CHAIR: Can you clarify what the  
8 type of --

9 MS. IBARRA: So onsite sales with  
10 food and service at five restaurants for  
11 onsite. One cafe on the observation deck  
12 should it be developed. Onsite sale for  
13 line of alcoholic beverages in  
14 conjunction with the nightclub and live  
15 entertainment, and one retail  
16 establishment such as a grocery store or  
17 high-end servicing, like wines.

18 THE CHAIR: And, again, those still  
19 have to come before this --

20 MS. IBARRA: They still have to go  
21 through the plan approval process. And  
22 then live entertainment, again, with the  
23 club lounge restaurant. Again, that has  
24 to go through the plan approval process  
25 with the ZA. And then the plan -- and

1           then just there's a reference of  
2           condition numbers 2(a) to 2.1, that  
3           should really be 1(a) through 1(c).

4           And then there's a duplicate  
5           condition referencing the Star program,  
6           so the employees that serve alcohol will  
7           have to go through this training with  
8           respect to serving and checking IDs and  
9           things like that. So there was a  
10          duplicate condition to that effect.

11          THE CHAIR: So those were the  
12          technical changes.

13          MS. IBARRA: Those are the --

14          MR. LESSIN: And those are all  
15          included in your recommendation?

16          MS. IBARRA: Those are included in  
17          my recommendations, and we gave a copy to  
18          James for the record.

19          MR. LESSIN: Okay.

20          MS. KHORASANEE: So, commissioners,  
21          just to clarify, so I think it's  
22          important to make it clear. Your motion  
23          is going to include adoption of staff's  
24          report and recommendations, including  
25          certification of the EIR, and then

1 everything else that was just --

2 MR. LESSIN: That is my motion.

3 MS. KHORASANEE: Great.

4 MR. LESSIN: this has been a long  
5 day, so we don't want to screw it up at  
6 this point.

7 Thank you for the help.

8 THE CHAIR: So we're looking for a  
9 second?

10 MR. PERLMAN: I would ask first for  
11 a brief amendment, and then I'd second,  
12 is possible.

13 With respect to the traffic  
14 mitigation efforts, if I heard correctly,  
15 it was to work with Caltrans on the  
16 Argyle and Franklin intersection. My  
17 notes showed that there were two other  
18 unmitigated intersections, which were  
19 Cahuenga and Franklin, and Vine and  
20 Hollywood. And I would like to have the  
21 applicant continue to work with LADOT to  
22 exert whatever efforts are possible to  
23 mitigate the traffic at those  
24 intersections, as well.

25 THE CHAIR: Can we make sure that we

1 have those intersections correct? I have  
2 different ones. So --

3 MS. KHORASANEE: There's five.  
4 There is Hollywood and then --

5 THE CHAIR: But the two went down.

6 MS. KHORASANEE: -- two unmitigated,  
7 and then Argyle -- yeah, I think you're  
8 right. It's Argyle and Franklin,  
9 Cahuenga and Hollywood, and Vine and  
10 Sunset.

11 MR. PERMAN: Can you confirm that  
12 those were the two that were not  
13 mitigated?

14 MR. AARONS: Unmitigated were  
15 Hollywood and Vine, and Cahuenga and  
16 Franklin.

17 MR. PERLMAN: Yes, okay. So, again,  
18 that they would commit to working with  
19 LADOT to mitigate those intersections.

20 MS. KHORASANEE: Good catch.

21 MR. LESSIN: All right. I will  
22 happily accept that amendment.

23 MR. PERLMAN: Right. And I'll  
24 second the motion.

25 MR. NEUMAN: Jerry Neuman. My only



1 request would be to recognize that as  
2 part of the environmental findings that  
3 you're adopting, you are also adopting  
4 overriding considerations relative to  
5 those. And this would not be to diminish  
6 that, or you would recognize that you're  
7 doing that, but at the same time, we'll  
8 continue to work to try to find ways to  
9 mitigate.

10 MR. LESSIN: That's -- that's the  
11 motion, yes.

12 THE CHAIR: So I think we have a  
13 motion from Commissioner Lessin. Do we  
14 have a second?

15 MR. PERLMAN: I second it.

16 THE CHAIR: We have a second from  
17 Commissioner Perlman.

18 James --

19 MR. WILLIAMS: Certainly.

20 THE CHAIR: -- would you like to  
21 poll the commission?

22 MR. WILLIAMS: Commissioner Lessin?

23 MR. LESSIN: Yes.

24 MR. WILLIAMS: Commissioner Perlman?

25 MR. PERLMAN: Yes.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

MR. WILLIAMS: Commissioner  
Hovaguimian?

MR. HOVAGUIMIAN: Yes.

MR. WILLIAMS: Commissioner Romero?

MS. ROMERO: Yes.

MR. WILLIAMS: Commissioner Freer?

THE CHAIR: Yes.

MR. WILLIAMS: Motion carries.

THE CHAIR: Thank you all for your  
time and patience. And I'd like to remind  
folks that this is not the end of the  
road, but rather one step along the way.  
That this will be going to the planning  
and land use management committee of the  
city council, and on to the full city  
council. So there's still opportunity  
for input as it goes forward.

Thank you so much for your patience  
and input today.

(Whereupon these proceedings were  
concluded)

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

C E R T I F I C A T I O N

I, Sharon Meyer, hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct transcription, to the best of my ability, of the sound recorded proceedings submitted for transcription.

I further certify that I am not employed by nor related to any party to this action.

In witness whereof, I hereby sign this date:  
May 27, 2014.

-----  
Sharon Meyer (CET\*\*D 638)  
AAERT Certified Electronic Transcriber

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

PLANNING AND LAND USE MANAGEMENT  
COMMITTEE HEARING

----- )  
IN THE MATTER OF: )  
HEI/GC Hollywood & Vine Condominiums )  
v. )  
City of Los Angeles )  
----- )

Tuesday, June 18, 2013  
John Ferraro Council Chamber  
Room 340, City Hall  
200 North Spring Street  
Los Angeles, CA 90012

B E F O R E:

COUNCIL MEMBER ED P. REYES, CHAIR  
COUNCIL MEMBER JOSE HUIZAR  
COUNCIL MEMBER MITCHELL ENGLANDER

A P P E A R A N C E S:

Gerald Neuman, Esq.  
Alfred Fraijo, Esq.  
Sheppard, Mullin, Richter & Hampton LLP  
Counsel for Hollywood Millennium  
Robert Silverstein, Esq.  
Silverstein Law Firm  
Counsel for Appellant, Communities  
United for Reasonable Development

Benjamin M. Reznik, Esq.  
Jeffer Mangels Butler & Mitchell LLP  
Counsel for Appellant, W Hotel

Luciralia Ibarra  
LA City Planning Department  
Gary Handel  
Handel Architects

PAGES 1 - 126

1 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. That takes us  
2 to what some might call the big ticket  
3 item, items 4 and 5, we'll take together.

4 Okay. Staff, given us the  
5 commission report and the staff  
6 recommendation?

7 MS. IBARRA: Good afternoon,  
8 committee members. Luci Ibarra with the  
9 planning department, major projects.

10 Before you is a City Planning  
11 Commission determination on a property at  
12 1720 through 1770 North Vine Street,  
13 properties along Ivar, Argyle, Yucca.

14 The City Planning Commission, at its  
15 hearing on March 28th, approved a vesting  
16 zone change, a height district change, a  
17 vesting conditional use, a master  
18 conditional use, and zone variances,  
19 relative to the mixed-use development  
20 of -- excuse me -- 492 residential units,  
21 a 200-room hotel, approximately 100,000  
22 square feet of office, 35,000 square feet  
23 of a sports-related club, 15,000 square  
24 feet of retail uses, and 34,000 square  
25 feet of food and beverage uses, within

1 two towers, one at 55 stories and the  
2 other at 45 stories, along with the  
3 associated development regulations and  
4 the land use equivalency.

5 They also denied the appeals that  
6 were filed to the vesting tentative tract  
7 map that was heard and approved by the  
8 Deputy Advisory Agency for the  
9 development and the subdivision of these  
10 properties.

11 The planning department recommends  
12 the City Planning Commission project,  
13 finding that it was consistent with the  
14 regional community center land use  
15 designation and the zone, and was  
16 consistent with the Hollywood Community  
17 Plan.

18 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. That's it?  
19 That's everything? Okay. Are you sure?

20 MS. IBARRA: Unless you have  
21 questions, that should --

22 THE CHAIRMAN: Questions, staff?  
23 No? Okay. Thank you.

24 Let's hear from the appellants on  
25 record.

1 MS. IBARRA: My apologies. I forgot  
2 to add, following the issuance of the  
3 determination of the City Planning  
4 Commission's action, the planning  
5 department staff reviewed the  
6 determination letter and the development  
7 regulations, and we found that there were  
8 some typographical errors and formatting  
9 issues, page number issues, and there  
10 were references to a development  
11 agreement that has since been withdrawn  
12 that we wanted to correct. And so we  
13 provided a memo here, on behalf of the  
14 department and planning staff, relative  
15 to those corrections.

16 THE CHAIRMAN: They're technical?

17 MS. IBARRA: Right.

18 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Okay. All  
19 right, thanks.

20 Okay. So we have appellants on  
21 record, Communities United for Reasonable  
22 Development. Are you here? Would you  
23 like to speak? Let's hear your points of  
24 view, reason for your appeal.

25 MR. SILVERSTEIN: Thank you. We are

1 appellants in item 4 and 5, and I would  
2 respectfully request that we be given at  
3 least ten minutes to present our  
4 objections.

5 THE CHAIRMAN: Well, why don't you  
6 start, and let's see how far you get?

7 MR. SILVERSTEIN: Thank you. Robert  
8 Silverstein of the Silverstein Law Firm,  
9 appearing on behalf of appellant,  
10 Communities United for Reasonable  
11 Development. That is a coalition of more  
12 than forty community associations opposed  
13 to the project in the EIR before you.  
14 Collectively, these groups represent more  
15 than 250,000 residents in Hollywood and  
16 the greater Los Angeles area.

17 Let the record reflect that I have  
18 handed in a letter, which I'm also  
19 holding up, today. That letter has  
20 twenty-seven exhibits attached to it, and  
21 that has been provided to each of you  
22 honorable members of the PLUM committee.

23 I would respectfully ask that you  
24 give great consideration to these  
25 arguments prior to any decision being



1 made. And when you do finally make a  
2 decision, I am confident that you will  
3 conclude that the Millennium project  
4 violates state law, CEQA, the LA charter,  
5 and the LA municipal code.

6 A significant portion of the  
7 material that's in the letter before you  
8 relates to seismic issues, and that is an  
9 issue, the importance of which we did not  
10 grasp until approximately two weeks ago  
11 when we discovered that a study had been  
12 prepared by the Millennium consultant's  
13 geologist, which had not been made  
14 public, and in fact which had been  
15 suppressed. It was not circulated, it  
16 was not part of the technical appendices  
17 attached to the EIR, it was not referred  
18 to in the draft or the final EIRs.

19 And we, in turn, hired our own  
20 certified engineering geologist to  
21 analyze the seismic issues. And I'm here  
22 today to tell you that there is something  
23 very rotten in the State of Denmark, also  
24 known as Hollywood, with regard to  
25 seismic issues, that no matter how great

1           somebody thinks this project is, no  
2           matter how wonderful of an investment or  
3           an improvement, or whatever benefits it  
4           might supposedly confer on the community,  
5           it cannot be approved, because the truth  
6           is that there are active fault traces of  
7           the Hollywood fault crossing this  
8           property.

9           This is not just an issue of  
10          disagreement among experts; this is an  
11          issue that was well known to the  
12          developer's consultants and was kept out  
13          of the public record. The planning  
14          staff, whether through negligence or  
15          incompetence -- I don't believe it could  
16          be either, because the data out there is  
17          so public and peer-reviewed -- has  
18          allowed this to get this far. You, as  
19          stewards of the public good, have to look  
20          at this and stop this process now.

21          Let me be a little more specific  
22          with regard to these seismic issues,  
23          because they are earthshaking, literally  
24          and figuratively. George Abrahams, who  
25          is a long-time resident of Hollywood, got

1 wind of some issues, questions about  
2 seismic, and he contacted a Professor  
3 Dolan at USC, who is the recognized  
4 national expert on the Hollywood fault.

5 THE CHAIRMAN: For the record, who  
6 is George Abrahams?

7 MR. SILVERSTEIN: I'm sorry?

8 THE CHAIRMAN: Who is George  
9 Abrahams, for the record?

10 MR. SILVERSTEIN: George Abrahams is  
11 right there, let the record reflect.  
12 And --

13 THE CHAIRMAN: Who is he?

14 MR. SILVERSTEIN: He is a --  
15 approximately a fifty-year resident of  
16 Hollywood.

17 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay.

18 MR. SILVERSTEIN: He's also an  
19 officer of the Beachwood Canyon  
20 Neighborhood Association, and he is a  
21 prominent activist. He also may be  
22 somebody who has saved thousands of lives  
23 because of the discovery of this seismic  
24 issue.

25 He contacted Professor Dolan of USC.

1 Professor Dolan of USC's jaw figuratively  
2 dropped when he learned what was being  
3 said about the supposed nonexistence of  
4 the Hollywood fault across the site. We  
5 have attached all of Professor Dolan's  
6 e-mails to us at Exhibit 24, and we urge  
7 you to read those. In polite terms, but  
8 nonetheless clear terms, Professor Dolan  
9 basically says that a fraud has been  
10 committed on the public in terms of the  
11 complete lack of disclosure of well-  
12 documented studies and fault traces on  
13 the property.

14 We discovered this, again, all of  
15 two weeks ago, and we've been busy trying  
16 to present the most comprehensive set of  
17 objections that we can so that you can  
18 make a decision based upon the proper  
19 information before you.

20 The problem with the EIR is that it  
21 doesn't serve its fundamental purpose of  
22 being a proper information disclosure  
23 document upon which both you, as the  
24 decision makers, and we, as the public,  
25 can make informed decisions. What we

1 have done is try to fill in those rather  
2 enormous gaps in the data that was before  
3 you until now.

4 What's really amazing here is that  
5 the EIR and the studies prepared by a  
6 firm out of Irvine, called Langan  
7 Engineering, hired by the Millennium  
8 consultant, failed to recognize, mention  
9 or disclose that for the past twenty  
10 years there have been peer-reviewed  
11 studies, including from Crook & Proctor  
12 in 1992, and Dolan in 1997, which map  
13 active fault traces across the property.

14 What did the Millennium people do?  
15 Well, I'd like you to take a look at an  
16 exhibit that I have prepared, because the  
17 Millennium folks falsified a map and  
18 showed -- yes, I say that with one  
19 hundred percent confidence and no  
20 hesitation -- falsified a map which  
21 depicts the subject property as being 850  
22 feet north of where it actually is.

23 And I'll show you and I will show  
24 the audience. The black lines here  
25 represent the City's fault rupture study

1 area, per the general plan safety  
2 element. The blue polygons represent  
3 what was shown to the public and you, in  
4 the EIR, as supposedly being the site of  
5 the Millennium project. The red  
6 square -- rectangle is the actual site,  
7 which is right through the black line.

8 So what's happening here? Figure 2.  
9 We've taken the Langan May 2012 study,  
10 the one that was part of the record, not  
11 the November one that was suppressed.  
12 And what we've done is -- the blue  
13 polygons are what were presented by  
14 Langan. And those blue polygons did not  
15 have the street map.

16 What the street map is, is our  
17 geologist, to scale, superimposed the  
18 street map to show the actual location of  
19 the subject property. Langan pretended  
20 that Yucca wasn't there, and shoved the  
21 properties, the blue, up to the north  
22 near Franklin, to get it outside the  
23 fault rupture zone.

24 What the red rectangle shows is the  
25 actual location. So you have before you

1 something that was what we would call  
2 tampered with.

3 And why don't you turn around and  
4 show the audience?

5 So the blue is what the EIR falsely  
6 claims. The red is where the property  
7 actually is. The black is the City's own  
8 fault rupture study zone, which means  
9 there has to be a fault investigation  
10 done and it has to be a proper fault  
11 investigation. This is no accident; this  
12 cannot be attributed to mere negligence  
13 or incompetence. That's number one.

14 Number two, not only did they fail  
15 to cite the Dolan studies and the Crook &  
16 Proctor studies, but unbelievably, the  
17 2010 California State Geological Survey  
18 Map, which shows the Hollywood fault  
19 crossing the subject property, was never  
20 mentioned in the studies. This is not,  
21 again, a disagreement; this is the  
22 California geological survey's 2010 map,  
23 which is considered the bible of  
24 geologic issues. To somehow pretend that  
25 it doesn't exist and to not mention it is

1 completely unacceptable.

2 THE CHAIRMAN: Well, you said the  
3 same things several times now, different  
4 ways.

5 MR. SILVERSTEIN: Okay. The  
6 black --

7 THE CHAIRMAN: So can you move on to  
8 other points --

9 MR. SILVERSTEIN: Yes.

10 THE CHAIRMAN: -- because you're  
11 losing your time.

12 MR. SILVERSTEIN: So the black line  
13 there -- George, if you could just show  
14 the audience also -- the black -- the A  
15 represents Hollywood and Vine. The  
16 project site is just north of that. The  
17 black line, from the California geologic  
18 survey, is the Hollywood fault, which is  
19 active --

20 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay.

21 MR. SILVERSTEIN: -- which the MTA  
22 has said, in their EIR --

23 THE CHAIRMAN: You've made that very  
24 clear now.

25 MR. SILVERSTEIN: Okay. I didn't



1 mention the MTA. But in any event, I  
2 think we get the point.

3 And the third -- I'm going to skip  
4 it. It's in my letter. I trust that you  
5 will read it, given that we don't --

6 THE CHAIRMAN: You just gave it to  
7 us; yeah, we're looking through --

8 MR. SILVERSTEIN: Right.

9 THE CHAIRMAN: -- it right now.

10 MR. SILVERSTEIN: Right, and we  
11 just, you know, only figured this out.  
12 But we trust that you aren't going to  
13 want to approve, basically, a fifty-five-  
14 story tomb on top of an active earthquake  
15 fault.

16 Okay. Continuing briefly. There  
17 are several CEQA issues that I have  
18 included in the letter. I am only going  
19 to hit a couple here, for the sake of  
20 time.

21 Number one, CEQA is under attack  
22 because people claim that it's being  
23 misused to stop good projects. First of  
24 all, this isn't a good project; it's a  
25 calamitous project on top of an

1 earthquake fault.

2 But second of all, remember that  
3 sometimes other governmental agencies  
4 actually weigh in and say, wait a minute;  
5 this is a bad and dangerous project. And  
6 what you have here is Caltrans, a sister  
7 agency, which is called a responsible  
8 agency under CEQA, weighing in and saying  
9 over and over, in written comments to the  
10 City, that this EIR is facially  
11 inadequate, fails to respond to Caltrans'  
12 comments, and should not be approved.  
13 Caltrans has also complained in writing  
14 that the City has ignored Caltrans'  
15 comments and has failed to proceed in the  
16 manner required by law.

17 I would respectfully tell you that  
18 when another agency, like Caltrans,  
19 weighs in and says, stop, this is bad,  
20 this is harmful and this is illegal, you  
21 really need to listen. So far you  
22 haven't.

23 I'm here because Caltrans -- I don't  
24 know if they have a representative here;  
25 I know they've appeared in writing. But

1 I'm here to emphasize their points.  
2 Under CEQA, as a responsible agency,  
3 Caltrans has the right to tell you, the  
4 City, the lead agency, the contents and  
5 the scope of information that shall be in  
6 the EIR.

7 Caltrans specifically demanded that  
8 you analyze the impacts to the 101  
9 freeway, based upon the highway capacity  
10 manual methodology, not based upon the  
11 congestion management program  
12 methodology. It sounds very esoteric,  
13 sounds boring, but Caltrans is telling  
14 you the right way to do it, and the City  
15 hasn't done it. On that basis also --

16 THE CHAIRMAN: Let me highly  
17 recommend you start concluding.

18 MR. SILVERSTEIN: On that basis  
19 also, this EIR is improper.

20 We've also put into the record  
21 information from the fire department.  
22 Not too long ago, the fire department  
23 made a public announcement that all of  
24 the data on response times that the fire  
25 department had previously submitted to

1 the City was not reliable. That's their  
2 words, "not reliable". Everything in  
3 this EIR is based on that now expressly  
4 repudiated data by the fire department  
5 itself. There has not been an adequate  
6 analysis of fire and safety response  
7 times and the impact to fire and police  
8 services.

9 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay.

10 MR. SILVERSTEIN: On that basis, as  
11 well, the EIR has to be --

12 THE CHAIRMAN: Are you finished?

13 MR. SILVERSTEIN: -- set back.

14 If you would like, I will cut it  
15 shorter.

16 THE CHAIRMAN: Well, you're already  
17 down to ten minutes, so --

18 MR. SILVERSTEIN: Okay. If I may --

19 THE CHAIRMAN: So you're done.

20 MR. SILVERSTEIN: Okay. I  
21 appreciate that. But I also appreciate  
22 you giving us due process. This is  
23 obviously extremely important.

24 THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, and that's why  
25 you got the ten minutes you asked for.

1 MR. SILVERSTEIN: Thank you. I  
2 should have asked for twenty.

3 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: You would  
4 have gotten five.

5 MR. SILVERSTEIN: Bill Roschen --  
6 Bill Roschen is the president of the  
7 planning commission. At the planning  
8 commission hearing a couple of months  
9 ago, the City attorney correctly  
10 announced that Bill Roschen had a  
11 disqualifying conflict of interest  
12 because he was financially interested in  
13 the project as a consultant to the  
14 developer. As a result, the developer  
15 withdrew the development agreement but  
16 proceeded with the rest of the project  
17 entitlements. That is not good enough.

18 The City attorney only got it partly  
19 right. The other entitlements are a  
20 contract, because everything, at the end  
21 of the day, is reduced to what is called  
22 a covenant and agreement. That covenant  
23 and agreement has the same force and  
24 effect as the development agreement, in  
25 terms of it being contractually binding.

1           What that means, under Government Code  
2           Section 1090, is that every decision that  
3           was made by the planning commission is  
4           tainted by Roschen's conflict of  
5           interest. The taint was not cured or  
6           removed solely by excluding the  
7           development agreement. It has to be  
8           redone entirely. And this process does  
9           not cure the prior infirmity; otherwise  
10          Section --

11           THE CHAIRMAN: Okay.

12           MR. SILVERSTEIN: -- 1090 would be  
13          meaningless.

14           To conclude --

15           THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, sir. To  
16          conclude --

17           MR. SILVERSTEIN: To conclude --

18           THE CHAIRMAN: Final sentence.

19          Let's see if you can do it.

20           MR. SILVERSTEIN: -- we appreciate  
21          your time. We ask you to give this  
22          serious consideration, especially  
23          regarding the seismic.

24           On behalf of appellant, its  
25          constituent groups, dozens of supporting

1 neighborhood associations, and hundreds  
2 of thousands of City of Los Angeles  
3 residents, we urge you to reject this  
4 project and the EIR.

5 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, sir.

6 MR. SILVERSTEIN: Thank you.

7 THE CHAIRMAN: You have a question?

8 COUNCIL MEMBER: On the -- Mr.  
9 Silverstein --

10 THE CHAIRMAN: Please, my colleague  
11 has a question for the speaker, please.

12 COUNCIL MEMBER: On the issue of the  
13 fault, are you claiming that you're  
14 asking the City to investigate, or do you  
15 know already whether it's active or  
16 inactive, or what is the actual status of  
17 the fault?

18 MR. SILVERSTEIN: Well, the status  
19 of the fault is active; there's no doubt.  
20 Even in the City's recent EIR on the  
21 Hollywood Community Plan Update, that  
22 document, by the City, acknowledges that  
23 the Hollywood fault is active. Nobody  
24 denies that.

25 Active, in seismic terminology, is

1 defined as any movement within the last  
2 11,000 years. And it's moved plenty,  
3 much more recently than that. So number  
4 one, the City's own documents acknowledge  
5 that it's active. There is no dispute  
6 about that.

7 The MTA EIR and EIS for the red  
8 line, similarly, said that the Hollywood  
9 fault is active. It also said that there  
10 is a five percent chance of a 7.0  
11 earthquake in the relatively near future.  
12 So in terms of activity, that's not even  
13 in dispute.

14 COUNCIL MEMBER: Okay.

15 MR. SILVERSTEIN: In terms of what  
16 am I asking, what I am saying is that the  
17 EIR is invalid, verging on, you know,  
18 fraudulent, because of the way that the  
19 information was suppressed about the  
20 Hollywood fault; because of the way that  
21 they falsified the location of the site;  
22 because of the way that they falsely  
23 claimed that the fault was 0.4 miles  
24 away, when it's not; because of the  
25 disregard of the Dolan and the Crook and



1 Proctor studies; because of the disregard  
2 of the California Geologic Survey Map,  
3 which shows the fault running across it.  
4 They can't build a doghouse on that  
5 property, respectfully --

6 COUNCIL MEMBER: Thank you --

7 MR. SILVERSTEIN: -- and they know  
8 it.

9 COUNCIL MEMBER: -- for your answer.

10 MR. SILVERSTEIN: Now you know it.

11 COUNCIL MEMBER: Thank you.

12 MR. SILVERSTEIN: And we're asking  
13 that you do the right thing.

14 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

15 And now to our City attorney, did we  
16 evaluate the Section 1090 assertion, and  
17 where are we with that?

18 CITY ATTORNEY: Well, I believe that  
19 we have, but I will go back and discuss  
20 it with the City attorney that was at the  
21 City Planning Commission meeting. I  
22 believe that entitlements are different  
23 from a contract --

24 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay.

25 CITY ATTORNEY: -- such as a

1 development agreement.

2 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay.

3 CITY ATTORNEY: But I'll confirm  
4 that.

5 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you.

6 COUNCILMAN ENGLANDER: Quick  
7 question. First an observation on your  
8 Exhibit 3, that states the inadequacies  
9 that you addressed in the fire  
10 department. You included, in fact, the  
11 entire analysis and the fixes from the  
12 fire department, in their report,  
13 identifying the updated CAD (ph.) systems  
14 being put into place, identifying --  
15 further identifying the FireStat LA (ph.)  
16 system being put into place and adopted  
17 by the council and the City, the fix in  
18 what they put together to accurately  
19 reflect all the current data and backlog  
20 the data to fix the underlying issue of  
21 what was wrong with their data, which --  
22 so it didn't include the additional  
23 reports that the fire department actually  
24 corrected their action and have true  
25 baseline data, retrospectively. But

1 just -- so you might want to update that.

2 On the safety element, on your  
3 Exhibit 16, basically, on a lot of the  
4 things you're saying about the fault  
5 lines -- and I paid careful attention to  
6 that, particularly, as I represent  
7 Northridge earthquake area, which we're  
8 coming up on the twenty-year anniversary  
9 on.

10 And in reading through it, I'm very  
11 familiar with these studies as well. One  
12 of the interpretations of your analysis  
13 is actually highlighted in the report  
14 that you submitted, but basically says  
15 that the entire City of Los Angeles poses  
16 the same seismic threat, every part of  
17 the City, regardless of the underlying  
18 geologic and soil conditions, and that in  
19 fact these faults and thresholds, whether  
20 active or inactive, in fact pose a  
21 significant risk, and the entire City of  
22 Los Angeles is at that risk.

23 In fact, it's been further stated by  
24 the experts, Dr. Lucy Jones, of the U.S.  
25 Geological Survey, and others, that it's

1 not a matter of if the big one hits; it's  
2 when. But it's going to happen here,  
3 anywhere, at some point in time. But  
4 you're pointing to this one particular  
5 area. I just wanted to show fault in  
6 your study, that yeah, there's a true  
7 threat, but it's everywhere in Los  
8 Angeles.

9 MR. SILVERSTEIN: Can I --

10 COUNCILMAN ENGLANDER: Not to make  
11 you any more comfortable, but it was just  
12 my analysis.

13 THE CHAIRMAN: It's just an  
14 observation.

15 COUNCILMAN ENGLANDER: Just an  
16 observation. But thank you very much.

17 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Thank  
18 you. We've given you ample time.

19 We have another appellant that we  
20 need to hear from as well. I believe we  
21 have Mr. Reznik representing the other  
22 appellant?

23 MR. REZNIK: Good afternoon. The  
24 appellant -- I think you have the  
25 corporate name, just for the record, so

1 we should note it's -- I represent the W  
2 Hotel in Hollywood and the residences at  
3 the W Hotel.

4 I'm Ben Reznik, with the firm of  
5 Jeffer Mangels Butler & Mitchell. We  
6 have filed letters and objections dating  
7 back to the comments on the EIR and the  
8 planning commission.

9 Let me just start off by saying my  
10 client is supportive of development in  
11 Hollywood and seeing Hollywood continue  
12 its development and seeing this very site  
13 be developed.

14 The problem our client has is that  
15 there is no known project in front of  
16 you. What you have and what the planning  
17 commission approved is basically a blank  
18 envelope, carte blanche, for this  
19 applicant to be able to build whatever he  
20 so chooses in the future, within a  
21 framework known as trip gaps; the only  
22 thing limiting here is the number of  
23 AM/PM peak trips. But this development  
24 can be anything. This development, in  
25 the future, is not tied to anything.

1           This is 1,160,000 square feet of  
2           development; basically, we don't know  
3           what it's going to be. This could be a  
4           height of anywhere from 220 feet to 585.  
5           This could be 900 residential units or  
6           zero residential units. This could be  
7           200 hotel rooms or zero hotel rooms.  
8           This could be 250,000 square feet of  
9           office space, or a lot more. This could  
10          be any combination you can think of.  
11          This could be the two spiral towers you  
12          see, or this could be something  
13          completely different. There is nothing  
14          to lock in this project into any sort of  
15          review. What you're approving is a carte  
16          blanche envelope. It's never been done  
17          this way in the City with this size  
18          project, for sure.

19                 So for example, they want to apply,  
20                 in the future, for alcohol permits,  
21                 restaurants and all of that. There's a  
22                 condition, condition 3, that says they'll  
23                 come in for plan approval every time they  
24                 do that. But there is nothing to allow  
25                 any sort of review for stakeholders in

1 the area to see what they're actually  
2 going to build. They can literally walk  
3 in, under this set of entitlements, and  
4 pull building permits and build what they  
5 so choose to build. It could be half the  
6 height of the building, but it could  
7 cover the entire podium or the deck.

8 And so our concern is that we don't  
9 know what it is we're being asked to  
10 approve, support. And we've raised this  
11 issue before, and hence we're in a  
12 position of saying we can't support a  
13 project that is a carte blanche  
14 development of this magnitude and this  
15 size.

16 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay.

17 MR. REZNIK: So at a minimum, there  
18 ought to be some conditions imposed that,  
19 as the project shifts or changes,  
20 whatever it is that they're willing to  
21 commit to today -- because you saw how  
22 short the staff report was; that's  
23 because there is no real project to give  
24 you that's committed to.

25 So there should be subsequent plan

1           approvals, subsequent committee reviews.  
2           That doesn't mean they have to go back  
3           and start again; they'll have a certified  
4           EIR, maybe. But there's a problem too.  
5           The EIR is not a project EIR; it's a  
6           program EIR. It analyzes all sorts of  
7           options, but it doesn't analyze a  
8           project, this project, or whatever it is  
9           that this is.

10           And so we find ourselves in this  
11           awkward place where we've actually asked  
12           this developer to commit to a project,  
13           show us what the project is. We've seen  
14           pictures, but when you read the  
15           paperwork, when you read what was  
16           actually approved, it's carte blanche;  
17           they can do anything they want. And so  
18           we oppose, based on that basis.

19           And based on that, the EIR is  
20           defective, because there is no specific  
21           project description. And so hence, we  
22           think that it's a terrible mistake to  
23           approve something of this nature. And  
24           it's being done under what we call the  
25           land use equivalency program. If that's



1 the future of the City, if that's the way  
2 applications now will get filed, then  
3 basically, you're basically wasting your  
4 time with public hearings, aren't we,  
5 because it's going to be here, just give  
6 a set of limits, and in the future the  
7 developer can build whatever he or she  
8 chooses. So that's our objection, and  
9 with that --

10 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

11 MR. REZNIK: -- we ask that the  
12 project be either returned for a real  
13 project analysis and a commitment or that  
14 today some commitment be made to a  
15 specific project, and if that's going to  
16 change, require a plan approval review in  
17 the future. Thank you.

18 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, sir.

19 All right, folks. We've still got a  
20 few more steps to go through, so I  
21 appreciate your cooperation.

22 We will now hear from the applicant,  
23 and then we'll go into public comment.

24 Applicant like to come on up and  
25 give us your response?

1           Do we have another appellant? I  
2 think that's enough, those two.

3           MR. AARONS: Good afternoon, members  
4 of the PLUM committee and others, and  
5 thank you very much for the opportunity  
6 to be here today.

7           My name is Philip Aarons. I'm a  
8 founding principal of Millennium  
9 Partners, along with Argent Ventures,  
10 other developers of the Millennium  
11 Hollywood project.

12           When Millennium acquired the Capitol  
13 Records project, Capitol Records  
14 building, and the adjacent underutilized  
15 parking lots six years ago, we started a  
16 dialogue with the planning department,  
17 elected officials and neighborhood groups  
18 to determine the best design for a  
19 project that would preserve Capitol  
20 Records, preserve the views -- historic  
21 views of Capitol Records, as well as  
22 create a transformative, transit-oriented  
23 project at one of the most famous  
24 intersections in the world.

25           We had numerous meetings with

1 neighborhood groups and the council  
2 office for CD-13, both current and  
3 future, and have studied a variety of  
4 possible design solutions for this  
5 exciting mixed-use project.

6 I would like to ask Gary Handel,  
7 from Handel Architects, who along with  
8 Roschen Van Cleve, are architects for  
9 this project, to present the design, as  
10 originally approved by CPC, and some  
11 lower-height alternatives which we have  
12 studied, that address the concerns of our  
13 neighbors and the council office. Thank  
14 you.

15 MR. HANDEL: Thank you, Phil.

16 Council members, my name is Gary  
17 Handel, a founding principal of Handel  
18 Architects and a member of the design  
19 team.

20 And so the guidelines and standards  
21 actually represent a robust framework of  
22 rules that govern development on the  
23 site. The design guidelines and  
24 standards themselves are a sixty-one page  
25 document that encompasses hundreds of

1 rules and regulations that are tied  
2 together to achieve the development  
3 objectives that have been agreed to by  
4 the developer, planning and the  
5 community.

6 In addition, I'm working with  
7 planning staff, over the years, to bring  
8 this project to you. There are  
9 approximately eighty pages of conditions  
10 that basically further restrict the  
11 development.

12 And so those design guidelines and  
13 standards govern a number of things on  
14 the site and actually mandate a project  
15 of a certain quality and that it needs to  
16 behave in a certain way.

17 THE CHAIRMAN: If you -- if I may  
18 interrupt. If you could try to answer  
19 some of the assertions made during the --

20 MR. HANDEL: So the first -- you  
21 know, the first assertion is that there  
22 are -- there is nothing that governs  
23 development on the site. And so the  
24 guidelines and standards are actually a  
25 legal framework that we need to exist

1 within, in order that any development on  
2 the site can be measured against.

3 Next. There are a series of  
4 objectives that basically guide the  
5 design guidelines and standards.

6 Next. Next. And basically, it does  
7 allow for a certain programmatic  
8 flexibility, with the idea being that the  
9 development on the site would produce a  
10 vibrant mixed-use development that can be  
11 built within this economic climate.

12 Next. It governs specifically where  
13 tall buildings can be located on the  
14 site. So if you look at zones B and C,  
15 those are the areas where towers can be  
16 located on the site, and zones A and D  
17 are lower-height districts. This is in  
18 line with the Hollywood Community Plan,  
19 which basically sets forward Vine Street  
20 as an appropriate corridor for tall  
21 buildings.

22 Next. It sets forth street wall  
23 standards that basically mandate that  
24 retail and other active uses will line  
25 the streets and passageways as well as

1           establishing public open space.

2           Next. And it creates a binding  
3           formula for, basically, lot coverage,  
4           open space and height. And so while the  
5           project -- next -- can exist at a number  
6           of different heights, at those different  
7           heights, it needs to provide different  
8           things.

9           And so this is a complex document  
10          that has been negotiated with planning,  
11          with the stakeholders, and with the  
12          electeds, to govern development on the  
13          site.

14          Next. In order to illustrate that,  
15          we did a series of views that basically  
16          would show how the project would perform  
17          at different heights. So at the 220-foot  
18          height -- go back, please, you see, you  
19          know, it occupies more lot coverage, so  
20          that basically it is a bulkier building.  
21          Next. At a higher height, it pulls back,  
22          and more open space is provided. Next.  
23          And that at the tallest heights, it  
24          occupies the least amount of site  
25          footprint and more public open space is

1 provided. These are binding  
2 requirements.

3 From the little country church  
4 across Argyle, a similar series of views.  
5 So the project at 229, with its required  
6 open space; at 400, with its open space;  
7 and at 585, again, occupying the smaller  
8 portion of the site, with more of the  
9 development organized into tall slender  
10 towers.

11 Next. It actually sets out rules  
12 for urban design and architecture. Next.  
13 It mandates that the podiums will be  
14 organized according to appropriate  
15 neighborhood data with higher podium  
16 heights on -- you know, fronting onto  
17 Ivar and to the east side of Vine; lower  
18 heights on to the east side of Vine and  
19 onto Argyle.

20 Next. And it allows for the  
21 creation and mandates a through-block  
22 connection of public open space that can  
23 then be extended -- next -- to the  
24 parking lots to the west, and eventually  
25 tie into the Hollywood cap park.

1           Next. The open space itself  
2 basically was shown, and this is at the  
3 tallest height, with a series of public  
4 open spaces, working our way from Argyle  
5 to the east.

6           Next. Showing the longue. Next.  
7 The garden. Next. And then the stage  
8 which fronts onto Vine Street. Next.  
9 And again, a view of the state. Next.  
10 And across the street on Vine, Capital  
11 Plaza.

12           Next. The towers themselves. You  
13 know, basically, there are articulation  
14 standards within the guideline that  
15 basically the idea is to not produce the  
16 standard residential, slick, glass tower,  
17 but something that's more articulated.  
18 This is Pierre Koenig's case study 21.  
19 Next. Taking that into building form.  
20 Next. Into aggregate form. Next. And  
21 then into towers.

22           We met with the design and review  
23 commission. There were suggestions on  
24 our peer group review that we provide an  
25 alternate palette, which has been put



1 into the planning document, and so that  
2 there are material standards that will  
3 have to be followed for any building that  
4 is created on the site.

5 Next. Next. And so this was the  
6 scheme that was approved at planning.  
7 And then working with -- well, working at  
8 the suggestion of the council, we looked  
9 at some lower-height alternatives.

10 Next. And you can see -- and so --  
11 go back. And so the initial study is at  
12 fifty-five and forty-five stories. Next.  
13 And then alternative 1 reduces the  
14 building height to forty-five and thirty-  
15 nine stories. Next. And then  
16 alternative 2 further reduces the height  
17 to thirty-nine and thirty-five stories.

18 Next. A similar view. This is a  
19 view of the City planning approved  
20 scheme. Next. And then a reduction to  
21 the thirty-nine/thirty-five, in this  
22 case.

23 Next. This is another -- this is a  
24 view looking towards the south. Next.  
25 And this is the reduction in -- the first

1 reduction. Next. And then the second  
2 reduction to the thirty-nine/thirty-five.

3 Next. On the open space, there --  
4 this is the approved open space from the  
5 larger scheme. And then next -- and so  
6 the attempt has been made to maintain the  
7 principles that were established in the  
8 larger scheme in all of the schemes,  
9 fully following the guidelines and  
10 standards that are established for the  
11 site.

12 And so you can see this -- go back.  
13 So this is the first alternative. Next.  
14 And then this is the thirty-nine/thirty-  
15 five alternative. All of the elements  
16 are there. The open space is slightly  
17 reduced in order to accommodate a  
18 slightly bulkier podium.

19 Next. And then some vies of the --  
20 so this is the view of the stage from  
21 the -- in the CPC-approved scheme. Next.  
22 And then this is alternative 1. Next.  
23 And then alternative 2, with a slightly  
24 bulkier podium. Next. The CPC-approved  
25 scheme. Next. The redesigned project at

1 lower height. Next. And again, a view  
2 looking back across Vine Street, and then  
3 with the alternative scheme. Next. This  
4 is a view looking up Vine Street towards  
5 the Capitol Records building in the  
6 CPC -- go back -- CPC-approved scheme.  
7 And then the revised alternative.

8 Next. And then go back, back, back.  
9 Sorry.

10 THE CHAIRMAN: Are we done?

11 MR. HANDEL: Almost. So there -- go  
12 ahead. And then a view of the CPC-  
13 approved scheme, the alternative scheme.  
14 Next. The view of the observation  
15 longue, which is a requirement of the  
16 project. Next. That at night. Next.  
17 And that's the close.

18 Thank you.

19 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, sir.

20 How much more time do --

21 MR. NEUMAN: Council Member Reyes,  
22 members of the PLUM committee, my name is  
23 Gerry Neuman, representing the Hollywood  
24 Millennium project.

25 We'd like to run through a couple of

1 responses to what you heard from the  
2 appellants. My partner, Alfred Fraijo,  
3 would like to present a letter that we  
4 have provided you, relative to the  
5 responses to the written appeal that we  
6 saw, as well as some -- we have a writing  
7 relative to the amount of some  
8 corrections that we would like to see  
9 from the planning commission approval.

10 THE CHAIRMAN: So give us the  
11 Reader's Digest version.

12 MR. NEUMAN: The Reader's Digest  
13 version.

14 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay.

15 MR. NEUMAN: I think you may have  
16 questions. I'm going to first address --  
17 why don't we -- why don't I let Alfred go  
18 first and run through the Reader's Digest  
19 version of those issues.

20 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay.

21 MR. NEUMAN: And then I'll come back  
22 and address responses to the -- what the  
23 appellant said in the last couple  
24 minutes.

25 THE CHAIRMAN: We're going to keep

1           it within four minutes, because that's  
2           within the ten minutes I gave the  
3           appellant. So we'll keep it four  
4           minutes.

5           MR. FRAIJO: Thank you, committee  
6           members. Alfred Fraijo, counsel for the  
7           applicant. I simply wanted to raise a  
8           couple of points really quickly.

9           We did submit a written letter in  
10          response to all of the objections that  
11          were raised in the appeal, for your  
12          consideration, in May, in advance of the  
13          hearing, unlike our appellants, for your  
14          consideration.

15          And the issues -- to conclude and  
16          sort of summarize, in a nutshell, the  
17          issues that were raised are not new  
18          issues that have not been considered by  
19          the EIR. The appellants have been  
20          working with a series of stakeholders, as  
21          was mentioned. They submitted a series  
22          of comment letters, and those comment  
23          letters were adequately addressed in the  
24          EIR.

25          The major points that were raised,

1 in terms of objections, was this issue of  
2 specificity relative to the project  
3 description. This is a project-specific  
4 EIR. The notion of an equivalency  
5 program is not a new program, as both of  
6 you know; it's a program that's been used  
7 as a lead agency in the City of LA for  
8 various projects, projects of this scale  
9 that require the kind of consideration,  
10 both in terms of the uses that are  
11 considered -- it's a transit-oriented  
12 development with the range of uses.

13 The equivalency program allows a  
14 series of changes. And as a result, the  
15 EIR takes a conservative stance, relative  
16 to those changes, meaning that we studied  
17 the most potentially impactful scenario  
18 relative to those modifications that are  
19 adequately addressed in the EIR. And  
20 we're confident that, both in terms of  
21 precedent by the lead agency and on the  
22 basis of case law, that we are within the  
23 range of what CEQA permits.

24 With regards to the Q condition,  
25 which is another important issue to raise

1 with you today, there is an argument that  
2 somehow because of the removal of the  
3 development agreement and the Q  
4 condition, that allows for the  
5 flexibility relative to the development  
6 regulations that were presented by our  
7 architects. The Q condition in the  
8 Municipal Code is designed precisely to  
9 add specificity with regards to  
10 development standards for projects that  
11 are before the City.

12 And so in that respect, the  
13 requirements that are found in the  
14 provisions of the Q condition is that the  
15 project comply with the general plan,  
16 that with respect to those additional  
17 development standards, that they be  
18 designed to provide further guarantees to  
19 the City relative to what is going to be  
20 built. And in that sense, the project  
21 complies with those additional  
22 requirements in the Q condition.

23 Finally, to turn it over to my  
24 colleague, I wanted to just alert you to  
25 the series of modifications that we are

1 requesting. Again, that was already  
2 presented for your consideration, and  
3 they relate primarily to a couple of  
4 additional issues that came about since  
5 the planning commission unanimous  
6 approval, namely, there were a couple of  
7 changes with regards to the terminology  
8 in the development regulations that we  
9 thought were appropriate. One example of  
10 that was with regards to the use of --  
11 their use of the term "street wall" as  
12 opposed to "podium". And we wanted to  
13 make sure that there was some consistency  
14 around that.

15 There's also two provisions, in  
16 terms of the conditions that were  
17 required, that, after consultation with  
18 Metro, Metro gave us some input, and as a  
19 result, we wanted those conditions  
20 modified as well.

21 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. So let's keep  
22 it short.

23 MR. FRAIJO: And those, again, the  
24 series of requested changes have been  
25 submitted for your consideration and have



1           been discussed with the planning  
2           department.

3           Thank you very much.

4           MR. NEUMAN: All right. In terms of  
5           the specific issues that were raised  
6           today, one, the seismic issue, and two,  
7           the not knowing what the project is -- I  
8           think Mr. Fraijo already discussed the  
9           fact that this is the most -- as you look  
10          at the guidelines, this is actually the  
11          most over-studied, over-regulated project  
12          that the City has ever considered, and it  
13          provides greater tools to the City and  
14          City Planning Department than they've  
15          ever had, in trying to provide projects  
16          that can both meet the needs of the  
17          market as well as respond to them  
18          appropriately on a timely basis.

19          Relative to the 1090 issue, the City  
20          attorney has reviewed that issue. While  
21          we -- we provided opinions that we didn't  
22          even agree that there was a conflict  
23          relative to the development agreement,  
24          out of an abundance of caution, the  
25          development agreement was removed. There

1 is no 1090 issue relative to the specific  
2 standards of passing entitlements on a  
3 project, irrespective of whether a  
4 covenant is recorded or not.

5 I'm not going to go into the fire  
6 department issue, as I think Council  
7 Member Englander has already discussed  
8 that a little bit.

9 On the seismic issue, I want to be  
10 clear as to what exactly that issue was  
11 discussed. It's interesting that Mr.  
12 Silverstein's own charts have different  
13 locations of the fault lines. So where  
14 he says that things have been changed by  
15 us, which is completely an utter  
16 falsehood, the reality is is even his own  
17 charts indicate different areas of the  
18 fault.

19 Now, the reason for that is, as  
20 we've gone through the process, the City  
21 of Los Angeles has been waiting for the  
22 state to undertake its new fault study,  
23 which the state is undertaking. The City  
24 has never done its own fault study. And  
25 to say that the faults are active, one,

1 is completely erroneous; there is no  
2 document within the City that determines  
3 that there is any active fault within the  
4 area.

5 We did specific studies, at the  
6 request of the planning department,  
7 voluntary studies relative to our EIR,  
8 and did specific borings across the  
9 entire site to determine whether or not  
10 there was any evidence of a fault within  
11 the area. Those studies were included in  
12 our EIR, and you can see those studies.

13 In addition -- and this may be where  
14 there is some mistake relative to the  
15 thought that we had some secret study --  
16 the planning department, as part of our  
17 track map, requires additional studies to  
18 be done relative to specific building on  
19 a track, and that is part of their track  
20 conditions. So they requested that we go  
21 back and do additional borings across the  
22 site to determine whether or not there is  
23 a fault.

24 There is a -- the state currently  
25 has an idea that there -- the Hollywood

1           fault extends to the north boundary of  
2           the property and then comes southward.  
3           And we didn't know where and if it  
4           intersected the property. What our  
5           boring showed, as we crisscrossed the  
6           site in borings, was that the fault was  
7           not evident anywhere on our site.

8           That study was not included in the  
9           EIR, because it was never part of what  
10          were the requests in the scope of the EIR  
11          to begin with, but it was a requirement  
12          specific relative to building and safety  
13          and their analysis of our track map. And  
14          so that's why you hear that there may be  
15          two different studies.

16          The reality is, at the end of the  
17          day, the site is over-studied. It has  
18          been studied to the -- to an incredible  
19          extent, borings across the site,  
20          determining that there is no fault on the  
21          property.

22          THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, sir.

23          COUNCIL MEMBER: So there is no  
24          building that will be built on top of a  
25          fault?

1 MR. NEUMAN: No, there is no fault  
2 line that actually crosses the boundary  
3 of the property. There is no evidence of  
4 any fault on the property.

5 COUNCIL MEMBER: If there is, do you  
6 know --

7 MR. NEUMAN: If there is --

8 COUNCIL MEMBER: -- how far --

9 MR. NEUMAN: If there is one  
10 determined, for instance, if you ended up  
11 excavating and found a fault that was  
12 active -- one, it has to be younger than  
13 11,000 years old for it to be considered  
14 active. If in excavation that was  
15 discovered, there are regulations that  
16 regulate where a building can be built  
17 relative to a fault line, and we would  
18 have to adhere to those regulations. And  
19 that's part of what the building and  
20 safety study was meant to determine.

21 COUNCIL MEMBER: When we were  
22 building schools, we had a number of  
23 cases like that, and there are some  
24 guidelines as to how far away you could  
25 build from a fault --

1 MR. NEUMAN: Exactly.

2 COUNCIL MEMBER: -- but there is no  
3 fault near the site? In terms --

4 MR. NEUMAN: There may be a fault to  
5 the north of the site; we don't know.  
6 But nowhere that is close enough to  
7 change the building regulations that is  
8 part of our proposal at the moment.

9 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay.

10 MR. NEUMAN: Thank you. We would  
11 request --

12 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

13 MR. NEUMAN: -- that you deny the  
14 appeals and that you approve the planning  
15 commission, subject to any discussion  
16 that the council office may wish to  
17 present to you today.

18 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Okay. We  
19 have a lot of cards, folks. We'll be  
20 here until, like, 9 p.m. Just kidding.  
21 We do have a lot of cards, though.

22 Let's go with twenty minutes each  
23 side, and let's see how far we can go.  
24 So when you do come up, the shorter your  
25 presentation of your statements, the more

1 people will be able to speak. We are  
2 going to limit every speaker to one  
3 minute.

4 If you don't have to take the whole  
5 minute, more people can be heard. If you  
6 are in agreement with the previous  
7 speaker, you're fine to say I agree with  
8 the previous speaker and give us anything  
9 else. Try not to repeat what was already  
10 said. I know this can be an emotional  
11 issue.

12 If you wrote a letter, get to the  
13 point of the letter as quickly as you  
14 can. So if you just zero in on your main  
15 point on your letter, and not go through  
16 the whole letter, you would save yourself  
17 time. Keep it to one minute.

18 So let's start with those who are  
19 opposed. And we'll start with Jack  
20 Humphreville, then John Hartman (ph.) --  
21 you're welcome to come to the mic --  
22 Arlene VanBreems (ph.) and John Girodo  
23 (ph.).

24 Good day, sir.

25 MR. HUMPHREVILLE: Hi. My name's

1 Jack Humphreville. I'm with the Greater  
2 Wilshire Neighborhood Council, and on May  
3 8th, we voted to oppose the Millennium  
4 Hollywood project as proposed. We also  
5 notified the City council and the Mayor.

6 I also wrote the opposition argument  
7 to Proposition A, the half-cent increase  
8 in our sales tax that would have raised  
9 200 million dollars. Prop A was rejected  
10 by fifty-five percent of the voters, yet  
11 only four months earlier, seventy percent  
12 of LA's voters voted for Prop A, which  
13 raised 300 -- 600 million dollars.

14 If you approve the Millennium  
15 monstrosity, where the New York City  
16 developer makes a billion dollars and we  
17 get nothing but gridlock and chromes, you  
18 will create another -- you will alienate  
19 another high-voting neighborhood. Then  
20 consider all the other high-voting  
21 neighborhoods and homeowner associations  
22 that you have screwed. You have created  
23 a massive opposition to any tax increase  
24 you might impose, including, Mitch, your  
25 street tax.



1           Is this the way Eric wants to begin  
2 his reign? Is this what Mitch O'Farrell  
3 wants to begin? Send the -- send the --

4           THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, sir.

5           MR. HUMPHREVILLE: -- Millennium  
6 project back --

7           THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much.

8           MR. HUMPHREVILLE: Thank you.

9           THE CHAIRMAN: John Hartman? Arlene  
10 Vanbreems? John Hartman, are you here?

11           Okay. Arlene Vanbreems.

12           MS. VANBREEMS: Yes. My name is  
13 Arlene Vanbreems. Gentlemen, I  
14 appreciate the chance to speak before  
15 you.

16           I also had the opportunity of  
17 looking at the pictures that were  
18 presented to you, and I would request  
19 that you notice -- or pay attention to  
20 the fact that no cars were in any of the  
21 pictures. We who live in the hills, we  
22 drive; the City of Los Angeles is based  
23 on a grid that involves cars, motor  
24 vehicles.

25           I am also a -- I use public

1 transportation; I have a TAP card. And  
2 if you look at Warren Olney's interview  
3 with the developer, he has absolutely no  
4 sense of how we get around in Los  
5 Angeles. He thought that these two  
6 towers would be icons for Los Angeles.  
7 He was very excited about that. We have  
8 our icons; it's the Hollywood hills, it's  
9 the Hollywood sign, it's the historic  
10 capital building.

11 And we -- on a night where the  
12 Hollywood Bowl is being -- has a crowd,  
13 15,000 cars are getting to the Hollywood  
14 Bowl. We will not be able to get out of  
15 our neighborhoods.

16 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, ma'am.  
17 Thank you so much.

18 John Girodo? John Hartman? Alex  
19 Chavez? Robert Ajimian (ph.), please  
20 come on up.

21 MR. GIRODO: John Girodo, speaking  
22 for Hollywood Heritage.

23 Hollywood Heritage believes the  
24 Millennium Hollywood project fails to  
25 address the negative impact created by

1 the mass and height of the proposed  
2 development on the Hollywood Boulevard  
3 commercial and entertainment district,  
4 irrevocably altering the character of  
5 this district, which is recognized in the  
6 National Register of Historic Places at  
7 the national level of significance.

8 Hollywood Heritage recommends the  
9 following: The proposed towers should  
10 not bury the landmark Capitol Records  
11 building. To ensure its continued  
12 integrity, Hollywood Heritage recommends  
13 towers in the order of 150 feet to 220  
14 feet, in keeping with current Hollywood  
15 hi-rises.

16 Number two, the planning commission  
17 should strike the permissive language in  
18 the draft approval allowing podium blocks  
19 at the bottom of hi-rise towers, or  
20 should define "podium" more tightly.  
21 Another option is renaming podiums as the  
22 base of tall buildings and requiring that  
23 for the base of these tall buildings  
24 street scale architectural openings and  
25 street level public spaces be designed to

1 reinforce the historic district of  
2 Hollywood.

3 Number three, an articulated street  
4 wall should be designed to reinforce the  
5 historic district. While we applaud the  
6 inclusion of open space, we would like to  
7 see the redirection --

8 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, sir.

9 MR. GIRODO: -- of buildings --

10 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much.

11 MR. GIRODO: -- along Vine Street.

12 Thank you.

13 THE CHAIRMAN: John Hartman?  
14 John Hartman? Alex Chavez? Robert  
15 Ajimian?

16 MR. CHAVEZ: Thank you. Thank you.  
17 My name is Alex Chavez, and I am the  
18 president of the Hollywoodland Homeowners  
19 Association.

20 Hollywoodland is a community located  
21 directly beneath the Hollywood sign, and  
22 it's comprised of 550 homes and 1,200  
23 residents. We oppose the Millennium  
24 Hollywood plan to build an oversized  
25 project in our community that will

1 irreparably harm all the surrounding  
2 neighborhoods.

3 And you know, I had a whole thing  
4 written here, but I am not going to read  
5 it because, you know, we oppose this  
6 project, and you know, either one of you  
7 will be more than welcome to come to our  
8 neighborhoods, our communities, Bronson,  
9 Argyle, Franklin, from 4 o'clock to 7  
10 o'clock. Let's go now and take a ride  
11 and you'll see the gridlocks and you'll  
12 see what the situation in relation to  
13 mobility and traffic is around in that  
14 place. And this is just not something  
15 that should happen. And you know, now  
16 it's in your hands, so we are waiting for  
17 your determination.

18 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Thank you  
19 very much.

20 Robert Ajimian? Carolyn C.  
21 Letsinger (ph.)? Ms. Fortune Zuckerman?  
22 Okay, sir.

23 MR. AJIMIAN: My name is Robert  
24 Ajimian. I'm a volunteer with the Los  
25 Angeles Fire Department in the capacity

1 of a CERT coordinator.

2 And I'm concerned -- I'm going to  
3 focus on just emergency response for the  
4 fire department. I'm concerned that with  
5 the some 2,000 people in the new  
6 building, 1,000 people of the W building,  
7 and the fire department being instructed  
8 to cut down their response, that this is  
9 going to be an undue burden, and will  
10 result in reduced effectiveness of  
11 emergency services.

12 So I just am kind of confused why  
13 there's just been no traction on it. I  
14 have written about it to the council. I  
15 have spoken. And maybe just for a  
16 moment, you could explain how it works,  
17 because it seems very important to me  
18 that there be a proper emergency response  
19 with this increased development.

20 Thank you.

21 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, sir.

22 Carolyn Letsinger? We have Fortune  
23 Zuckerman and Steven Poster, Linda -- I  
24 believe it's Martyr (ph.).

25 MS. ZUCKERMAN: Okay. My name is

1 Fortune Zuckerman.

2 The proposed project will change the  
3 whole face of Hollywood permanently. It  
4 will set the stage to turn Hollywood into  
5 a west coast New York City. There are  
6 plenty of tall buildings in the world to  
7 see. There are plenty of tall buildings  
8 in Los Angeles to see. But there is only  
9 one Hollywood.

10 I'm a fifty-year resident of Los  
11 Angeles, because I've lived in a lot of  
12 other places. And I was born at the Good  
13 Samaritan Hospital, and I love Los  
14 Angeles, and I've been in Hollywood,  
15 living there for sixteen years, and I  
16 don't want it to change. This is my  
17 Hollywood, and let's keep it. Thank you.

18 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, ma'am.

19 Is Carolyn Letsinger here? Carolyn  
20 Letsinger? Okay, we'll just put that  
21 aside.

22 Steven Poster? Linda Martyr? Jim  
23 Van Dusen? Thomas Meredith? Michael  
24 Andreas.

25 Hello, sir.

1 MR. POSTER: How do you do? I'm  
2 Steven Poster. I am a representative of  
3 the Lookout Mountain Alliance. I am also  
4 past president of the American Society of  
5 Cinematographers building at Hollywood  
6 and Franklin, an historical building.

7 And the traffic at this point is  
8 almost impossible at certain times of the  
9 day. This building, without proper  
10 parking, without proper traffic studies,  
11 is going to congest the area in a way  
12 that will cost the City. In the long  
13 run, this is going to cost the City. No  
14 matter what you're making off of this, no  
15 matter what tax breaks we're giving them,  
16 this is going to end up costing the City.  
17 And I'm very concerned that it will  
18 change the life of the people that live  
19 in the area and the businesses in the  
20 area forever.

21 Thank you.

22 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, sir.

23 MR. VAN DUSEN: My name is Jim Van  
24 Dusen. I'm a member of the board of the  
25 Hollywood United Neighborhood Council and



1 co-chair of the PLUM committee,  
2 representing 19,000 Hollywood  
3 stakeholders in the geographic area of  
4 this project.

5 We oppose the unbridled,  
6 uncontrolled development represented by  
7 this project. Specifically, one, this is  
8 a project without a plan. It has outside  
9 parameters but no detail. No one on your  
10 committee or in the planning department  
11 has any idea what Millennium is going to  
12 build or how they are going to use the  
13 space around the Capitol Records  
14 building. We request that they present  
15 their plan building drawings for comment.

16 Two, HUNK (ph.) is on record with  
17 opposing a six to one floor area ratio as  
18 it will far outstrip the ability of the  
19 area and infrastructure to absorb, and it  
20 is inconsistent with the spirit and goals  
21 of the Hollywood Community Plan.

22 Three, Caltrans stated the  
23 Millennium-sponsored traffic study is  
24 flawed and does not address the regional  
25 impact of this project. We request a

1 regional traffic study and traffic  
2 management plan, as this project will  
3 impact the entire LA basin, since  
4 Hollywood is a regional traffic  
5 chokepoint. You're urged to vote to  
6 support elegant density and a 4.5 to 1  
7 FAR. Thank you.

8 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, sir.

9 Come on up, please. Give us your  
10 name.

11 MR. MEREDITH: Good afternoon. My  
12 name is Tom Meredith. I am a forty-seven  
13 year resident of Los Angeles, twenty-five  
14 years in Hollywood Dell, the community  
15 most impacted by unmitigated traffic. I  
16 also serve as the treasurer for Hollywood  
17 United Neighborhood Council and today I  
18 speak on behalf of the Hollywood Studio  
19 District Neighborhood Council, for which  
20 I am vice chair.

21 May the 31st, I sent you a letter  
22 that reflected a board opinion of  
23 opposition to the Millennium Hollywood  
24 project, citing certain conditions that  
25 we're all going to talk about here today

1 and you're going to hear many times.

2 I'll just bring up the point that I  
3 think really resonates the most. The  
4 project EIR states that the congestion is  
5 immitigable. This is just not acceptable  
6 community planning, and I strongly urge  
7 that you reconsider moving forward on  
8 this. And it's important to note that --  
9 I don't think anybody here is against  
10 development; it's just respectful  
11 development. Thank you.

12 THE CHAIRMAN: Thanks, sir.

13 Next speaker. We have Mike Andreas?

14 MR. ANDREAS: Yes.

15 THE CHAIRMAN: Linda Martyr, one  
16 more time, Shelly Kia, Jamie McNarry, and  
17 Ben Reznik -- well, he already spoke, and  
18 Valarie Kigen.

19 Good day, sir.

20 MR. ANDREAS: Good day. I'm Michael  
21 Andreas (ph.), Whitley Heights Civic  
22 Association, native Angelino, and lived  
23 here for over sixty years, and have seen  
24 Hollywood go from a town that I thought  
25 would never come back to a vibrant city

1 that it is now. And the reason it's  
2 vibrant is because it's Hollywood; people  
3 love Hollywood. And if somebody tried to  
4 put buildings like this up in a city like  
5 Paris, they would have each been given  
6 their cigarette and their mask and they  
7 would have been put away and the City  
8 would have been done with it.

9 This is a land grab. This is just a  
10 way to make a billion dollars. We don't  
11 need a million square foot of development  
12 in the middle of Hollywood. I had a  
13 meeting with them, with one of the people  
14 from Millennium, and I said why do you  
15 have to build it so big? Why don't you  
16 make it something that enhances the City?  
17 They had no answer.

18 We have to do it because they need  
19 to make the billion dollars off of it.  
20 Don't allow this is to happen. This is a  
21 beautiful city. Hollywood's beautiful.  
22 You guys are responsible for it. And we  
23 want you to be responsible for it.

24 We can develop on that piece of  
25 property without destroying the city but

1 developing it.

2 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

3 MR. NEUMAN: Thank you.

4 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

5 MS. HYER: Hello, my name is Shelley  
6 Hyer (ph.), and I have been a homeowner  
7 in Whitley Heights, Hollywood, for the  
8 last fifteen years.

9 I agree that we need development in  
10 Hollywood, but it needs to be sensitive  
11 and sensible. And it needs to take into  
12 consideration the existing architecture,  
13 infrastructure, services, and icons, and  
14 Millennium is neither, and is not taking  
15 those things into consideration.

16 Hollywood is not just a tourist  
17 attraction. It's a dest -- it's not just  
18 a destination holiday. It's a community  
19 where people live, raise their children,  
20 and need services -- services that are  
21 adequate to accommodate the residents and  
22 visitors.

23 On any given day, traffic comes to a  
24 grinding halt notwithstanding Hollywood  
25 Bowl, Ford Theater, or film industry

1 events. Add the Millennium Project to  
2 this mix.

3 We don't need the congestion and  
4 density a development of this size will  
5 bring.

6 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, ma'am.

7 MS. KAGAN: Good afternoon. Thank  
8 you for your time. My name is Valerie  
9 Kagan (ph.) and I am a many, many years'  
10 resident of Hollywood -- world renowned  
11 Hollywood. Hollywood is a neighborhood.

12 Today we are downtown. Hollywood is  
13 not a downtown. But what we do have are  
14 millions of tourists and visitors and  
15 Hollywood with the streets shut down  
16 almost on a daily basis.

17 I'm here to ask you to send this  
18 plan back, because there is no plan. We  
19 don't know anything what's going to  
20 happen. We don't know the height. We  
21 don't know the scope.

22 It was eloquently said earlier,  
23 community plans are supposed to guarantee  
24 a certainty, to let us know what will be  
25 built there, what the density will be,

1           what we need to be able to provide for  
2           that density, especially with police,  
3           fire, ambulances. Hollywood, we borrow  
4           ambulances and police all the time.  
5           We're borrowing from everybody all the  
6           time, because we have more night clubs  
7           than anywhere else in the city. We have  
8           over 550 liquor licenses in Hollywood.

9           This density is out of scale. The  
10          height -- you're asking for terrorist  
11          activity. Anything that would be built  
12          next to the hills --

13          THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

14          MS. KAGAN: -- please say no.  
15          Actually, I brought you some postcards.

16          THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Thank you  
17          so much.

18          MS. KAGAN: So you'll have little --

19          THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. So Jamie  
20          McNairy, one more time; Barbara Witkin,  
21          Barbara Witkin, are you here? Barbara  
22          Witkin? Rosemary DeMonte? Come on up.  
23          I called Jamie McNairy, Barbara Witkin,  
24          Rosemary De Monte -- DeMonte. Chris  
25          Bonbright, Joyce Director --

1 MS. DEMONTE: I'm Rosemary DeMonte.  
2 Barbara, I don't know if she wants to  
3 come up.

4 THE CHAIRMAN: So come on up.

5 MS. DEMONTE: I -- I represent the  
6 Greater Griffith Park Neighborhood  
7 Council, which has officially opposed  
8 this project. The geology reports are  
9 not complete. They have not finished the  
10 borings at all, so whatever they say.

11 This will create traffic, and there  
12 are no mitigations even possible from  
13 this -- this project. We are not against  
14 jobs. You can still have all these  
15 people working on a project that's  
16 twenty-two to twenty-nine stories high,  
17 like the poor W followed the rules and  
18 they built. That would be fine.

19 Now, what would be left after the  
20 good construction jobs are gone, are the  
21 employed poor that will not be able to  
22 buy or rent in the building that they're  
23 working at. Why don't you build movie  
24 studios, build production -- give the  
25 money to the production companies so that



1 we have jobs that stay here, and is good  
2 pay, instead of building huge buildings  
3 full of people that demand -- that are  
4 going to overtax our city services and  
5 our insufficient infrastructure today.

6 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, ma'am.  
7 Thank you. Thank you.

8 MS. DEMONTE: I know. One thing --

9 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, ma'am.

10 MS. DEMONTE: -- that if this  
11 earthquake happens, it's three apartment  
12 building stories -- it's fifty-eight  
13 stories --

14 THE CHAIRMAN: Ma'am, we're giving  
15 everybody one minute, ma'am. Please.  
16 Thank you very much.

17 Next speaker.

18 MS. DIRECTOR: Yes, good  
19 afternoon --

20 THE CHAIRMAN: Hi.

21 MS. DIRECTOR: -- councilmen. My  
22 name is Joyce Director. Hollywood is not  
23 New York. It cannot handle this big a  
24 development. Hollywood is a top  
25 destination not only for tourists, but

1 the other T, terrorists. These buildings  
2 look like the World Trade Towers (sic).  
3 And the line from that movie, "Field of  
4 Dreams", with Kevin Costner keeps playing  
5 over and over in my head: "If you build  
6 it they will come."

7 Make it fit into the neighborhood,  
8 not stand out like a sore thumb. It  
9 should be no higher than twenty-two  
10 stories. We're not against development,  
11 we just want it scaled down.

12 We residents who live in Hollywood  
13 are the backbone of Hollywood. We love  
14 Hollywood. We pay a lot of taxes. We  
15 care for our homes, a lot of which are in  
16 historic areas.

17 We are involved in our communities.  
18 We want the best for Hollywood. We have  
19 lived here for many years. We are not  
20 passing through the way these developers  
21 are.

22 You hold a very important position.  
23 You are entrusted to look out for the  
24 interest of the public, of the residents  
25 in your district and for the whole city,

1 not for the interests and pocketbooks of  
2 the developers. Time will be the judge  
3 of the decisions you make.

4 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you ma'am.

5 MS. DIRECTOR: Think wisely.

6 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you so much.

7 MS. DIRECTOR: Thank you.

8 THE CHAIRMAN: Last call, Jamie  
9 McNairy, Barbara Witkin, and Chris  
10 Bonbright.

11 MR. BONBRIGHT: I'm actually  
12 speaking in favor of the project. It's  
13 Chris Bonbright. Should I speak later  
14 or --

15 THE CHAIRMAN: Yeah.

16 MR. BONBRIGHT: -- do you want me to  
17 go ahead.

18 THE CHAIRMAN: That's a good idea?

19 MR. BONBRIGHT: Pardon me?

20 THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, that'll be at  
21 the different stack.

22 MR. BONBRIGHT: Great, okay.  
23 Thanks. All right. Chris Bonbright.

24 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Dietrich  
25 Nelson? Dietrich Nelson? Jim Geoghan, I

1 believe. Sandy Sommer (ph.), Sarajane  
2 Schwartz. Could they --

3 MR. NELSON: Hi, I'm Dietrich Nelson  
4 and I'm Emergency Services Chair for two  
5 Hollywood organizations. And I'm  
6 speaking here today as a homeowner in  
7 Hollywood.

8 There have been many project that  
9 have been approved by this committee and  
10 the City council, and in each case,  
11 they've stated that there have -- is no  
12 need for additional police or fire.  
13 Presently, emergency services are at  
14 capacity dealing with existing residence,  
15 businesses, tourists and events in  
16 Hollywood.

17 The proposed building of these  
18 massive twin towers at the iconic  
19 location of the Hollywood sign, has the  
20 potential to generate a multitude of  
21 terrorism threats.

22 LAPD and LAFD cannot possibly defend  
23 the buildings if they soar to these  
24 proportional heights and increase  
25 density. Who will pay for these

1 services? Thank you.

2 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, sir.

3 MR. GEOGHAN: Thank you. My name is  
4 Jim Geoghan. My wife and I have lived in  
5 Whitley Heights for twenty-six years.  
6 I'm traffic chair for the Hollywood Hills  
7 West Neighborhood Council, which has  
8 voted against the Millennium Plan. And I  
9 also represent my stakeholders who have  
10 e-mailed me about this.

11 I've invited myself to seven  
12 Millennium pitch sessions in  
13 neighborhoods about this where they've  
14 gotten residents' reaction to it. And I  
15 can tell you what the reaction was.  
16 Every one of them was terrible, just  
17 absolutely terrible. And all I've ever  
18 seen is fifty-eight story buildings.

19 Today we have a buffet. There's a  
20 buffet of buildings. I don't know what  
21 they're going to build. We've got a  
22 thirty-five; we've got a forty-four;  
23 we've got a fifty-eight. Nobody knows  
24 what they're going to build. It's going  
25 to be a surprise.

1 I've given two years of my life to  
2 this thing. I still don't know what the  
3 hell you guys want to build.

4 New York City has twenty-four subway  
5 lines feeding Manhattan. We have one.  
6 We also have Penn Station, Grand Central  
7 Station, the PATH trains and five  
8 ferries.

9 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, sir.  
10 Thank you very much.

11 Next speaker?

12 MS. SCHWARTZ: Hello. I'm Sarajane  
13 Schwartz, former president and current  
14 member of the Hollywoodland Homeowners  
15 Association and a member of CURD. I am  
16 urging you today to make this a true  
17 hearing, to listen to the voices of the  
18 dozens of HOAs and neighborhood councils  
19 that have already voted against this  
20 project in its current form; to the  
21 voices of dozens of Hollywood residents  
22 that are here today at their own expense  
23 trying to protect their lives and their  
24 largest investment, their homes, from a  
25 dangerous project that threatens both,

1 and to the chorus of voices that will  
2 surely rise in the future if this project  
3 is allowed to complete its steamroll  
4 through the City.

5 They will ask, how did something  
6 unprecedented, that was so obviously  
7 inappropriate, too big and too dangerous  
8 get built? Why didn't anyone try to stop  
9 it? Didn't anyone see?

10 Well, today, here, we can see. And  
11 we're asking you to listen.

12 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, ma'am.

13 MS. SOMMER: Good afternoon. My  
14 name is Sandy Sommer. And to quote Lou  
15 Naidorf, the architect of the Capitol  
16 Records Building, he says, "this does not  
17 mean that you pander to the needs of the  
18 developer. You need to understand the  
19 economic drivers of a project. There are  
20 the developers' needs and wishes, the  
21 residents' needs and wishes, and the  
22 communities' needs and wishes."

23 I think we have to have faith there  
24 is an overlap, a richer solution that  
25 responds fully to all people's needs.

1           There are no community issues in these  
2           skyscrapers as we have seen the plan. I  
3           want to hold out for a richer solution  
4           that does address the needs of the  
5           community, because this is who we are.  
6           This is our aesthetic. We are Los  
7           Angeles. We are Hollywood, and we love  
8           this place. And this is what enjoy every  
9           day. And every tourist comes to take a  
10          picture of this. This is our Hollywood.  
11          This has not gotten a good response from  
12          anybody. It doesn't make you feel good.  
13          And you guys are my protectors.

14                 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, ma'am.  
15                 Thank you, ma'am.

16                 MS. SOMMER: Thank you so much.

17                 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

18                 Come on up, please. I'm assuming we  
19                 called your name.

20                 MS. WITKIN: I'm Barbara Witkin.

21                 THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

22                 MS. WITKIN: And I'm here to ask,  
23                 what are the benefits to the community?  
24                 So far I have not heard of one benefit to  
25                 this community, only a deterrent. Thank



1           you very much.

2                   THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, wow.

3                   That was short and sweet.

4                   Anne Geoghan. Anne -- and Stacy  
5 Sillins? And this will take up our  
6 twenty minutes.

7                   MS. GEOGHAN: Good afternoon,  
8 gentlemen. I'm Anne Geoghan. I'm part  
9 of Communities United for Reasonable  
10 Development, and I am a Whitley Heights  
11 representative, and a resident of Whitley  
12 Heights for about twenty-five years.

13                   The project entitlement is based  
14 upon the unlawfully adopted Hollywood  
15 Community Plan update, are further  
16 subject to nullification. The project  
17 has been approved based upon the  
18 Hollywood Community Plan update, which is  
19 currently subject to litigation that may  
20 overturn the City Council's adoption of  
21 the new community plan and its associated  
22 zoning.

23                   The project has not been conditioned  
24 on the possibility that the underlying  
25 zoning will be placed back to zoning that

1 is much less dense and used and approved  
2 in the letters of determination.

3 The flaw is fatal to the density  
4 approved to the project. The Millennium  
5 developer can have no vested interest in  
6 the project density sought. Should the  
7 Hollywood Community Plan be overturned in  
8 the current pending litigation, you need  
9 to wait for the outcome of that  
10 litigation. You need to stop this  
11 project now.

12 You all passed the Hollywood  
13 Community Plan after you council told you  
14 there were problem with it. You  
15 plastered the City Council with no  
16 recommendation and Eric Garcetti got it  
17 passed --

18 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you ma'am.

19 MS. GEOGHAN: -- so you --

20 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much.  
21 Good afternoon.

22 MS. SILLINS: Good afternoon. My  
23 name is Stacy Sillins and I represent  
24 over 500 homes Upper Nichols Canyon  
25 Neighborhood Association, and I'll keep

1 it short and sweet, because everybody is  
2 speaking so eloquently today, and I don't  
3 really have anything new to add except we  
4 agree with everything.

5 Thank you for your time, and please  
6 consider everything that we're saying.

7 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, ma'am.  
8 Okay.

9 Those who are opposed, please stand.  
10 Those that did not speak can submit a  
11 stand. Please stand, we want to make  
12 sure you're recognized. Those that are  
13 opposed, please stand. Okay. These are  
14 the opposed.

15 Your cards will go on record as  
16 opposed. We've finished our twenty  
17 minutes. Now, we'll go into the support.  
18 Thank you very much.

19 Okay, now for supporting the  
20 project, the next twenty minutes. It's  
21 now 4:40. Chris Bonbright, Leron Gubler,  
22 Callie Ray Cole (ph.), Alfredo Hernandez  
23 and Giovanni Flores (ph.).

24 Good day, sir.

25 MR. BONBRIGHT: Good afternoon,

1           honorable council members. My name is  
2           Chris Bonbright. I am a longtime  
3           Hollywood commercial real estate broker,  
4           commercial and residential property owner  
5           and community activist.

6           As a stakeholder and someone who is  
7           passionate about Hollywood, I want to  
8           begin by saying how much I and countless  
9           other residents, community members, and  
10          stakeholders appreciate the fact that  
11          this developer has chosen our community  
12          to make this level of investment.

13          It is a testament to what we, the  
14          Hollywood community has accomplished over  
15          the last twenty years, that we've  
16          attracted this level of investment.

17          Secondly, I want to talk for a  
18          moment about the concept of height. Some  
19          people seem to believe there's something  
20          inherently wrong about tall buildings. I  
21          believe the opposite is true. I actually  
22          love tall buildings.

23          I'm -- if I'm standing on my balcony  
24          at the Broadway Hollywood Building or on  
25          a friend's balcony in the Hollywood

1 Hills, I want to look out and be  
2 inspired. Tall buildings do that.

3 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you sir. And  
4 please, the audience, let's respect  
5 each --

6 MR. BONBRIGHT: Thank you very much.

7 THE CHAIRMAN: -- speaker. Thank  
8 you Let's respect each speaker. I  
9 believe while you were making your  
10 statements, there was an amount of  
11 decorum here. We would appreciate the  
12 same courtesy.

13 Next speaker.

14 MR. GUBLER: Hello, I'm Leron  
15 Gubler, president and CEO of the  
16 Hollywood Chamber of Commerce. The  
17 Chamber supports Millennium Hollywood.

18 There are currently numerous  
19 projects in the pipeline in Hollywood,  
20 but this is not just another project.  
21 This is the -- because of its location,  
22 the signature project that will define  
23 the Hollywood of the twenty-first  
24 century. It represents the very best of  
25 good urban planning, which LA needs.

1           And so I ask, if we truly want to  
2           change the paradigm in LA, isn't it time  
3           we started doing it? Isn't it time, when  
4           it comes to design, that we try to do  
5           things a little more daring?

6           If you can't build something truly  
7           exciting in Hollywood, then where can you  
8           build it? This is a visionary project  
9           that makes a statement that Hollywood is  
10          back and that our best days are ahead of  
11          us. It deserves your support. Thank  
12          you.

13          THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

14          MR. HERNANDEZ: Good afternoon,  
15          planning committee members. My name is  
16          Alfredo Hernandez, and I'm a thirty-two  
17          year resident of Hollywood.

18          And I ask that you support the  
19          Millennium Hollywood project. As a  
20          founding board member of the Friends of  
21          the Hollywood Central Park, and now its  
22          first employee, I believe the Quimby fees  
23          generated by this project will be vital  
24          in building our park, which will create  
25          forty-four acres of park space in

1 Hollywood.

2 In addition, Millennium will  
3 activate a dead zone only a mere block  
4 away from the historic Hollywood & Vine  
5 intersection, while preserving the  
6 historical Capitol Records building at  
7 the same time. Thank you.

8 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

9 MR. FLORES: Good afternoon. My  
10 name is Giovanni Flores, and I'd like to  
11 thank you for letting me speak today.

12 I was born and raised in Hollywood,  
13 and I have seen many changes come to my  
14 community. I support the Millennium  
15 Hollywood project, because it brings a  
16 modern streetscape that appeals to young  
17 people like myself and my generation.

18 Transit oriented of a limit like  
19 this will one day allow me to live in the  
20 free life city without having to be on  
21 the cars. And I could always be on the  
22 train every day. Thank you for your  
23 time.

24 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, sir.

25 Callie Ray Cole? Are you here?

1           Nicole Shahenian-- I always butcher  
2           you name. Jeffrey Williams? Elliot  
3           Johnson, Jorge Cavalero (ph.).

4           MS. SHAHENIAN: Good afternoon.  
5           Nicole Shahenian. I'm a board member of  
6           the Friends of the Hollywood Central  
7           Park, and I'm here to express my support  
8           of this project.

9           I am really pleased with the  
10          developer's commitment to green space and  
11          the -- their efforts to make Hollywood  
12          more walkable. They've already, in fact,  
13          started doing things for the community  
14          around this, including a bike and -- a  
15          bike-in movie, and other things that  
16          really show the transit orientedness of  
17          the site.

18          And as a member of the Park, I  
19          really would hope that we can allocate  
20          all of the Quimby funds from this project  
21          to the Park. Thank you.

22          THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, ma'am.

23          Jeffrey Williams? Elliot Johnson,  
24          Jorge Cavalero. Scott Campbell and --

25          MR. JOHNSON: Gentlemen, I'm Elliot



1 Johnson. I've lived in Hollywood --  
2 Hollywood Heights for thirty three years.  
3 I checked the wrong box.

4 I'm not opposed to development, I am  
5 opposed to the height as I understand the  
6 Millennium Project. So I am standing  
7 here and I'm asking the developer, bring  
8 it down a notch. Make it nice. Make it  
9 habitable. Thank you very much.

10 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, sir. Next  
11 speaker?

12 MR. CAMPBELL: Thank you for the  
13 opportunity, councilmen. My name is  
14 Scott Campbell. I'm president of Central  
15 Hollywood Neighborhood Council, which is  
16 just south of this project, south of  
17 Hollywood Boulevard.

18 We've been involved with this  
19 project for a number of years, now,  
20 getting presentations over and over  
21 again. And earlier this year we did vote  
22 to support this project at its presented  
23 height of up to 585 feet. We feel that  
24 transit-oriented development is the right  
25 thing for this area of Hollywood along

1 Vine Street, and if we're going to have  
2 height, this is the place to put it.

3 So I'd like you to consider that  
4 there are a lot of people opposed to this  
5 project, but there are a lot of people  
6 who are unable to come out, who are in  
7 support of this project as well. Thank  
8 you.

9 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Jeffrey  
10 Williams, are you here? Jorge Cavalero?  
11 Tal (sic) Gabelson (sic)? Steven  
12 Woodward (ph.)? John Tronson? Either  
13 you don't want to speak or you're gone.  
14 One or the others. Charles Schulman  
15 (ph.)? Brandon Mason (ph.). Come on up,  
16 give us your name.

17 MR. GABRIELSON: Tait Gabrielson.

18 THE COURT: Okay.

19 MR. GABRIELSON: As a young  
20 professional working and living in  
21 Hollywood, I am here in support of the  
22 Millennium Project because of the  
23 benefits that I believe come with  
24 allowing for -- excuse me -- and  
25 preparing for density.

1 I plan on being here for a good part  
2 of my adult life, and would like to be  
3 able to look forward to Hollywood's  
4 enrichment of employment opportunities,  
5 public transportation, and a ground-up  
6 revitalization that only substantial  
7 stimulation like this can promote.

8 Developmental growth in our  
9 community is inevitable, and streamlining  
10 such projects allows for effective  
11 allocation of the economic benefits to  
12 follow. Thank you for your time.

13 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, sir.

14 Next speaker, come on up.

15 MR. TRONSON: Hi, my name is John  
16 Tronson. I'd like to just share that I  
17 own a -- live to work loft in the  
18 Broadway Lofts, and the Millennium  
19 Project will effectively be built  
20 directly in my line of sight from the  
21 Hollywood sign. And I can't wait to see  
22 it constructed.

23 It's a wonderfully designed,  
24 beautiful project. I can't wait to see  
25 the businesses that are moving into the

1 office space. I can't wait to meet the  
2 residents that are going to come in there  
3 and enjoy the amenities that go into the  
4 retail spaces.

5 And I think in large part, what's  
6 happened over the last twenty years in  
7 Hollywood is -- is developers like  
8 Millennium have put a fortune into this  
9 community and really helped it turn into  
10 what it is today from what it was twenty  
11 years ago, and I'd like to see that  
12 progress continue. Thank you.

13 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Next  
14 speakers?

15 MR. SCHULMAN: Good afternoon,  
16 Charles Schulman. Good afternoon. I'm  
17 Charles Schulman a Hollywood neighbor,  
18 and I support the Millennium Hollywood  
19 project.

20 The developers have worked for the  
21 community for more than six years, and  
22 have created a community benefits package  
23 which enhances the quality of life for  
24 all stakeholders.

25 The open courtyards in Millennium

1 Hollywood will be lively, enriching, and  
2 will be a place for the developers to  
3 take steps to ensure the space will be  
4 enlivened on a regular basis with money  
5 set aside to pay for the programming of  
6 arts and activities.

7 Moreover, those events will be  
8 community oriented, because the events  
9 will be held with the help from the  
10 Hollywood Arts Council and the Hollywood  
11 Entertainment District. Thank you.

12 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Next  
13 speaker please. Come on up.

14 MR. MASON: Good afternoon. My name  
15 is Brandon Mason. I am a Hollywood  
16 resident and unconditional supporter of  
17 the Hollywood Millennium Project. While  
18 in agreeance (sic) with everything that  
19 was said just before me, I want to point  
20 out, you know, something that was brought  
21 to my attention today at the economic  
22 summit.

23 Between the years of 2001 and 2010,  
24 the Red Line has had an eighty-percent  
25 increase in usage on daytime riders. And

1 if everybody's talking about, you know,  
2 the amount of traffic that's going to be  
3 caused by this project, I mean we need to  
4 look at the grand picture of, you know,  
5 where's the post-educational dream?

6 Everybody wants to go to an urban  
7 densification -- or city that's full of  
8 urban densification, such as San  
9 Francisco, Chicago, New York, Boston.  
10 People like to walk. We're going green.

11 This is a project that's going to  
12 let that happen. So let's have that  
13 post-educational dream become now  
14 Hollywood where we can keep our -- the  
15 future of tomorrow at home. Thank you.

16 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Steven  
17 Woodward? Ron Miller, Rodrigo Garcia,  
18 Piedmont Brown, Randy Myer, Adrian Scott  
19 Fine, Victor De la Cruz, you're welcome  
20 to come to the microphone.

21 MR. MILLER: Good afternoon  
22 councilmen. I'm Ron Miller, Executive  
23 Secretary of the Los Angeles/Orange  
24 County Building Trades. And on behalf of  
25 the 140,000 men and women that work and

1 live around the City of Los Angeles and  
2 Orange County, and on behalf of the  
3 County Federation of Labor -- they wanted  
4 to be here but they couldn't -- and the  
5 hundreds of thousands of people they  
6 represent, we are in full support of this  
7 project.

8 We've been working with the  
9 developer for over six years. This is a  
10 good project. It's good for the  
11 community. It's a transit-orientated  
12 development. It's going to help our  
13 members get rid of a car and be able to  
14 live around the Hollywood area, hop on  
15 the subway and go to work and be part of  
16 the community more than they are.

17 So let's move this along and get to  
18 building. Thank you.

19 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, sir.

20 Please, go ahead.

21 Good afternoon, Adrian Scott Fine  
22 with the Los Angeles Conservancy. The  
23 Conservancy has been primarily focused on  
24 the project development regulations that  
25 establish definitive standards and

1 guidelines for new construction at the  
2 project site.

3 Through our discussions with  
4 Millennium Partners, the Conservancy is  
5 confident now, that we now have specific  
6 language in place that calls out and  
7 protects the significant view of Capitol  
8 Records from the corner of Hollywood &  
9 Vine.

10 Further, Millennium Partners has  
11 agreed to a thirty-foot separation  
12 between the two-story historical  
13 Hollywood Playhouse. The Conservancy is  
14 in support of these precise safeguards  
15 that protect the view corridors of the  
16 historic Capitol Records Building and  
17 provide adequate space between the new  
18 construction and the historic structures.  
19 Thank you.

20 MR. BROWN: Good afternoon. My name  
21 is Piedmont Brown. I'm the president of  
22 the Ironworkers Local 433 with thousands  
23 of hardworking members. I'm here on  
24 behalf of our members to support the  
25 Millennium Hollywood Project.



1 Right now we have members on the job  
2 on the Hollywood -- on the Sunset  
3 Boulevard Building, the new Emerson  
4 College. There's a lot of growth today  
5 in Hollywood.

6 That's because years ago we made the  
7 right decision to build the Red Line  
8 subway. Local 430 helped in that  
9 project.

10 With the Red Line in place, we can  
11 build new developments without terrible  
12 impact on traffic. Millennium Hollywood  
13 is a transit orientated development. The  
14 aim is to get people out of their cars,  
15 to get them into the city, the urban  
16 experience.

17 When we built the Red Line, people  
18 said no one would ride it. They said no  
19 one in Los Angeles would get out of their  
20 cars and get onto trains. Well, people  
21 do ride the subways. I'm living proof of  
22 that. I rode it for four years when I  
23 worked out in the fields.

24 Like we always -- the ironworkers  
25 love to up high rise buildings. And the

1 Millennium Pro -- Hollywood Project is a  
2 smart, transit-orientated development. I  
3 hope for your support. Thank you.

4 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Good  
5 afternoon.

6 MR. DE LA CRUZ: Good afternoon,  
7 council members. Victor De la Cruz, of  
8 Manatt, Phelps & Phillips on behalf of  
9 AMDA College and Conservatory of the  
10 Performing Arts.

11 AMDA's Hollywood campus, which is  
12 immediately adjacent to the Millennium  
13 Project site, has educated some of the  
14 world's most talented singers, dancers,  
15 and actors for years. With approximately  
16 700 full-time students using the eight  
17 buildings that comprise AMDA's campus  
18 each day, some of which share a property  
19 line or are across the street from  
20 Millennium, AMDA was initially very  
21 concerned about how construction would  
22 impact the school's operations.

23 Today we are very pleased to be here  
24 in full support of the project.  
25 Millennium has risen to the occasion by

1 listening and working closely with us to  
2 ensure that AMDA will not only be able to  
3 operate but thrive during construction.

4 Those issues resolved, AMDA believes  
5 its students, who come all over the world  
6 to study at its campus, deserve a  
7 neighborhood with great architecture,  
8 public spaces, and a mix of uses that  
9 will activate sidewalks and provide for a  
10 safe, vibrant environment. This project  
11 does that.

12 We look forward to the new vibrant  
13 environment that this transformative  
14 project will create, not only for AMDA,  
15 but for all of Hollywood and respectfully  
16 ask for your approval. Thank you.

17 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Mr.  
18 Garcia?

19 MR. GARCIA: Good afternoon. I'm  
20 Rod Garcia. I represent the Hispanic  
21 Engineers Business Corporation. We're in  
22 support of the project. We believe it to  
23 be economically beneficial to the  
24 community, and we look forward to being  
25 it built.

1 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you for all  
2 your work sir.

3 Randy Myer, Scott Donahue (ph.),  
4 Terri Tilton, Ed Hunt, Adine Forman?  
5 Good afternoon, ma'am.

6 Hi there. My name is Randy Myer.  
7 You called my name. I must've filled out  
8 the card wrong. I represent the Los  
9 Feliz Improvement Association. We  
10 represent 1,000 households in Los Feliz.  
11 And we have some serious concerns about  
12 the current scope of the Millennium  
13 Project. We do support the  
14 revitalization of Hollywood and the  
15 redevelopment of Hollywood, but currently  
16 we see some significant flaws.

17 The out-sized height of this project  
18 raises safety, practicality and  
19 appropriateness questions. As a  
20 community of people who live, work, and  
21 drive through the development site, we're  
22 deeply concerned about the impact of the  
23 greatly increased traffic.

24 I just want to say that we support  
25 the opposition of all those contiguous

1 neighborhoods who have very clearly  
2 voiced their concerns today. And in the  
3 face of this, the planning committee  
4 seems to move in lockstep with its  
5 leader, who happens to be the architect  
6 of the project, a serious concern for us.

7 We urge you to take a serious look  
8 at the project and balance community  
9 concerns with reasonable development.  
10 Thank you.

11 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, ma'am.

12 Yes, sir?

13 MR. HUNT: I'm Edward Hunt,  
14 president of Melrose Hill Neighborhood  
15 Association, a thirty-five-year resident  
16 of Hollywood and a licensed California  
17 architect and landscape architect.

18 This is a truly exciting mixed-use  
19 transit-oriented project that gives up an  
20 amazing one-third of the site for open  
21 space and pedestrian uses.

22 I would rather see tall slender  
23 towers that are part of the view, than  
24 short fat towers that block the view.

25 We like the treatment of the iconic

1 Capitol Records Building. It's a  
2 wonderful piece of sculpture. And we  
3 urge you to approve the project. And I'm  
4 looking forward to being able to bike  
5 over from my house. Thank you.

6 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

7 MS. TILTON: I am Terri Tilton. I  
8 am a resident of Hollywood for thirty-  
9 five years, live on Hollywood Boulevard  
10 at that La Brea intersection. I'm also  
11 on the board of directors for Hollywood  
12 PAL, and I've been very involved in our  
13 community over the years I've lived in  
14 it.

15 This is a tremendous project that  
16 needs to move forward. I came to our  
17 community when our streets were filled  
18 with prostitutes, with drugs, and to the  
19 point where we were afraid to get out on  
20 our streets.

21 What we have now is amazing, and  
22 it's because of the revitalization. It's  
23 because of people like -- but like Phil  
24 Aarons and the Millennium Project.  
25 Hollywood and Highland exist because

1 somebody had a vision. Millennium has a  
2 vision for our community, and we need  
3 to -- we need to be part of that.

4 I do agree with all sides, one thing  
5 we do have mutually agreeable, is passion  
6 for Hollywood.

7 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Ma'am?

8 Good afternoon. My name is Adine  
9 Forman, and I am the executive director  
10 of the Los Angeles Hospitality and  
11 Training Academy.

12 On behalf of the HTA, we wish to  
13 express our strong support for the  
14 Millennium Hollywood project. Millennium  
15 Hollywood has joined in partnership with  
16 the HTA, so we can ensure local residence  
17 are recruited and trained for high-  
18 quality jobs at this hotel.

19 The Hospitality Training Academy is  
20 a nonprofit institute, and a true labor  
21 with the UNITE HERE Local 11, management  
22 partnership, it's a Taft-Hartley fund,  
23 that provides benefits to both employers  
24 and the employees of the new hotel.

25 We partner with educational

1 institutions, nonprofits, and other  
2 groups to make sure that those who work  
3 in the hotels are well trained.

4 Therefore we support the project and  
5 for the process to move forward for final  
6 approval. Thank you for your  
7 consideration.

8 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, ma'am.

9 Okay, Rachel Torres, Priscilla Chang  
10 (ph.), Phillip Alberstadt (ph.) , please  
11 come on up, and Owen Williams (ph.).

12 MS. TORRES: Good afternoon. My  
13 name is Rachel Torres. I'm a research  
14 analyst for UNITE HERE Local 11. We  
15 represent about 20,000 members, and we  
16 wish to express our strong support for  
17 the Millennium Hollywood Project for a  
18 variety of reasons.

19 Hollywood is vast becoming the  
20 epicenter of new and hotel and commercial  
21 development. In collaboration with the  
22 City, community and local business, we  
23 have transformed the area from a  
24 community with poverty wages into a  
25 revitalized tourist destination with good



1 living-wage jobs that benefit the entire  
2 city.

3 The Millennium Hollywood Project  
4 continues the strong precedent of  
5 responsible development from the  
6 Hollywood and Highland project to other  
7 hotel developments. This project will  
8 receive no City dollar nor is it on City  
9 land, yet thousands of good jobs will be  
10 produced for the construction and  
11 permanent employees.

12 We want to express our strong  
13 support for the project and encourage the  
14 planning and land use management  
15 committee to vote in favor of the  
16 project. Thank you.

17 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

18 MR. ALBERSTADT: Hi there. My name  
19 is Phil Alberstadt, and I'm a resident of  
20 Hollywood. I just wanted to say that I  
21 agree with a lot of the people that were  
22 up here before me. I believe that this  
23 development will be game changing,  
24 transformational. It'll give a lot of  
25 benefits to our families.

1 I think that a lot of the people  
2 that live in the Hollywood area are in  
3 support of this. They're not overly well  
4 represented. And I think that hopefully  
5 I'm speaking on the behalf of some of my  
6 neighbors and my friends that are in  
7 support of this. And I hope that you  
8 will look into this and make it move  
9 forward.

10 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

11 MR. ALBERSTADT: Thank you.

12 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Next  
13 speaker?

14 MR. WILLIAMS: My name is Owen  
15 Williams, and I live in East Hollywood  
16 for the last twenty-eight years. And I  
17 came to support Hollywood Millennium, but  
18 this -- I think this is a good investment  
19 to our community. Our community need the  
20 jobs. Traffic -- we live in a traffic --  
21 city traffic, LA, and I think it's a good  
22 idea for our community. That's it.  
23 Thank you.

24 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, sir.

25 Maura Johnson -- Maura Johnson, Priscilla

1 Chang, Phillip Alderstadt (sic).

2 Yes, please.

3 MS. JOHNSON: Good afternoon. My  
4 name is Maura Johnson and I'm the housing  
5 director of Hollywood Community Housing  
6 Corporation. And I'm here to speak in  
7 support of the Millennium Hollywood  
8 mixed-use development.

9 Hollywood Housing appreciates all  
10 the outreach performed by the project  
11 owners, Millennium Partners and Argent  
12 Ventures. We are aware that they have  
13 committed to have a local hire program  
14 which includes an apprenticeship training  
15 component, contribute funds toward the  
16 creation of a hundred low-income housing  
17 units, which we hope will be located in  
18 Hollywood, and have a project labor  
19 agreement.

20 These commitments to helping improve  
21 the lives of low-income working Angelinos  
22 are greatly appreciated and we ask that  
23 you approve this project. Thank you.

24 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, ma'am.

25 That does take us to twenty minutes.

1 Those who wrote cards in support, please  
2 stand?

3 Wave your hands. That's good too.  
4 All right. So your cards will be  
5 submitted for the record. I appreciate  
6 your being here and your patience.

7 So this concludes -- oh, wait a  
8 minute, I've got general comment cards on  
9 this item. So let's go through those  
10 cards, and then we should be done with  
11 public comment.

12 We have Gary Handel -- he already  
13 spoke. Tyrone Ross (sic), I believe.  
14 Tyrone Ross (sic) 3191 Berendo?

15 Okay. Brittany Braun -- Brittany  
16 Braun (ph.). Doug Haines (ph.)? Sir,  
17 come on up. Genevive Geoghan and  
18 Sharon -- I believe it's Short (ph.).

19 Hello, sir. Please give us your  
20 name.

21 MR. ROY: My name is Tyrone Roy  
22 (ph.). I have trouble speaking. The  
23 Constitution, I believe, starts with "We  
24 the people", and with that in mind, I'd  
25 like to say, since I've been here

1 listening to this meeting, you guys have  
2 talked about laws, codes and ordinance  
3 and rules. But at the same time, you  
4 talked about preferences and  
5 modifications and redesigns, which lead  
6 to variances.

7 What I want to say is, is it seems  
8 that you should give the public a chance  
9 to weigh in on this redevelopment for  
10 this area in a timely manner. And as you  
11 got are not representative of the people,  
12 but as quasi representatives of the  
13 people, you need to --

14 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

15 MR. ROY: -- go with the majority as  
16 the Constitution says.

17 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, sir.

18 MR. HAINES: You're all by yourself  
19 now. My name is Doug Haines. I just  
20 wanted to bring up a few points that  
21 haven't been referenced before. One is  
22 that the EIR acknowledges that this  
23 project would trigger the need for a new  
24 elementary school and potentially a new  
25 middle school.

1           And there's no funding for that  
2           through LUSD, no state funding for a new  
3           school. And when you provide for  
4           schools, you don't take commercial land,  
5           you take residential land. And as a  
6           community that's been through that  
7           process before, I don't want to see  
8           hundreds of people lose their homes so a  
9           developer can produce other people's  
10          homes.

11           I also want to bring up that there's  
12          no acknowledgment by the planning  
13          department or by the EIR of the fact that  
14          there's a significant deviation from the  
15          requirements of the advisory agency for  
16          parking on this project. It's required  
17          to be 2.5 parking spaces per unit, and  
18          instead it's 1.5. And we had this in a  
19          similar case, Hollywood Gower, that we  
20          recently had through the courts and we  
21          won. And in that matter, it was  
22          acknowledged that you cannot deviate.  
23          There's been no acknowledgements in the  
24          agenda or anything. This is a Brown Act  
25          violation on this matter.

1 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr.  
2 Haines.

3 MR. HAINES: Thank you.

4 MS. HISSERICH: Good afternoon,  
5 Helmi Hisserich with the Los Angeles  
6 Housing Department. I'm not here to  
7 speak for or against the project, but  
8 rather to advise the committee on the  
9 agreement on affordable housing.

10 The Housing Department approached  
11 the developer with a policy consideration  
12 to provide twenty percent of the units as  
13 affordable. And they responded with very  
14 strong support for the policy. We  
15 started to discuss how best to implement  
16 the policy and identified some potential  
17 developments.

18 Since then, those developments are  
19 already moving through the pipeline, but  
20 the developer has committed to provide  
21 the funding -- the gap funding they would  
22 have provided for those projects to the  
23 Council District -- to the Housing  
24 Department Trust Fund in support of  
25 affordable housing near transit in the

1 Council District 13.

2 THE CHAIRMAN: These are off-site?

3 MS. HISSERICH: Off-site, but near  
4 transit. And we've been working with the  
5 Council office, and they've been -- this  
6 isn't a requirement. This is completely  
7 voluntary. They are not displacing  
8 anybody. So this is a purely voluntary  
9 commitment by -- on behalf of the  
10 developer.

11 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, ma'am.

12 MS. HISSERICH: Thank you.

13 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Okay.

14 MS. HISSERICH: I should have said,  
15 it's 4.8 million dollars, and that  
16 equates, from our analysis, to  
17 approximately 104 units.

18 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay.

19 MS, HISSERICH: Which his more than  
20 twenty percent of the total units that  
21 we've been advised they're proposing.

22 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Brittany  
23 Braun? Are you here Brittany?

24 Okay, last time, Genevive Geoghan,  
25 G-E-O-G-H-A-N.



1 Sharon -- I believe it's Short or  
2 Shirt, Whitley Heights?

3 Okay, then that does cover public  
4 comment.

5 I know, we went with twenty minutes  
6 and those that I called came forward.  
7 Those that I did not get to call, I asked  
8 you to stand to let you know that your  
9 cards are in for the record. I gave  
10 twenty minutes on each side.

11 Okay. All right. That does include  
12 all the applicants, folks that made the  
13 cards. So let's go to the district  
14 office and -- do we have the council  
15 representatives here?

16 Okay, while we're waiting for them,  
17 I do have an announcement regarding this  
18 project. It's just been turned in. My  
19 understanding is that the applicant  
20 consents to rescheduling the hearing  
21 before the City Council to July 24.

22 So -- the applicant also consents to  
23 an extension of time for City Council  
24 action on the above mentioned cases to  
25 July 31.

1           So it is currently moved to July  
2           24th, the City Council hearing. So  
3           that's been continued.

4           Okay. So let's take a one -- give  
5           me a three-minute break, and we'll be  
6           right back.

7           (Pause)

8           THE CHAIRMAN: All right. I want to  
9           thank you for your cooperation. If you  
10          could please take a seat?

11          Thank you for your patience. Are my  
12          colleagues in the room?

13          Okay, that does constitute a quorum,  
14          so I do have one colleague in the room.  
15          All right. Is Mr. Englander nearby?

16          Okay. All right. For the sake of  
17          clarity, our CLA, can you -- Roberto, can  
18          you please give us the new time frame,  
19          what it means, just to be very clear,  
20          what the new time frame means, based on  
21          the June 18th letter?

22          ROBERTO: My understanding,  
23          Councilman, is that this issue is before  
24          the City Council on July the 24th. And  
25          with a final deadline of July 31st for

1 the City Council to act.

2 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, so that's the  
3 window.

4 ROBERTO: Yes, sir.

5 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. So I want to  
6 be very clear, in case folks did not  
7 understand what I was saying. I saw some  
8 confused looks out there.

9 So at this stage -- can you call the  
10 applicant to the microphone?

11 In the presentation there were  
12 several scenarios of different heights of  
13 presented. For the record, could you  
14 tell us what is your preferred scenario?  
15 What would be the height that would be  
16 reviewed by the council once it leaves  
17 this committee?

18 MR. NEUMAN: Thank you Councilman  
19 Reyes. On behalf of the Millennium team,  
20 and after listening to the concerns of  
21 the community, in consultation with the  
22 Council Office, and understanding that  
23 there are a number of concerns relative  
24 to the height of the project, we, at this  
25 point, would be willing to accept a

1 limitation of the height at the thirty-  
2 nine, thirty-five foot project that was  
3 presented today.

4 THE CHAIRMAN: Thirty-nine and  
5 thirty-five.

6 MR. NEUMAN: Thirty-nine, thirty-  
7 five stories.

8 THE CHAIRMAN: Right. So that goes  
9 from -- what was the original?

10 MR. NEUMAN: The original had a  
11 height of up to fifty-five and forty-five  
12 stories. Those heights are being reduced  
13 to thirty-nine and thirty-five. The  
14 exact language of a condition that I  
15 would propose would be that the project  
16 shall be limited to no more than thirty-  
17 nine stories on the east side and no more  
18 than thirty-five stories on the west  
19 site.

20 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay.

21 MR. NEUMAN: And that would be a  
22 condition that would be imposed upon the  
23 project as recommended by this body.

24 THE CHAIRMAN: And how -- that's --  
25 and that would be the substance of this

1 report when we do write the committee  
2 report to the full council.

3 Okay, now my understanding is that  
4 there are some -- when it comes to the  
5 transit management policy, could you  
6 elaborate on those?

7 MR. NEUMAN: We have presented a  
8 wide range of transit demand management  
9 plan -- plans. We have also listened to  
10 the concerns of the Council Office and  
11 would recommend that the ones that were  
12 adopted by the central -- by the citywide  
13 planning commission be augmented with the  
14 following:

15 That the number of park and ride  
16 space be increased on the site offered by  
17 the site from ten to fifty; and that the  
18 developer institute a program whereby we  
19 would be acquiring transit passes for the  
20 workers and residents within the project,  
21 and we would commit to a fund of 500,000  
22 dollars over ten years -- 50,000 dollars  
23 a year, towards acquisition of those  
24 transit passes.

25 What we believe is that we can work

1 with the MTA. What we understand from  
2 the Metropolitan Transit Authority --  
3 from Metro, is that there are programs  
4 that we can initiate through board action  
5 that would allow us to buy -- to  
6 supplement a fifty-percent buy at up to  
7 about 400 passes, and that's our  
8 intention to work with Metro and with the  
9 Council Office and the mayor-elect's  
10 office to try to achieve that number with  
11 that amount of money.

12 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Okay.

13 MR. NEUMAN: Thank you very much.

14 THE CHAIRMAN: Any questions for the  
15 applicant?

16 COUNCIL MEMBER: Just one question.  
17 There was some comments made by some of  
18 the public speakers that we don't know  
19 what the project is; we don't know what  
20 the actual composition is; that we may be  
21 analyzing a project that has a certain  
22 amount of square feet but the ultimate  
23 product, we're not aware of that. Is  
24 that an accurate assessment?

25 MR. NEUMAN: The project maintains,

1 as it was presented, a set of guidelines  
2 and standards that allow the project to  
3 be built in a variety of configurations  
4 and uses. That -- that is true.

5 But the regulations that are imposed  
6 are set to create, in effect, and  
7 overregulation of the site, so that no  
8 matter at what height or what  
9 configuration it gets built at, that  
10 there are specific design standards, much  
11 like a very specific plan that gets  
12 adopted.

13 So at the end of the day, what was  
14 the concern is that you could build a  
15 range from fifty-five stories to five  
16 stories. What we've just done by our  
17 action is limit the upper end of that to  
18 thirty-nine stories on the east site and  
19 thirty-five stories on the west site, so  
20 that it could never go beyond that.

21 And we've set it within those  
22 guidelines. And then the specific  
23 standards for open space and the like  
24 apply.

25 COUNCIL MEMBER: How about the mix

1 of residential and commercial?

2 MR. NEUMAN: The intention of the  
3 project as applied, has a -- has a mix of  
4 residential uses. If you note what we've  
5 applied, there's a project that was  
6 applied for entitlement that basically is  
7 represented by the larger project that  
8 you saw. That project is, then, with the  
9 guidelines, allowed to be -- to be  
10 shifted.

11 There -- the uses within that are  
12 also shifted. We've now limited the  
13 upper end of how high it can go. And the  
14 uses can shift, but it can't -- if there  
15 is any shift in uses, it can't create any  
16 more impacts than were studied, and  
17 therefore we've limited the number of  
18 impacts irrespective of the use, to  
19 ensure that there are no traffic -- no  
20 additional traffic mitigations that are  
21 necessary, in fact, that traffic is  
22 mitigated, and that the size and density  
23 of the project doesn't create any  
24 additional impact on infrastructure than  
25 provided in the EIR.



1 COUNCIL MEMBER: Great. Thank you.  
2 And then -- I'm bad at math. So help  
3 me -- percentagewise, you're reducing it  
4 in height, what percentage is that, would  
5 you say?

6 MR. NEUMAN: Nearly thirty percent.

7 COUNCIL MEMBER: Nearly thirty  
8 percent or so, roughly?

9 MR. NEUMAN: Nearly thirty percent.

10 COUNCIL MEMBER: Okay.

11 THE CHAIRMAN: Roughly thirty  
12 percent.

13 COUNCIL MEMBER: Thank you.

14 MR. NEUMAN: Thank you.

15 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, Councilman  
16 Englander. We had a quorum all along.  
17 He was with us. He was right there.

18 COUNCILMAN ENGLANDER: I'm used to  
19 sitting over there. They usually don't  
20 let me sit at the big-boy table. Thank  
21 you. I'm going to move.

22 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, no questions  
23 there.

24 Office of the District would like to  
25 come forward and give us your statement

1           pertaining to this project.

2           Mr. PORRAS: Good afternoon, Marcel  
3           Porrás, planning and economic  
4           development, deputy for Councilmember  
5           Eric Garcetti and Mayor-Elect Garcetti.

6           First we would like to thank the  
7           community for the passion and committed  
8           participation, both for and against the  
9           project. We've engaged in multiple  
10          communications with the developer and  
11          stakeholders over multiple months, even  
12          years.

13          After reviewing this project and  
14          listening to the community, we made it  
15          clear to the applicants that we do not  
16          support this project at fifty-five  
17          stories.

18          We are pleased that that applicant,  
19          in turn, listened as well. This proposal  
20          of thirty-five and thirty-nine stories  
21          represents a shorter project with more  
22          open space and more traffic mitigations.

23          We commend the applicant for their  
24          willingness to work with their neighbors.  
25          At this time, we believe it is

1 appropriate to move this proposal forward  
2 to the full City Council in July to  
3 provide an opportunity to for the newly  
4 elected council to review this better  
5 proposal. Thank you.

6 THE CHAIRMAN: These are the July  
7 24th date, correct?

8 MR. PORRAS: Yes.

9 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. All right.

10 So I think we've covered all our  
11 bases and all the different facets of  
12 this committee hearing.

13 Roberto, could you suggest language  
14 that would incorporate the actions of  
15 this committee, so we can move this  
16 forward to the full council?

17 ROBERTO: Yes, Councilman. The first  
18 action would be to deny the appeals for  
19 items 4 and 5. The second action would  
20 be to incorporate the changes that Mr.  
21 Neuman alluded to, which is a thirty-  
22 nine -- thirty stories limitation for the  
23 east side, and a thirty-five story  
24 limitation for the west side.

25 Mr. Neuman also mentioned

1 incorporate -- incorporating a transit  
2 plan. He would work with the MTA. That  
3 should be reflected in the committee  
4 report. Also, the technical amendments  
5 that the planning department has  
6 enumerated in its June 18th letter should  
7 be incorporated.

8 And you also alluded to the fact  
9 that this matter is in the City Council  
10 on July the 24th.

11 THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Neuman, anything  
12 we should add?

13 MR. NEUMAN: It was thirty-nine on  
14 the east site, thirty-five on the west  
15 site.

16 ROBERTO: On the west site, yes.

17 MR. NEUMAN: I thought you said  
18 thirty, so I just --

19 ROBERTO: No, thirty-five.

20 THE CHAIRMAN: So you just  
21 negotiated another nine decrease.

22 Okay, thirty-nine and thirty-five.  
23 And we're going to get there.

24 Thank you, Mr. Neuman for helping  
25 with the committee.

1 FEMALE SPEAKER: I just wanted to  
2 add for the record that to accommodate  
3 the reduced alternative 2, that there  
4 might need to be some changes to the  
5 development regulations so that they're  
6 consistent with this proposed -- now  
7 proposed project.

8 THE CHAIRMAN: So these are the  
9 technical amendments?

10 FEMALE SPEAKER: Right. So they're  
11 in addition to those that were submitted  
12 today on behalf of the Department.

13 THE CHAIRMAN: Right, all the  
14 corrections. Okay.

15 MALE SPEAKER: Also, took involved  
16 in environmental conditions.

17 THE CHAIRMAN: So those are the  
18 actions before us. Any comments or  
19 responses to those recommendations? I  
20 would vote that we take the actions as  
21 specified by the CLA, and all the added  
22 technical recommendations identified by  
23 the planning staff, including the changes  
24 by the representative of the development.

25 Is there anything else that we

1 should cover?

2 ROBERTO: Apparently, there's a  
3 letter from the applicant that was  
4 submitted to the City Clerk, council  
5 members. That also need to be adopted.

6 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. And that's  
7 the -- on the extension of the date.

8 ROBERTO: I believe so.

9 THE CHAIRMAN: Is that right, Madame  
10 Clerk? No? Another letter? Please  
11 specify.

12 MR. NEUMAN: Council members, Jerry  
13 Neuman again. There was a letter that  
14 was submitted to you that had certain  
15 requested changes relative to the  
16 conditions of approval of the CPC that to  
17 the extent, as staff said, that a reduced  
18 project alternative was -- was required,  
19 that would need to be implemented. And  
20 that letter was submitted on --

21 MR. PORRAS: Committee members, it's  
22 a -- the letter that I referenced for  
23 your consideration in my remarks --

24 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay.

25 MR. PORRAS: -- relative to the

1 changes that were mentioned. So that's  
2 already part of the record and before  
3 your consideration.

4 THE CHAIRMAN: So it -- it aligns  
5 all the changes --

6 MR. NEUMAN: It aligns all the  
7 changes.

8 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. All right.  
9 Are we ready?

10 That clears everything? Right. So  
11 we will include a letter that  
12 specifically aligns with the lesser  
13 number of stories of thirty-nine and  
14 thirty-five. And so I believe that  
15 covers all the items?

16 MALE SPEAKER: Yes, sir.

17 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. So that being  
18 said, the committee approves, and that's  
19 a yes from both of my colleagues?

20 COUNCILMAN ENGLANDER: Yes.

21 COUNCILMAN HUIZAR: Yes.

22 THE CHAIRMAN: And that's three  
23 yeses. That's the action of this  
24 committee.

25 Okay. Anybody here for general

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

public comment, not on the agenda?

Seeing none, this meeting is  
adjourned.

(Whereupon these proceedings were  
concluded)



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

C E R T I F I C A T I O N

I, Sharona Shapiro, hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct transcription, to the best of my ability, of the sound recorded proceedings submitted for transcription.

I further certify that I am not employed by nor related to any party to this action.

In witness whereof, I hereby sign this date:  
May 27, 2014.

-----  
Sharona Shapiro  
AAERT Certified Electronic Transcriber  
CET\*\*D 492

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

CITY COUNCIL HEARING

----- )  
IN THE MATTER OF: )  
 )  
HEI/GC Hollywood & Vine Condominiums )  
 )  
v. )  
 )  
City of Los Angeles )  
----- )

Wednesday, July 24, 2013  
John Ferraro Council Chamber  
Room 340, City Hall  
200 North Spring Street  
Los Angeles, CA 90012

B E F O R E:  
PRESIDENT HERB J. WESSON, JR.  
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE MITCHELL ENGLANDER  
ASSISTANT PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE TOM LABONGE  
COUNCIL MEMBER GILBERT A. CEDILLO  
COUNCIL MEMBER PAUL KREKORIAN  
COUNCIL MEMBER BOB BLUMENFIELD  
COUNCIL MEMBER PAUL KORETZ  
COUNCIL MEMBER FELIPE FUENTES  
COUNCIL MEMBER BERNARD C. PARKS  
COUNCIL MEMBER CURREN D. PRICE, JR.  
COUNCIL MEMBER MIKE BONIN  
COUNCIL MEMBER MITCHELL O'FARRELL  
COUNCIL MEMBER JOSE HUIZAR  
COUNCIL MEMBER JOE BUSCAINO  
PAGES 1 - 81

1 THE CHAIRMAN: That takes us to, I  
2 believe, to items 21 and 22. So we're  
3 going to go ahead and take those items  
4 together. And we'll have ten minutes  
5 for -- we're going to split this up. We  
6 have a lot of cards on this, and there's  
7 a lot of interest. I believe that's what  
8 most people are here for today, on the  
9 Millennium projects. So we'll go ahead  
10 and do ten minutes on the card, so far on  
11 the support, ten minutes on the  
12 opposition, ten minutes for each of the  
13 appellants; there's two appellants,  
14 another ten minutes from the applicant.  
15 And we'll go ahead and open it in that  
16 order.

17 MALE SPEAKER: And, Mr. President,  
18 for the record, amending motion 21(a),  
19 O'Farrell/Koretz has been circulated.

20 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. If we can open  
21 the clock for ten minutes, and these are  
22 the supporters, we'll open it up with the  
23 supporters first, for the proposal.

24 First, Scott Campbell (ph.).

25 If you could line up -- I'm going to

1 ask everybody, since you only have,  
2 before we started off, ten minutes on  
3 each section, if you will, for a public  
4 comment and speakers, we've had numerous  
5 public comment on this already in  
6 committee, in the PLUM committee. And so  
7 we'll ask if you -- you don't have to use  
8 all of your time. If you want to make a  
9 point -- we're going to do one minute for  
10 each speaker, but we, certainly, still  
11 will not get through the entire stack.

12 And so, with that, we want everybody  
13 the opportunity to be heard. So if you  
14 can keep your comments brief. If  
15 somebody's already made a point that you  
16 also want to share, and you've already  
17 had that, heard that point, if you have  
18 something fresh or new to say, please do  
19 that. You can certainly say that you  
20 echo one of the previous speakers. But  
21 we do want to get an opportunity to have  
22 as many speakers as possible. And so,  
23 with that, if you can keep that in mind.

24 We will call three cards at a time,  
25 so you can line up behind each other, and

1 we can be as efficient as possible, since  
2 I know many of you are taking time off of  
3 work, as well.

4 With that, we'll have Scott  
5 Campbell, followed by Ed Hunt, followed  
6 by Leron Gubler. Please. Good morning.

7 MR. CAMPBELL: Good morning. Thank  
8 you for having me here today.

9 My name is Scott Campbell, I'm  
10 president of Central Hollywood  
11 Neighborhood Council. I'm representing  
12 over 20,000 stakeholders immediately  
13 south of this project. And, first, I'd  
14 like to congratulate all of the recently  
15 elected and reelected members of this  
16 body.

17 Central Hollywood Neighborhood  
18 Council voted to support this project at  
19 it's original height after many years of  
20 working directly with the developer. We  
21 recognize the transformative power of  
22 this project, and the benefits to our  
23 community, including bringing jobs closer  
24 to people, bringing people closer to  
25 jobs, utilizing existing transit of

1 Hollywood and Vine, which I took today,  
2 and the benefits package, which I've been  
3 provided, and I know has been provided to  
4 you.

5 I, and the Central Hollywood  
6 Neighborhood Council Board, ask you to  
7 approve this project and allow Hollywood  
8 to maintain and improve its position as a  
9 premier destination for people from  
10 across the city, across our state, across  
11 our country, and across the world. Thank  
12 you.

13 THE CHAIRMAN: Great, thank you.  
14 Mr. Hunt.

15 MR. HUNT: I'm Edward Hunt. I'm a  
16 thirty-five-year resident of Hollywood,  
17 president of the Melrose Hill  
18 Neighborhood Association.

19 And just wanted to say that here we  
20 finally have a true transit-oriented  
21 pedestrian-friendly mixed-use project  
22 that's literally less than 500 feet from  
23 a subway stop. And I recommend it's  
24 approval without reservation. Thank you.

25 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

1 MR. GUBLER: Good morning, I'm Leron  
2 Gubler, president and CEO of the  
3 Hollywood Chamber of Commerce. Coming  
4 here on support of this project.

5 For decades the city has discussed  
6 the need to do real planning, and today  
7 the city council has an opportunity to do  
8 exactly that by approving a project that  
9 takes, literally, acres of unsightly  
10 urban parking lots and transforms them  
11 into a transit-oriented pedestrian-  
12 friendly development with a diverse mix  
13 of living, working, shopping, dining and  
14 recreation activities. This is a  
15 signature project that will redefine the  
16 Hollywood of the 21st Century as an  
17 exciting livable walkable community. It  
18 represents the very best of urban  
19 planning and urban design.

20 You know, the decision -- the  
21 decision to make a truly urban-density  
22 and to build in Hollywood, in the core,  
23 was made really twenty-five years ago  
24 when Metro approved -- when Metro  
25 approved the subway of Hollywood.

1 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, thank you.  
2 Thank you very much.

3 MR. GUBLER: So let's approve this  
4 project.

5 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. The next  
6 speakers will be Ron Miller, followed by  
7 Alfredo Hernandez, followed by Priscilla  
8 Cheng.

9 And, forgive, me, I'm reading  
10 writing that hopefully I'll get some of  
11 these right. If I don't get them right,  
12 please just feel free to correct me.

13 Good morning.

14 MR. MILLER: Good morning. I'm Ron  
15 Miller, I'm executive secretary of the  
16 Los Angeles Orange County Building and  
17 Construction Trade's Council.

18 We represent 140,000 craftsmen and  
19 women, across fifty-two affiliated local  
20 unions, and fourteen trades.

21 We support the Millennium project.  
22 We urge you to approve it today. It will  
23 make Hollywood a livable community for  
24 the residents with easy access to public  
25 transit.



1           Mayor Garcetti and Councilman  
2           O'Farrell have worked with current  
3           residents to create a project that  
4           benefits the community. With 664 million  
5           dollars investment, it's going to create  
6           2900 construction jobs. And it's going  
7           to be built under an all union project  
8           labor agreement. These jobs are part of  
9           careers into our apprenticeship program.

10           Please support it. Thank you.

11           THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, thank you.  
12           Good morning.

13           MR. HERNANDEZ: Good morning,  
14           council members. My name is Alfredo  
15           Hernandez, I work for the Friends of the  
16           Hollywood Central Park, and I'm a board  
17           member of the East Hollywood Neighborhood  
18           Council.

19           This is a very, very excellent  
20           developer. He has met numerous, numerous  
21           times with the community, and has  
22           provided many community benefits. And I  
23           urge you to support them, and they  
24           will -- you know, I also recommend that  
25           all the fees generated by this project be

1 used towards the Hollywood Central Park.

2 Thank you very much.

3 THE CHAIRMAN: All right. Thank you  
4 very much.

5 MS. CHENG: Good morning. My name's  
6 Priscilla Cheng, and I'm the economic  
7 development director for the Los Angeles  
8 County Federation of Labor.

9 I'm here today on behalf of Madelena  
10 Farazo (ph.) and the hundreds of  
11 thousands of workers throughout Los  
12 Angeles County.

13 This project is a good one, create  
14 good union jobs; over 3,000 good union  
15 jobs and 1300 good permit jobs, and an  
16 excellent training program.

17 As we enter a new administration,  
18 and new council, one of the big things  
19 that we committed to voters is that we'd  
20 create good jobs, and this is our  
21 opportunity.

22 So we ask that you support this  
23 project today. Thank you.

24 THE CHAIRMAN: Great, thank you very  
25 much.

1           Moira, or Maria Johnson, followed by  
2 Victor De la Cruz, followed by Eric  
3 Anthony. Whoever makes it to the mic  
4 first, feel free.

5           MR. TRANCIN: Good morning, and  
6 thank you. My name is John Trancin  
7 (ph.). I'm here to speak on behalf of  
8 the project.

9           Just as a reference, I own a couple  
10 of historic buildings in Hollywood. I do  
11 have a passion for preserving historic  
12 buildings. I also own a loft at the  
13 Broadway Lofts, which around the corner  
14 of Hollywood and Vine. And my unit  
15 stairs is right out the Capital Records  
16 building, so I know a lot about the  
17 project.

18           I do think one of the buildings is  
19 going to block my view of the Hollywood  
20 sign, and, obviously, have an impact on  
21 that historic building, but I just think  
22 it's a wonderful project. I know it's  
23 big, but I think the community plan calls  
24 for heavy density in this area around  
25 transit portals, and I support that as

1 well. And I just think it's a really  
2 well-designed project.

3 I urge you to support. Thank you.

4 THE CHAIRMAN: Great. No, thank  
5 you. Good morning.

6 MR. DE LA CRUZ: Good morning,  
7 council members. Victor De la Cruz,  
8 Mannatt Phelps & Phillips, I'm land use  
9 council for AMDA College and Conservatory  
10 of the Performing Arts.

11 AMDA's Hollywood campus, which is  
12 immediately adjacent to the Millennium  
13 project site, has educated some of the  
14 world's most talented singers, dancers  
15 and actors for years.

16 With approximately 700 full-time  
17 students using the eight buildings that  
18 comprise AMDA's campus each day, some of  
19 which would share a property line or are  
20 directly across the street from  
21 Millennium.

22 AMDA was initially very concerned  
23 about how construction would impact the  
24 school's operations. Today, we are very  
25 pleased to be here in full support of the

1 project. Millennium has risen to the  
2 occasion by listening, and working  
3 closely with us to ensure that AMDA will  
4 not only be able to operate, but thrive  
5 during construction.

6 Those issues resolved, AMDA believes  
7 its students deserve a neighborhood with  
8 great architecture, public spaces, and a  
9 mix of uses that will activate sidewalks  
10 and provide for a safe vibrant  
11 environment.

12 We look forward to the new  
13 environment that this transformative  
14 project will create not only for AMDA but  
15 for all of Hollywood, thank you.

16 THE CHAIRMAN: Great, thank you.

17 MR. ANTHONY: Good morning,  
18 councilmen. My name is Eric Anthony, and  
19 I'm here on behalf of the Los Angeles  
20 Business Council. We represent over 350  
21 business leaders, commercial property  
22 owners, developers and other  
23 stakeholders. And I'm here today in  
24 support of the Millennium Hollywood  
25 Project.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

This project is of vital importance, not just to the Hollywood community, but to all of Los Angeles, which will see the economic benefits from this development for years to come. Millennium Hollywood will provide transportation options, reduce urban sprawl and decrease our heavy reliance on cars. This is a well-planned high density project adjacent to the transit hubs. That makes sense, and is consistent with the goals of the LABC.

I urge you to support this project, as well. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much.

Mr. Ruben Gonzalez, followed by Rachel Torres, followed by Terry Tilton. Please just start making your way up, that would be great. Good morning.

MR. GONZALEZ: Good morning, Mr. Chair, members of the council. My name is Ruben Gonzalez, I'm here on behalf of the LA area Chamber of Commerce, and our 1600 members employing over 700,000 Angelinos.

Today is one of the easiest votes of

1           this young council's term. The community  
2           is in favor, business is in favor, labor  
3           is in favor. This creates jobs, and puts  
4           hundreds of millions of dollars into our  
5           economy. This is an easy yes vote, and I  
6           will look forward to seeing a positive  
7           result here. And want to thank  
8           Councilman O'Farrell for bringing this  
9           across the finish line. Thank you very  
10          much.

11                   THE CHAIRMAN: Great, thank you.

12                   FEMALE SPEAKER: I urge all of you  
13           to please vote yes for this project, it's  
14           vital for Hollywood, it's vital for our  
15           community on so many levels that have  
16           been stated. I'm a thirty-year -- over  
17           thirty-year resident of Hollywood. I  
18           work in Hollywood. I'm on the Board of  
19           Directors for Hollywood PAL, and also  
20           working with the Hollywood Central Park  
21           Project.

22                   The Millennium project is essential  
23           for our revitalization. Please vote yes.

24                   THE CHAIRMAN: Great, thank you.  
25           Good morning.

1 MS. TORRES: Good morning. My name  
2 is Rachel Torres. I'm a research analyst  
3 with UNITE HERE Local 11.

4 On behalf of my colleagues and the  
5 20,000 members of UNITE HERE Local 11, we  
6 wish to express our strong support for  
7 the Millennium Hollywood Project.

8 This project continues a strong  
9 precedent of responsible development in  
10 Hollywood. Beginning with the Hollywood  
11 and Highland Project. This project will  
12 receive no city dollars, nor is it on  
13 city land, yet thousands of good jobs  
14 will be produced for the construction and  
15 permanent employees.

16 We want to express our strong  
17 support for this project. Thank this  
18 council for your due diligence in making  
19 this work. And vote in favor of the  
20 project. Thank you so much.

21 THE CHAIRMAN: Great. No, thank you  
22 very much. Terry Tilton? No longer  
23 here, okay. Raul Munoz, followed by  
24 Kelly Cole, followed by Gary Cook. Good  
25 morning.



1 MS. COLE: Good morning. Hi, I'm  
2 Kelly Cole.

3 And I just -- I support the  
4 Millennium Park project, because I think  
5 it's going to create a lot of new jobs,  
6 and a lot of new opportunities for  
7 people, in especially Hollywood, that  
8 needs a park. It needs something new to  
9 revive it. So I'm looking forward to it  
10 happening. That's it.

11 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much.  
12 Gary Cook. Not present. Raul Munoz.  
13 That's the second time I've called.  
14 Followed by Kevin Harvey, followed by  
15 Martin Rodriguez. Good morning.

16 MR. COOK: Gary Cook, UA Plumber's  
17 Local 78.

18 We stand in support of this project,  
19 building the community, the  
20 infrastructure around it. It's a good  
21 project. Thank you very much.

22 THE CHAIRMAN: All right. Thank you  
23 very much.

24 MR. MUNOZ: Good morning. My name  
25 is Raul Munoz.

1           And I'm here to support Hollywood  
2 Millennium, because we need restaurants  
3 retail store to jobs for our community.  
4 And the last past two/three years we have  
5 a lot of buildings, but this is studios,  
6 and it's not a job for our communities.  
7 This is outside job, I welcome, and I  
8 want to stand in Hollywood Millennium  
9 welcome to. Thank you.

10           THE CHAIRMAN: All right, thank you.  
11 Actually, that wraps up, I believe, the  
12 ten minutes. The remaining cards will be  
13 kept for the record, and they'll all be  
14 part of the actual record.

15           And now we'll go ahead and switch to  
16 another ten minutes for the opponents.

17           (Pause)

18           And, again, if you can line up at  
19 least three at a time. We'll start off  
20 with Jim Dusen, followed by Jamie  
21 McNairy, For or Jim Dusen is what the  
22 card says, one of the two, followed by  
23 Alex Chavez.

24           MR. DUSEN: Good morning. My name  
25 is Jim Van Dusen, I'm a member of the

1 board of the Hollywood United  
2 Neighborhood Council and co-chair of the  
3 Palm Committee, representing 19,000  
4 Hollywood stakeholders in the geographic  
5 area of this project.

6 We have many concerns about this  
7 project. Among them are, one, this is a  
8 project without a plan. There's outside  
9 parameters but no detail. No one on your  
10 committee or on the planning department  
11 has any idea of exactly what Millennium  
12 is going to build.

13 On record is six to one floor area  
14 ratio far outstrip the ability of the  
15 area, and infrastructure is inconsistent  
16 with the spirit and goals of the  
17 Hollywood community plan.

18 Caltrans say the Millennium sponsor  
19 traffic study is flawed, and does not  
20 address the regional impact of the  
21 project. We request a regional traffic  
22 study, and traffic management plan.

23 Your urge to support Elgin Ditsney  
24 (ph.) with a 4.5 to one floor area ratio.  
25 Thank you.

1 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. The clock  
2 is going on the ten minutes, so if you  
3 could make your way at any time. Good  
4 morning.

5 MS. MCNAIRY: Good morning. My name  
6 is Jamie McNairy from the Hollywoodland  
7 Homeowner's Association. And we oppose  
8 this project. Thank you.

9 THE CHAIRMAN: Great, thank you.  
10 Alex Chavez, not present. Joanne  
11 DeAntonio (ph.), followed by Michael  
12 Mauro (ph.).

13 MS. DEANTONIO: I'm Joanne  
14 DeAntonio.

15 The Millennium project will create a  
16 traffic mess in Hollywood, which will be  
17 bad for business and be bad for tourists,  
18 and won't focus on the inconvenience to  
19 residents of the area, because they are  
20 not usually the consideration, but it  
21 will affect their quality of life.

22 Millennium will also interfere with  
23 the historical area. Hollywood is  
24 valuable to Los Angeles as preserved. If  
25 people want brand new glitz they could go

1 to LA. Think Pasadena, and how it has  
2 kept building height limited, and  
3 restored old buildings. And Pasadena's  
4 not suffering as a business area. The  
5 traffic is not unbearable and it's fun to  
6 go there. Just because there's a subway  
7 stop doesn't mean we have to turn an area  
8 into Manhattan. Our subway does not  
9 deliver everyone to walking distance of  
10 their destination, so there will always  
11 be cars. Plus, the latest DRR say that  
12 the buildings will straddle an earthquake  
13 fault.

14 THE CHAIRMAN: Great, thank you.

15 MR. MAURO: Although I've worked in  
16 the area as an attendance council, I  
17 don't speak for the LA Unified School  
18 District. And, although, my grandfather  
19 was a Professor of Architecture at USC --

20 THE CHAIRMAN: If you can state your  
21 name for the record, as well, please.

22 MR. MAURO: I am Michael Mauro,  
23 doctorate in educational administration.

24 I'm concerned about this project,  
25 these towers, about the increasing

1 traffic. It is approaching gridlock and  
2 you need to do something about that. I'm  
3 also concerned about the potential  
4 problem with the earthquake fault  
5 underneath. Have you -- will you  
6 consider warning everybody who lives and  
7 works along this area, or even condemning  
8 properties. I think you have an  
9 opportunity to create a couple of tax  
10 advantages or encourage that for a couple  
11 of pocket parks.

12 Please vote no on this project right  
13 now. Or at least wait until all the  
14 seismic reports are in.

15 Thank you very much for your  
16 consideration.

17 THE CHAIRMAN: Great, thank you.  
18 Sara Jane Schwartz, followed by Joyce  
19 Director, followed by Ms. Fortune  
20 Zuckerman.

21 AUDIENCE: We can't hear you.

22 THE CHAIRMAN: Can you hear me now.  
23 Yes, if we could just keep the voices  
24 down on the sides of the chambers. It is  
25 a bit of an echo in the chamber, so that

1 would be helpful.

2 Sara Jane Schwartz, followed by Ms.  
3 Joyce Director, followed by Ms. Fortune  
4 Zuckerman. Thank you. Good morning.

5 MS. SCHWARTZ: Hello. I'm Sarajane  
6 Schwartz, and I'm on the board of the  
7 Hollywoodland Home Owner's Association.

8 All eyes this morning are on  
9 Hollywood's new lawmaker to see how he  
10 handles this first test of his  
11 leadership. So far his position has been  
12 a mystery. Will the new Hollywood  
13 councilmen stand with forty community  
14 group citywide that oppose the project,  
15 or with the New York City developer and  
16 his band of high paid lobbyists. Will he  
17 join in support of development that is  
18 safe, sane, and appropriate, or will he  
19 support this project. Will he represent  
20 the people that will be most affected by  
21 this project, the residents of Hollywood.

22 First impressions are often lasting  
23 impressions. If unfavorable hard to  
24 shake. What happens if Hollywood  
25 councilmen vote for this project, and God

1 forbid there's a tragic earthquake. This  
2 is your day, your opportunity to save  
3 Hollywood. Thank you.

4 THE CHAIRMAN: Great, thank you.

5 MS. DIRECTOR: Good morning, I'm  
6 Joyce Director. I'm on the board of  
7 Hollywood Heights, I'm also on the board  
8 of the Hollywood Hills West Neighborhood  
9 Council, I'm on the Hollywood Bowl  
10 Advisory Committee. I'm very active in  
11 the community.

12 And I need to remind this council  
13 that you represent all of the people of  
14 Los Angeles, and not just one very  
15 wealthy builder.

16 Over fifty local civic associations  
17 representing thousands of Angelinos have  
18 come out against the Millennium as  
19 presented. Millennium's offered to lower  
20 the height of the buildings while  
21 maintaining the same square footage, was  
22 a ploy we all new was coming from the  
23 start. They proposed something they knew  
24 would never fly, and then fell back to  
25 plan B, which was always their plan A.



1 They have conceded nothing.

2 The traffic, earthquake and safety  
3 studies Millennium has provided have all  
4 been prevent to be questionable at best,  
5 and criminally liable at worst.

6 I'm requesting the city council to  
7 instruct Millennium to go back to the  
8 drawing board and present a project more  
9 in keeping with the existing height and  
10 land use --

11 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much.  
12 Ms. Zuckerman, followed by Julie Fleisher  
13 (ph.), followed by Shelli Kia (ph.).  
14 Good morning.

15 MS. FLEISHER: Good morning. I'm  
16 Julie Fleisher, TV and film script  
17 supervisor, proud union member, and  
18 Whitley Heights resident.

19 At the PLUM meeting last month there  
20 were three council members present, while  
21 we property owners made our case against  
22 the Godzilla-sized Millennium project.  
23 Councilman Huizar repeatedly got up, left  
24 the room, talking on his cell phone and  
25 was gone for many minutes at a time. The

1 other two councilmen, Reyes and Englander  
2 were handed large bound stack of papers  
3 by our lawyer, which outlined our  
4 concerns in the newest and accurate  
5 findings. The two picked up the study  
6 and leafed through with as much concern  
7 as if it were a cartoon flip book they  
8 picked up in a Hollywood souvenir shop.  
9 If I displayed that kind of  
10 unprofessionalism and hubris at my job  
11 I'd be fired.

12 Hopefully in the time that has  
13 passed council has done its job, and has  
14 taken into consideration the information  
15 given to you by we who have elected you  
16 to be our representatives.

17 Please don't continue to be led  
18 around by your wallet by those who have  
19 financed many of your campaigns as a way  
20 to guarantee your support for any  
21 monstrosity they wish to build.

22 THE CHAIRMAN: All right, thank you.  
23 Good morning.

24 MS. KIA: Good morning. My name is  
25 Shelli Kia, and I've been a homeowner in

1 Whitley Heights, Hollywood for the last  
2 fifteen years.

3 I'm all for the revitalization of  
4 Hollywood, but not a project of this  
5 magnitude.

6 Over forty homeowners association,  
7 neighborhood councils, community groups,  
8 have all been vocal in their opposition  
9 to this project. Caltrans, a state  
10 agency, has expressed its concerns about  
11 safety and the impact on the 101 freeway.

12 We've expressed our grievances in  
13 every way possible, and you don't hear  
14 us. My question is who do you listen to?  
15 We pay your salaries, they contribute to  
16 your campaigns. We'll see you at the  
17 polls next election day.

18 THE CHAIRMAN: All right, thank you.  
19 Jim Geoghan, followed by Valerie Keegan  
20 (ph.).

21 MR. GEOGHAN: Jim Geoghan, Hollywood  
22 Hills West Neighborhood Council Chair,  
23 Whitley Heights resident twenty-seven  
24 years.

25 If you like the traffic at Hollywood

1 and Highland, if you like to watch  
2 Highland jammed up from 4 to 8 o'clock  
3 every day, if you like that then you're  
4 going to love the Millennium Towers,  
5 you're just going to adore it. It's  
6 ridiculous.

7 To build a million point two square  
8 feet and say there'll be a little bit  
9 more traffic is nonsense, it's  
10 ridiculous. We need an independent  
11 traffic study. We also need an  
12 independent study of the earthquake fault  
13 that runs through the site. It's  
14 ridiculous. And that's all I have to  
15 say.

16 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you very  
17 much. Valerie, followed by Rosemary  
18 Dumont, followed Annie Geoghan.

19 MS. KEEGAN: Hi, good morning. And  
20 I thank you very much for your time and  
21 also attention to something that is so  
22 important.

23 Hollywood is a neighborhood, it's  
24 not a downtown, it's downhill. And these  
25 residents here really do know what

1 they're talking about.

2 I would also like to bring attention  
3 to the revised ordinance that was added  
4 to this file. I did attend the PLUM  
5 committee hearing, and I never heard  
6 anything discussed in that file about  
7 hours of operation, what they're going to  
8 have, five liquor licenses, possibly two  
9 nightclubs. Was the police notified of  
10 this? Normally, we would have some  
11 input. There's cafes, they're going to  
12 be open -- you know, dancing, maybe not  
13 in the streets. What about the Pantages  
14 Theatre, can they take outdoor amplified  
15 music and live concerts until 2 o'clock  
16 in the morning out there. This is a  
17 neighborhood.

18 I really do ask that you pay  
19 attention. Mr. Blumenfield, I do see  
20 that you are paying attention. And I  
21 greatly thank you. Thank you.

22 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much.  
23 This will be our final speaker. We've  
24 actually burned the clock on the ten  
25 minutes, so I just wanted to let you

1 know. Please. We'll do one more minute,  
2 we'll add that then for the other part.

3 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: So what is  
4 your rush, why are you rushing to get  
5 this through? You don't have to march to  
6 this developer's tune, especially when  
7 he's asking you to do -- to march  
8 blindfolded, possibly over a cliff. And  
9 make no mistake that he's asking -- what  
10 he's asking you to do, is to vote for  
11 this project without having all the  
12 facts.

13 And that's just not me, it's Dr.  
14 Parrish saying it -- warning you that the  
15 seismic study is deficient, Caltrans is  
16 telling you the traffic study is  
17 inadequate.

18 And if you proceed with ignorance  
19 and putting lives in danger, will you be  
20 able to live with it when the worst  
21 should happen, and it will happen. You'd  
22 be putting Hollywood's quality of life in  
23 jeopardy and you'll be risking legal  
24 jeopardy.

25 And what's the rush, again. Think,

1 don't act, until you have all the facts.  
2 The law demands it, we demand it, please  
3 do the right thing for once in your life,  
4 instead of a just listening to a  
5 developer's campaign promises.

6 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, thank you. Our  
7 final speaker will be Annie Geoghan.

8 MS. GEOGHAN: Thank you, good  
9 morning.

10 THE CHAIRMAN: Good morning.

11 MS. GEOGHAN: As far as the traffic  
12 Caltrans has written a number of letters  
13 to the city and to then Council Member  
14 Garcetti that have all gone ignored.  
15 That this is an inadequate traffic study,  
16 and it's basically illegal if you vote  
17 and pass this today. They have within  
18 thirty days to file a lawsuit.

19 The state geologists have said  
20 you've building on dangerous active fault  
21 line, and you're all ignoring it.  
22 Council Member O'Farrell, Council Member  
23 Huizar, Council Member Englander, and our  
24 current member all have been supported  
25 and helped get elected by Millennium.

1 And the Hollywood Chamber of Commerce  
2 pack was also supported by Millennium.

3 You are not selling out a city only,  
4 you are selling the very lives of the  
5 people who live here, putting us in  
6 jeopardy, and all of the people that come  
7 here and visit here.

8 You had a press conference about the  
9 safety, we have shootouts in the streets,  
10 we have knifings going on all the time.  
11 Six to one on Vine, this is will be a  
12 hundred times worth than what you're  
13 dealing with the murders and rapes over  
14 at Hollywood and Highland. What are you  
15 thinking about. You have an opportunity  
16 to create a safe city here.

17 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much.

18 Now, we're going to go ahead and  
19 start with the appellants. We'll open it  
20 up for ten minutes for each appellant.

21 We'll start with Mr. Ben Reznik. Is  
22 Mr. Reznik present and ready? I don't  
23 see Mr. Reznik, or anybody representing  
24 the other appellant. So we'll go ahead  
25 close his time.



1           And we'll go with Mr. Robert  
2 Silverstein for ten minutes. Good  
3 morning.

4           MR. SILVERSTEIN: Good morning,  
5 thank you.

6           First of all, since Mr. Reznik is  
7 not here, if I may request that his time  
8 be added to mine, and will do my best to  
9 speak on more issues for --

10          THE CHAIRMAN: Unfortunately, we  
11 cannot do that. We can give you the ten  
12 minutes, but if he's not here to yield it  
13 to you, then we'll go ahead and give you  
14 your ten minutes, as we did with the  
15 supporters and the appellants. Thank  
16 you.

17          MR. SILVERSTEIN: Okay. There are  
18 two appellants here, and I think in terms  
19 of due process, and given the gravity of  
20 the situation and the decisions that are  
21 before you today --

22          THE CHAIRMAN: This is part of your  
23 time, so if you want to --

24          MR. SILVERSTEIN: -- that are before  
25 you today, I would respectfully submit

1 that you should give more time to this,  
2 not less. Which really raises the issue  
3 what is your rush.

4 My name is Robert Silverstein, and  
5 I'm the attorney representing a coalition  
6 of more than forty community groups that  
7 have coalesced around this project,  
8 against this project, because of its  
9 outrageousness.

10 Let the record reflect, first of  
11 all, that I filed some objections this  
12 morning with your city clerk's office,  
13 three separate letters.

14 One is to Council President Wesson,  
15 one is to your Department of Building and  
16 Safety, and another one is to Council  
17 President Wesson with some exhibits.

18 We have tried our best to respond to  
19 a last-minute document submission by the  
20 developer of 311 pages. And I would  
21 respectfully submit that that action by  
22 the developer, and this city council's  
23 endorsement of that action, is a  
24 violation of our due process rights.  
25 There is simply no way in the limited

1 amount of time that we've had that an  
2 appellant, a land use appellant, which is  
3 what we are, can have assimilated that  
4 300 pages of material.

5 What we did notice in our initial  
6 review is that they have attempted to  
7 sneak in new studies, new data, all of  
8 which is similarly false to what they did  
9 before. However, the entire purpose of  
10 CEQA, is that it is a public disclosure  
11 document, and CEQA requires that both,  
12 you, as the decision makers, and we, as  
13 the public, have a full and fair  
14 opportunity to review and analyze the  
15 information that's presented. That has  
16 been rendered impossible by that  
17 procedure from the developer.

18 And I would respectfully remind you  
19 that last August I won a trial in the Los  
20 Angeles County Superior Court against  
21 you, the city council, based upon the  
22 Hollywood and Gower project, where the  
23 city, staff, and planning department, and  
24 you, allowed the last-minute introduction  
25 of material back-filled into the record,

1 written by the developer and denied our  
2 client, the Lamar Avenue Neighborhood  
3 Association of Hollywood's due process  
4 rights. And Judge Jones, downtown, found  
5 that the city violated our constitutional  
6 rights. A very similar abuse is  
7 happening here today. And that is a  
8 further ground for you to take a step  
9 back and not to vote to approve this  
10 project.

11 And I would, specifically, encourage  
12 Council Member O'Farrell, to give this  
13 his attention because this is not only a  
14 horrific project, but it's a horrific  
15 abuse of the process.

16 What the public wants to see is  
17 integrity in the process, and that is  
18 sorely lacking. And there are so many  
19 examples of that.

20 In the last couple of days, some  
21 startling information has come out with  
22 further blows the lid off of this  
23 project, exposing the danger and fraud  
24 surrounding.

25 First of all, the California State

1 Board of Professional Engineers and  
2 Geologists, has opened an official  
3 investigation into the Millennium  
4 developer's geologist. That is in  
5 response to our formal complaint that the  
6 developer's engineers distorted their  
7 technical reports to high the existence  
8 of the Hollywood earthquake fault running  
9 directly through this property.

10 We've been claiming, and now the  
11 state is investigating, that the  
12 Millennium geological engineers have  
13 misrepresented the facts about the life,  
14 health, safety risks of building  
15 skyscrapers on the property at issue in  
16 this matter.

17 The state board would not have  
18 opened this investigation if they did not  
19 believe that there was probable cause to  
20 our complaint. They are not required to  
21 simply open an investigation.

22 Second, the other dramatic  
23 development is that last Saturday, four  
24 days ago, the California State Geologist,  
25 Don Parrish, in a letter, written to you,

1 the city council, and Council President  
2 Herb Wesson, wrote with specific  
3 reference to the EIR in this matter and  
4 with specific reference to the Millennium  
5 project that the California Geological  
6 Survey has commenced a detailed study of  
7 the Hollywood fault and it's related  
8 splays.

9 Dr. Parrish noted, that the state's  
10 investigation could affect the city's  
11 "reviewing of plans for the prospective  
12 Millennium Hollywood project, which may  
13 fall within an earthquake fault zone."  
14 All independent shows that it does fall  
15 within an earthquake fault zone. More  
16 than that, that faults run through that  
17 property. Where do we know that from,  
18 from the 2010 California Geologic Surveys  
19 active fault trace map, which was ignored  
20 by the developer's consultants. From  
21 Professor Dolan from USC, who has no dog  
22 in this hunt, who is the world expert on  
23 the Hollywood fault. His studies, from  
24 prior studies, all peer-reviewed  
25 independent studies that were suppressed

1 and ignored by the developer's  
2 consultants. That is fraud, and your  
3 approval or anticipated approval, is  
4 endorsement and complicity in that fraud.

5 You need to step back and do what a  
6 responsible city council would do. Which  
7 is, Councilman O'Farrell, at a minimum,  
8 wait until the State Geologic Survey's  
9 investigation is complete. They have  
10 said that that's only going to take six  
11 months. We're not talking about years or  
12 decades, six months.

13 Instead, what will happen today is  
14 you will put the lives of as many as  
15 3,000 persons, including our respective  
16 union members, who would work, live, and  
17 shop in that giant project. They would  
18 be at risk if you approve this project  
19 today.

20 These are devastating new  
21 developments, these are red flags, that  
22 should warn the LA City Council, that it  
23 would be irresponsible and, possibly,  
24 criminally negligent for it to approve  
25 the Millennium project as it is now

1           planned.

2           All of this new information must be  
3 disclosed to the public in a new draft  
4 EIR before the city council votes on it.  
5 You cannot take the approach that you  
6 seem to be taking with yet a new amended  
7 ordinance, five minutes before this  
8 starts, where you're adding different  
9 things, or claiming different things, all  
10 window dressing, saying that there will  
11 be further seismic studies done to your  
12 satisfaction. That subverts the entire  
13 purpose of CEQA, which is the information  
14 needs to be in front of you before you  
15 make your decision, not afterwards.

16           If the Department of Fish and Game  
17 said to you we are investigating, and we  
18 have commenced a study of an endangered  
19 species on the Millennium Hollywood  
20 project site, and I would respectfully  
21 submit, that integrity is an endangered  
22 species on that site. But if they said  
23 that to you would you still go ahead and  
24 ignore it, ignore the state's study,  
25 ignore their jurisdiction, that is what



1           you are doing.

2           Moreover, for two and a half years  
3           you have ignored Caltrans' jurisdiction.  
4           For two and a half years you have ignored  
5           the statements and the directions from  
6           Caltrans, which is a responsible agency,  
7           which has said that your EIR uses bogus  
8           figures and falsifies data, and  
9           suppresses information about massive  
10          impacts to the 101 freeway, to the  
11          circulation system, to safety, to  
12          emergency response time, to queuing, none  
13          of those issues have been addressed to  
14          date, despite Caltrans' repeated and  
15          consistent objections to this EIR.

16          It is unheard of that you have forty  
17          community groups, plus six neighborhood  
18          councils that have coalesced against  
19          this.

20          It is further unheard of that you  
21          have at least three state agencies, which  
22          are now involved, saying to you city  
23          council, and Councilman O'Farrell, please  
24          stop, do the responsible thing. At a  
25          minimum, wait for the studies to be

1 complete. Do not ignore what is so  
2 crystal clear. Do not rubber stamp this.  
3 Do not conduct business as usual. We  
4 want to see better. You are our leaders,  
5 we expect responsible leadership.

6 We still have a shred of faith in  
7 the process. Please, please don't  
8 disappoint us. I know that's a big  
9 request, but, you know, hope springs  
10 eternal.

11 So we would respectfully request  
12 that you defer any decision until after  
13 the state's investigation is complete.

14 I would respectfully suggest that  
15 your building and safety department,  
16 including Supervisor Chan and your city  
17 geologist, Mr. Prevost, have been  
18 woefully negligent in their advice to  
19 you. They should have advised you to  
20 stop, and to not accept the geological  
21 studies that are underlying and  
22 undermining the EIR, and your decisions  
23 here.

24 I believe when you approve this, if  
25 you do, and when everything falls apart,

1           which it will, that there would be  
2           seismic shift within the building and  
3           safety department, and that's desperately  
4           needed. Because instead of being  
5           gatekeepers, they have rubberstamped  
6           clearly fraudulent and erroneous studies.

7           And I want to briefly mention in the  
8           few minutes that was have, to try to  
9           assimilate the new material they have  
10          dumped into the record. They claim, the  
11          developer, that ZIMAS, the city's zoning  
12          and information system, is an adequate  
13          basis, a legitimate basis, for  
14          determining the distanced to the  
15          earthquake fault. That's a ridiculous  
16          statement. There is no basis for that.  
17          It's not a geological survey.

18          They also falsely claim that our  
19          experts relied on ZIMAS, that is also a  
20          misstatement. Our expert referred to  
21          ZIMAS when critiquing their expert's  
22          reliance on it. Everything that they are  
23          saying is twisted. Everything that they  
24          are saying is misleading. Everything  
25          that they are saying is dangerous. And

1           you have an obligation to stop this  
2           project now.

3           THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, your time  
4           is up, Mr. Silverstein.

5           And, with that -- thank you for  
6           keeping to truly professional, as the  
7           attorney that you are.

8           And so with that, if we could, open  
9           it up for the members.

10          Mr. O'Farrell, if you'd like to  
11          begin.

12          COUNCIL MEMBER O'FARRELL: Thank  
13          you, Mr. President.

14          First and foremost, I'd like to  
15          thank everyone who came to council to  
16          express their view on the Millennium  
17          project, and I acknowledge all of you in  
18          this process.

19          Second, to my colleagues, I ask that  
20          you review the letter I placed on your  
21          desks. In order to provide each of you  
22          with specific details on why, after  
23          careful consideration of all the facts, I  
24          have decided to support this project.

25          This project is a long time in the

1 making. Many concerns have been raised,  
2 and addressed, throughout the six-year  
3 process.

4 The planning process began, as I  
5 said, six years ago. And as we move  
6 forward with our discussion, I'd like to  
7 remind all of you that this is a time-  
8 limit file. The council must act on it  
9 by July 31st or lose jurisdiction.

10 I would like to recognize city  
11 planning, city attorney, the Department  
12 of Building and Safety, the Department of  
13 Transportation --

14 THE CHAIRMAN: If we could keep the  
15 public -- excuse me, for one second.

16 COUNCIL MEMBER O'FARRELL: Sure.

17 THE CHAIRMAN: And not disrupt the  
18 meeting, but keep the comments down, and  
19 be respectful, as everybody was  
20 respectful so far. Otherwise, we'll have  
21 to clear the chambers. Thank you.

22 COUNCIL MEMBER O'FARRELL: I'd like  
23 to recognize the departments, and also  
24 transportation, for your diligent work in  
25 this matter.

1           Secondly, I'd like to acknowledge  
2           Mayor Garcetti and Council Member LaBonge  
3           for their efforts in this project.

4           Council Member LaBonge could not be  
5           at council today, and he asked me to read  
6           a statement from him which I will do.  
7           And this is from Council Member LaBonge.

8           While I support the jobs that  
9           Millennium project would create, I would  
10          not have voted for this project as  
11          presented today. I feel the height of  
12          the two towers is too tall, and out of  
13          scale with the character of Hollywood.  
14          I'm also concerned about the impact of  
15          traffic on adjoining Hillside  
16          neighborhoods which I represent.

17          Even though this project is not in  
18          my district, I have advocated  
19          consistently throughout the public  
20          process for a lower height. I would have  
21          supported a maximum height of twenty-nine  
22          stories.

23          And Council Member LaBonge thanks me  
24          for reading this statement.

25          The Millennium project will anchor

1 the east side of Hollywood, attracting  
2 new visitors, residents, and business to  
3 the region. Most importantly, it will  
4 create new jobs and a preference will be  
5 given to the City of Los Angeles  
6 residents through a strong project labor  
7 agreement.

8 I would -- before I invite the  
9 departments up to answer some questions I  
10 would like to invite Phil Aarons up to  
11 say few words.

12 THE CHAIRMAN: Before we do that, if  
13 we could, we're going to go the  
14 applicant. I wanted you to open --

15 COUNCIL MEMBER O'FARRELL: Sure.

16 THE CHAIRMAN: -- and then set the  
17 tone. And we'll go ahead and go to the  
18 applicant for their ten minutes. I  
19 believe they don't want to utilize all of  
20 their ten minutes, and we'll turn it back  
21 over to you for the departments and  
22 calling up other members.

23 COUNCIL MEMBER O'FARRELL: Okay.

24 THE CHAIRMAN: All right. Please.  
25 Thank you. Yes. We'll open it up to you

1 as part of Jerry's ten minutes as well,  
2 if we could.

3 MR. AARONS: Yes, absolutely.

4 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay.

5 MR. AARONS: I'll be brief.

6 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

7 MR. AARONS: Good morning, council  
8 members. My name is Philip Aarons, and  
9 I'm a founding partner of Millennium  
10 Partners, with Argent Ventures, are the  
11 developers of Millennium Hollywood.

12 Thank you so much for the  
13 opportunity to discuss our project with  
14 you this morning.

15 We spent a long time looking for the  
16 right site to build our first development  
17 in Los Angeles. And after much time and  
18 consideration, we decided we wanted to be  
19 in Hollywood.

20 The reasons are many. But the most  
21 important considerations to us were that  
22 Hollywood is centrally located, easily  
23 accessible by mass transit, and home to  
24 an amazing history and equally promising  
25 future.



1 Capital Records, and the adjacent  
2 surface parking lots on both sides of  
3 Vine Street, are an ideal location to  
4 build the dynamic mix-use project that  
5 pays tribute to the past, and points the  
6 way to a new future.

7 We set out to design a pedestrian-  
8 friendly, transit-oriented development,  
9 with an emphasis on preservation, good  
10 jobs, and I'm so grateful for the union  
11 representatives who came out this  
12 morning. Encouraging both walkability  
13 and bank friendliness.

14 Millennium Hollywood, however, is  
15 first and foremost, a preservation  
16 project. And by preservation, I mean  
17 both the preservation --

18 THE CHAIRMAN: Again, if we could  
19 keep it down in the audience. I'm sorry.  
20 I would like everybody to be respectful  
21 as we were, and they were, on each of the  
22 side of the proponent and the opponents.  
23 And now it's the applicant's turn. Thank  
24 you.

25 MR. AARON: I mean, both the

1 preservation of the Capital Records  
2 tower, which absolutely is the  
3 centerpiece of the project, and the  
4 preservation of views of Capital Records,  
5 and the Hollywood size.

6 As the building's architect, Lou  
7 Naidorf has said, he always expected the  
8 property around the site to be developed,  
9 and is confident that Capital will be  
10 able to hold its own.

11 In enhancing the environment around  
12 Capital Records, we propose to add a  
13 complimentary mix of uses. A boutique  
14 hotel, residences, community serving  
15 retail space, restaurants, and new office  
16 space, so that more media companies can  
17 work in the entertainment capital of the  
18 world.

19 Equally as significant is our  
20 dynamic open space that will not just be  
21 a respite, for both residents, and the  
22 greater Hollywood community, but a link  
23 to all the other amazing open spaces to  
24 be created in Hollywood, including the  
25 wonderful Hollywood Central Park.

1           Thanks to an extensive input from  
2           the community, many of whom are here  
3           today, leading stakeholders, the city  
4           family, and decision makers like you. We  
5           think we have crafted an outstanding  
6           project, benefiting Hollywood, by  
7           providing a gateway that the eastern end  
8           of the boulevard has long deserved.

9           Many of our supporters, especially  
10          the neighborhood residents, value our  
11          community benefit package. The business  
12          and labor communities, the numerous  
13          economic benefits of Millennium  
14          Hollywood, which will bring to the  
15          immediate area and the city as a whole.  
16          The thousands of jobs it will create  
17          during construction, and once the project  
18          is up and running.

19          Millennium Partners has worked  
20          nearly twenty-five years to bring safe  
21          dynamic architecturally distinguished  
22          projects to urban neighborhoods across  
23          the country. Ranging from Boston, to San  
24          Francisco, to the upper West Side of  
25          Manhattan, and to the Georgetown

1 neighborhood of Washington DC. With each  
2 development, we have worked with local  
3 government and neighbors to formulate a  
4 unique design and mix of uses that  
5 responds to the characteristics of each  
6 city and each site.

7 In every case, we have the  
8 project -- we have retained control and  
9 ownership of the projects we start.  
10 Millennium retains to this day a  
11 significant financial interest in every  
12 urban mixed-use project we have developed  
13 since 1991.

14 We're excited that we have the same  
15 opportunity here in Hollywood, and have  
16 spent much of the last seven years  
17 becoming a part of the community. With a  
18 vote by you today in support of our  
19 project we are eager to take the next  
20 step and start work on Millennium  
21 Hollywood, which we anticipate could  
22 happen within the next year.

23 I'd like to take a moment to address  
24 some of the concerns that have been  
25 raised.

1 First and foremost, Millennium is  
2 committed to safe, sound, responsible  
3 development. It is not our interest to  
4 develop a project without addressing any  
5 and all seismic concerns. We couldn't,  
6 and we won't.

7 Secondly, we have worked to address  
8 traffic concerns, including those raised  
9 by Caltrans, and we believe we have.

10 Finally, we were asked to consider  
11 reducing the height of our proposed  
12 project and we did.

13 Hollywood is constantly changing.  
14 Development projects on the western edge  
15 of the community around Highland have  
16 helped make that section of the Boulevard  
17 a thriving place, that is a must-see  
18 destination. We want to do something  
19 equally exciting around the intersection  
20 of Hollywood and Vine, one of the most  
21 famous street corners in the world. Our  
22 primary focus is on building a place that  
23 delivers on the dream of Hollywood for  
24 its residents and working community.

25 Millennium Hollywood is that

1 project. It will be -- it is a  
2 foundation for the reestablishment of  
3 downtown Hollywood. It is a project that  
4 provides a significant economic stimulus  
5 for an area where economic revitalization  
6 has yet to take hold fully. It is a  
7 project that fully addresses its impacts.

8 Hollywood's best days are a head,  
9 and we look forward to helping making  
10 that happen with this catalytic project,  
11 that will not just be a place to live,  
12 stay and work, but a place to shop, eat  
13 and play, a place to enjoy, a place to  
14 call the heart of a community.

15 I thank you advance for your  
16 support, and the opportunity to be here.  
17 Thank you.

18 THE CHAIRMAN: All right, thank you.

19 Mr. Neuman, you've got four more  
20 minutes if you want to utilize those, or  
21 less.

22 MR. NEUMAN: Mr. Pro Tempore  
23 Englander, members of the council, my  
24 name is Jerry Neuman, representing  
25 Millennium Partners.

1 I would only like to address one  
2 single issue that was raised by Mr.  
3 Silverstein in his presentation. And  
4 that is the provision of additional  
5 information that we did to this body and  
6 to the city as of yesterday.

7 I want to be clear that we are well  
8 aware of the law in Marada (ph.) case, we  
9 are well aware of what the court has  
10 determined, and would never, every put  
11 you in jeopardy as to any lawsuit that  
12 has challenged you in any way.

13 What Mr. Silverstein has attempted  
14 to do, is cast a response to his multiple  
15 letters, nearly 600-pages of information  
16 that he has provided you, his attempt to  
17 cast that as new information or means of  
18 clarifying, or additional findings, all  
19 of which were found to be the wrong  
20 methodology by the court.

21 What we have done is we have  
22 utilized our efforts, and I'm sure Mr.  
23 Silverstein would not want to deny us  
24 that, to have a good faith effort at  
25 addressing his concerns and providing you

1 the information you needed that support  
2 the conclusion in the EIR, that address  
3 the issues, not in a new way, but in a  
4 way that utilizes documents that are  
5 already in your record, that shows you  
6 the highlights that allows you to see why  
7 the conclusions were reached that they  
8 were. Not to change your findings, not  
9 to add new findings, not to do any of the  
10 things that have been volatile of due  
11 process previously.

12 So let us be clear that is exactly  
13 what we're doing. The new information  
14 provided is not new information, it is  
15 supportive information for what you  
16 already have before you, and for the work  
17 that you and your departments have done.  
18 And I want to be clear about that. So we  
19 are not recasting the issue in any other  
20 manner.

21 Thank you very much for that  
22 attention.

23 THE CHAIRMAN: Great, thank you very  
24 much.

25 I'll turn it back over to Council



1 Member Mitchell O'Farrell.

2 COUNCIL MEMBER O'FARRELL: I just  
3 want the chamber to understand that I  
4 take any issues raised very seriously,  
5 especially in relation to public safety.

6 So having said that, I'd like to  
7 call up the departments to answer a few  
8 questions. I'd like to invite Building  
9 and Safety, if you can come forward,  
10 please. Transportation representatives.

11 MR. CHAN: Good morning. Building  
12 and Safety, Ray Chan.

13 MR. PREVOST: Good morning. Dana  
14 Prevost, Chief Grading Division.

15 COUNCIL MEMBER O'FARRELL: Thank  
16 you, gentlemen.

17 If you could, you just heard the  
18 discussion on the possible fault line.  
19 It's been said with great certainty that  
20 this project is on top of the fault line  
21 by the appellants. If you could address  
22 that and share how the city is addressing  
23 the concerns. And respond to the  
24 greatest extent that you can in relation  
25 to the State Geological Survey. It's

1           been raised that there is an  
2           investigation. If you could address  
3           that, that would be terrific.

4           MR. CHAN: Sure. First of all, we  
5           pass out a letter that we put together to  
6           council, related to this particular  
7           subject. And I'm going to ask our chief  
8           geologist, Dana Prevost, to talk a little  
9           bit about how this whole approval of the  
10          report happened, and how we have talked  
11          to the state geologists just yesterday  
12          afternoon, and what was his response.

13          So please, Mr. Prevost.

14          MR. PREVOST: Sure. I'll just start  
15          a little bit, first, with the review  
16          process that we've had to date.

17          Initially reports, soil and geologic  
18          reports, were submitted to us for the  
19          tentative tract, back in April of last  
20          year.

21          We reviewed those reports and issue  
22          a correction letter. In that letter we  
23          requested that they do additional  
24          geotechnical work as well as perform a  
25          fault investigation on the site.

1 I would just say this -- in the seat  
2 of LA, we've actually long recognized  
3 that the Hollywood fault, and that it's  
4 considered an active fault. So we've  
5 requested that investigation be done last  
6 year.

7 They subsequently -- the consultants  
8 for the project, they prepared -- did --  
9 performed a fault investigation and  
10 submitted that to us last year. Our  
11 grading division staff reviewed the  
12 report, and issued an approval letter in  
13 January of this year.

14 I'll just say subsequently to that,  
15 in June, I received a call from Dr. James  
16 Dolan, at USC, requesting if he could get  
17 a copy of that report, and we made that  
18 available to him. And he called me back  
19 a few days later and said he had some  
20 concerns with the report.

21 So we recognize those concerns, and  
22 we immediately contacted the developer's  
23 consultants, and said we'd like you to  
24 address these concerns.

25 At this point, we feel that the

1 approval for the tentative tract is still  
2 a valid approval. We've discussed with  
3 the consultants, they are going to  
4 perform some additional work to satisfy  
5 the concerns that have been raised. And  
6 we will be reviewing that in the future.

7 And I will just say that when we  
8 received those reports, as soon as we  
9 receive them, they are public  
10 information. And at that time anybody is  
11 welcome to get a copy of the report, and  
12 provide any comments they want to us,  
13 we'll certainly provide a copy to Dr.  
14 Dolan, and receive his input as part of  
15 our review process. So it will be a very  
16 open review process.

17 THE CHAIRMAN: Great.

18 MR. PREVOST: I'd like to make a  
19 couple of comments about the letter from  
20 Dr. Parrish, who supervises the  
21 California Geologic Survey.

22 I called Dr. Parrish yesterday  
23 morning, and so I would like to -- based  
24 on that conversation, just clarify a  
25 couple of things from the letter.

1           Actually, let me back up a moment,  
2           and just say. The role of the State  
3           Geologic Survey is they evaluate faults  
4           throughout the State of California. And  
5           it's their task under the Alquist Priolo  
6           Fault Studies Act to establish study  
7           zones around faults that they believe to  
8           be active. And that is the study that  
9           they will be performing here for the  
10          Hollywood fault. And we have -- I've  
11          been long talking to the state over the  
12          past several years about trying to zone  
13          this fault. So they -- their study is  
14          going to be only to determine the  
15          limits -- well, one, the active activity  
16          level of the fault, but pretty much  
17          throughout the profession, it's accepted  
18          that this meets the criteria of an active  
19          fault. That's the first criteria that  
20          they have to satisfy themselves with.

21                 And then, beyond that, the purpose  
22                 of the study is really to establish  
23                 boundaries for the zone. And the zone is  
24                 a study zone. So what that means is  
25                 after they've established the zone any

1 project that -- for a development of  
2 buildings for habitable use, within that  
3 zone requires a fault investigation. The  
4 same as the fault investigation that we  
5 have already required from Millennium.  
6 So I just want to make that clear, that  
7 we're treating -- we started last year  
8 treating this project as if it is already  
9 in a state study zone.

10 THE CHAIRMAN: Great. Thank you  
11 very much. Let's see if we have any  
12 other members from -- questions from  
13 other members, I don't believe that we  
14 do. If you've got any of that documented  
15 that you can submit for the record, as  
16 well, that would be great.

17 We've got two on the queue. Mr.  
18 Bonin, followed by Mr. Krekorian.

19 COUNCIL MEMBER BONIN: Thank you,  
20 Mr. President.

21 Question primarily for DOT, a couple  
22 of transportation-related questions. And  
23 if there's somebody from Caltrans here,  
24 it might also be helpful if they could  
25 come to the table.

1 First question strictly to DOT is  
2 regarding traffic mitigations. We do a  
3 lot of talk in Los Angeles about transit-  
4 oriented development. I'm wondering if  
5 you could detail for us the ways in which  
6 this project is transit serving,  
7 what's -- if we could have a shuttle bus.

8 THE CHAIRMAN: If we could have  
9 you -- I'm sorry, for one second. If you  
10 could actually just speak from the podium  
11 because we didn't have you down yet.  
12 We'll keep the staff for now at the table  
13 for additional follow-up. Thank you.

14 COUNCIL MEMBER BONIN: So, Tom, if  
15 you could speak to what's being done to  
16 facilitate alternative means of  
17 transportation relating to this project.

18 MR. CARADO: Good morning. My name  
19 is Tom Carado (ph.) with the LA DOT.

20 Let me just open by saying that DOT  
21 worked closely with the applicant, and  
22 with their traffic consultant, to guide  
23 the preparation of the traffic study, and  
24 to guide the preparation of the traffic  
25 mitigation program.

1           Now, given the amount of transit  
2           service provided on either party's site,  
3           there was already an inherent setting for  
4           the projects employees and tenants to  
5           utilize public transportation. So the  
6           mitigation program really focuses around  
7           a very aggressive trip reduction program,  
8           which includes things like alternative  
9           work schedules, and telecommuting, and  
10          things that we've heard of, but, also,  
11          providing amenities on site.

12          The applicant has agreed to improve  
13          the sidewalks to enhance access to the  
14          Caltransit stops and the Hollywood/Vine  
15          station.

16          They're also improving this traffic  
17          signal equipment at thirty-five  
18          intersections throughout the site. But,  
19          really, the focus of the mitigation  
20          program was to reduce vehicle trips  
21          through --

22          COUNCIL MEMBER BONIN: What about  
23          bikes and DASH shuttles?

24          MR. CARADO: I believe one of the  
25          items in the trip pedestrian program was



1 to provide a financial contribution to  
2 the city's bike nontrust fund, so that we  
3 could use that money to implement some of  
4 the bike improvements that are identified  
5 in the city's bike plan.

6 Also, the community benefits package  
7 that the applicant has agreed to includes  
8 mobility funds for either expanded DASH  
9 transit services in the area, or some  
10 other type of local circulator  
11 surrounding the project site.

12 COUNCIL MEMBER BONIN: Thank you.  
13 And I guess the question for both DOT and  
14 for Caltrans is Caltrans came to the  
15 table, as I understand it, fairly late in  
16 this process. So I'm wondering going  
17 forward how we can avoid that, and what  
18 sort of procedures we can put into place  
19 to establish a better working  
20 relationship with Caltrans so they can  
21 get fed into the process sooner.

22 MR. CARADO: Well, I think we are --  
23 we are very happy to report that we  
24 are -- have been working closely with  
25 them recently. We've had some very

1 productive meetings. And our goal is to  
2 coordinate better with them. And we're  
3 working on developing a consistent  
4 methodology for how we assess impacts,  
5 not just for projects in Hollywood, but  
6 for an entire city. And a methodology  
7 that works for both agencies.

8 Having said that, I believe, Aziz  
9 Alatar from Caltrans is here, we'll be  
10 working with him and his staff to address  
11 the concerns they have with our  
12 methodology, and then to help us better  
13 understand how they want us to measure  
14 the impacts on the freeway system.

15 THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Bonin, your time  
16 has expired, but if you want to continue  
17 to ask questions, we'll go ahead and turn  
18 it over to Mr. Krekorian, and we can come  
19 back to you if you push your bottom  
20 again.

21 COUNCIL MEMBER BONIN: Sure. If I  
22 could just say I'd be happy to meet after  
23 them meeting, or later, with Caltrans and  
24 DOT, to see what I can do to try to  
25 facilitate those partnerships better.

1 THE CHAIRMAN: Terrific. Thank you  
2 very much. Mr. Krekorian.

3 COUNCIL MEMBER KREKORIAN: Thank  
4 you.

5 First, to follow-up on Mr. Bonin's  
6 question. Caltrans' concerns were some  
7 of my concerns as well. Because my  
8 constituents commute on the 101, and so  
9 I'm concerned about ensuring that we have  
10 minimized that traffic impact.

11 Can we have Caltrans -- did you say  
12 there's a Caltrans representative here  
13 now.

14 COUNCIL MEMBER BONIN: Yes.

15 COUNCIL MEMBER KREKORIAN: Okay. If  
16 they could come forward now, I'd like to  
17 hear if -- to what degree the concerns  
18 that you had previously expressed have  
19 been addressed through discussions about  
20 mitigation measures, and whether you  
21 believe that the potential mitigation  
22 measures that are being discussed will  
23 address the concerns that Caltrans has  
24 previously had.

25 MR. ALATAR: good morning. Still

1 morning, I think. I'm Aziz Alatar, I'm  
2 with Caltrans, the Department of  
3 Transportation.

4 And what I can say to address the  
5 question, is that we have been working  
6 closely with the city and the developer  
7 and the consultant to address the  
8 concerns that we have regarding the  
9 impact to the Hollywood freeway.

10 We've had meetings as late as last  
11 Friday, they seem to be fruitful, but  
12 that's the extent that we've worked  
13 things out thus far.

14 COUNCIL MEMBER KREKORIAN: Okay.

15 So, in the event that -- what will  
16 be the next steps in this process of  
17 consideration of traffic mitigations as  
18 it impacts the freeway, as we move  
19 forward on this project?

20 MR. CARADO: I believe that the  
21 traffic study and the mitigation program  
22 addresses the impacts of the project.  
23 Beyond that an agreement between the  
24 developer and Caltrans, it would be  
25 voluntary on the developer's side. We

1 feel that the traffic study was conducted  
2 according to the LA CEQA guide and the LA  
3 DOT traffic study guidelines.

4 Having said that, I believe an  
5 agreement is being worked out between  
6 Caltrans and the developer. And I guess  
7 I'll leave it at that.

8 COUNCIL MEMBER KREKORIAN: Okay. My  
9 time's expired. I'm going to have  
10 seismic questions, too, but I'll come  
11 back to that.

12 THE CHAIRMAN: Well, there's no  
13 other speakers on the queue, so if you  
14 want to go ahead and ask your questions.

15 COUNCIL MEMBER KREKORIAN: Okay. I  
16 just want to make sure I understand this.

17 First, let me just say in response  
18 to -- well, a few of the speakers that  
19 ask that we give consideration to this in  
20 great detail. I have to say for the  
21 record, that when, you know, hundreds of  
22 pages of argument and information are  
23 dropped on our desk on the morning that  
24 this is supposed to be ready for hearing,  
25 it's just humanly impossible to be able

1 to consider and digest this. And I  
2 note -- before you clap, don't clap yet,  
3 because I'm going to say it's  
4 inexcusable. This project has been going  
5 on, and under consideration, for this  
6 many years. There's time to have press  
7 conferences days before this hearing.  
8 There's time to, you know, provide this  
9 information to news outlets. But there  
10 isn't time to provide it to the council  
11 members who are going to decide this  
12 matter, before the morning of the  
13 hearing. It's inexcusable.

14 And I would say, Mr. City Attorney,  
15 I'd like to ask that any of this  
16 information that has been provided to us  
17 this morning needs to be recognized as  
18 being incapable of being considered as  
19 part of the record on this hearing.

20 I just feel that it should be stated  
21 for the record, that dropping things on  
22 the council at the last minute, I mean,  
23 literally, the very last minute and then  
24 expecting that to be considered as part  
25 of the public record in a fair hearing

1 matter, is just -- is, I think,  
2 unreasonable to expect the council  
3 members to be able to evaluate this.

4 So I think that these matters that  
5 have been submitted to us today, this  
6 morning, should be excluded from the  
7 record, as far as I'm concerned.

8 Now, on those geologic points, there  
9 is -- there has been studies in the  
10 record, the assumption of the city in  
11 this process has been that the this  
12 project is within an earthquake zone,  
13 correct?

14 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes.

15 COUNCIL MEMBER KREKORIAN: So the  
16 remaining critical issue that the state  
17 geologist wants to consider is the exact  
18 location of this fault, whether it  
19 proceeds onto the footprint of the  
20 project, essentially, is that right?

21 MR. CARADO: If I may, the state  
22 geologist, what they're really  
23 determining is the boundaries of the zone  
24 for future development that may occur,  
25 and to see which properties in the area

1 are within --

2 COUNCIL MEMBER KREKORIAN: So at  
3 that point it's a moot point, because  
4 you're already assuming it to be within  
5 the zone. So whatever the boundaries  
6 are, you're already assuming this project  
7 is within the zone, correct?

8 MR. CARADO: Yes, correct.

9 COUNCIL MEMBER KREKORIAN: Okay. So  
10 then the next issue on seismic safety is  
11 there has -- we're dealing with  
12 entitlements now, at some point there's  
13 going to be a building. And that  
14 building is going to have to be according  
15 to an architect's plans. And those plans  
16 are going to have to be reviewed, and you  
17 have an opportunity at that point to  
18 determine, based on the state geologist's  
19 additional information, and whatever  
20 other information that's going to be  
21 coming within the next six months, you'll  
22 have the opportunity to evaluate that,  
23 and evaluate the architectural integrity  
24 of these plans based on that information,  
25 before a building permit is issued, is



1 that correct?

2 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes.

3 COUNCIL MEMBER KREKORIAN: Okay.

4 And that is what the state law requires,  
5 is it not, that before a building permit  
6 is issued --

7 THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Krekorian, your  
8 time is --

9 COUNCIL MEMBER KREKORIAN: -- that  
10 those things be taken into account.

11 THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Krekorian, you  
12 time --

13 COUNCIL MEMBER KREKORIAN: Yes.

14 THE CHAIRMAN: -- is up, so if you  
15 can just wrap it up.

16 COUNCIL MEMBER KREKORIAN: Okay.

17 That's all I have, thank you.

18 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you.  
19 Mitchell O'Farrell to close. Thank you.

20 COUNCIL MEMBER O'FARRELL: Wanted to  
21 say a few words, and then I'm going to  
22 actually ask Mr. Chair, if I could invite  
23 Jerry Neuman of the project team to talk  
24 about Caltrans a little bit.

25 But before I do that, I just want to

1 let you know, let my colleagues know,  
2 that I've been speaking directly with  
3 Caltrans up until yesterday afternoon, a  
4 Mr. Miles, the Area 7 director. And  
5 there is no opposition to this project  
6 from Caltrans. And I'm committed, and  
7 Mr. Miles knows this, and I would like my  
8 colleagues to know this as well, I'm also  
9 committed to creating a template moving  
10 forward, so that any last-minute  
11 misunderstandings, and clarifications,  
12 with regard to EIRs be addressed in  
13 advance of any upcoming project.

14 This is a project that I inherited,  
15 quite frankly, and I've been working  
16 feverishly on it for three weeks, but we  
17 need to move forward.

18 So having said that I would love to  
19 have Mr. Jerry Neuman, if I may, for one  
20 minute.

21 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Before you  
22 speak, Mr. Price, did you have something  
23 to say to add to this as well?

24 MR. PRICE: Thank you, Mr. Chair,  
25 members.

1           And I appreciate the comments made  
2           by both sides of this matter, certainly  
3           is an important issue.

4           In a former life as state senator I  
5           represented the area, where the  
6           Millennium project is located, and so I  
7           am familiar with the area, the issues and  
8           the concerns that have been raised by the  
9           residents.

10          I think among the places in LA where  
11          we can support height in city growth is  
12          downtown and in Hollywood. This project,  
13          I think, represents the kind of transit-  
14          oriented development that LA needs to  
15          make the -- makes LA the 21st Century  
16          global economy.

17          I think the economy's going to be --  
18          the community's going to benefit from  
19          this project by the concessions agreed to  
20          by the developer to mitigate impacts from  
21          the project. Councilman O'Farrell  
22          supports this project, he knows I think  
23          what's best for the community. He's been  
24          working on the project for six years as  
25          chief of staff, and now, as a councilman.

1 I respect his judgment, and I am  
2 supportive of the project.

3 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Great,  
4 thank you very much.

5 Mr. O'Farrell, I believe, is ready  
6 to close. Thank you.

7 COUNCIL MEMBER O'FARRELL: I'm going  
8 to go ahead and close this, with all due  
9 respect, Jerry, there.

10 And I just want to say in closing  
11 the Millennium project is well designed,  
12 respects the community concerns, and as a  
13 result they've made significant changes,  
14 namely, the height reduction of the two  
15 towers from the original fifty-five and  
16 forty-five story iteration, to thirty-  
17 nine and thirty-five stories, while  
18 preserving a twenty-two percent open  
19 space dedication, which was of great  
20 importance to my predecessor and myself.

21 The open space will be used to  
22 enhance the pedestrian experience through  
23 public/transit linkages and through block  
24 connections for the project throughout  
25 the area.

1           Additionally, it should be  
2           highlighted, that although, the project  
3           is located in the Hollywood signage  
4           supplemental use district, it is  
5           committed to no offsite signage as a  
6           direct result of community input.

7           Billboards and digital displays will  
8           not be part of this project, they will  
9           not be entitled for this project.

10          Today I introduced, in a mini-  
11          motion, to codify some of the community  
12          benefits that my staff and I have been  
13          working on for the last few weeks.

14          Associated with the project,  
15          including seed funding for area parks. A  
16          4.8 million dollar allocation to develop  
17          new affordable housing in the immediate  
18          area, and funding for city planning to  
19          develop the central Hollywood design  
20          overlay zone, which I have long felt  
21          needed to come into place since the  
22          adoption of the community plan update.

23          That will help us establish strong  
24          controls for development going forward on  
25          Hollywood Boulevard, and the rest of

1 Hollywood.

2 The project includes design  
3 regulations that will preserve views of  
4 the iconic landmarks, including the  
5 Capital Records building, and the  
6 Hollywood Hills.

7 The historic Capital Records and  
8 Gogerty Buildings, will be preserved  
9 following the Secretary of Interior  
10 standards, and be complemented with  
11 public plazas, parkways, and community  
12 arts programming. The design regulations  
13 establish a ground floor space, and  
14 provide for pedestrian friendly  
15 experience through setback and minimum  
16 separation requirements between buildings  
17 in order to reduce massing its street  
18 level, and limit visual crowding of the  
19 historic buildings.

20 The Millennium project will preserve  
21 existing view corridors from certain key  
22 vantage points to the Hollywood Hills.  
23 It's a project that embraces alternative  
24 modes of transportation, as has been  
25 discussed.

1           The Millennium project is a game-  
2           changer, there's no doubt about that.  
3           It's a game-changer for the Hollywood  
4           area, and it's consistent with a long-  
5           range vision for Hollywood. It will  
6           bolster the local economy through job  
7           creation, both temporary, up to 3,000  
8           construction jobs, and permanent, around  
9           1500 permanent jobs, with new tax revenue  
10          critical to new funds, to help the  
11          general fund, which will increase the  
12          standard delivery of services that we all  
13          want to see.

14           Colleagues, I ask for your yes vote.

15           THE CHAIRMAN: Great, thank you very  
16          much.

17           See no members on the queue, we're  
18          going to go ahead -- we're going take  
19          both items separately.

20           Mr. City Attorney first.

21           CITY ATTORNEY: And I just wanted to  
22          clarify, following up on Mr. Krekorian's  
23          statement regarding the documents.

24           Your reference was not in regarding  
25          the city documents that were submitted?

1 COUNCIL MEMBER KREKORIAN: No. The  
2 documents that were submitted by the  
3 parties.

4 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, Mr. Clerk, that  
5 puts us -- we'll go ahead and vote on the  
6 items separately.

7 MALE SPEAKER: First would be item  
8 21 as amended, by motion  
9 O'Farrell/Koretz.

10 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, we'll go ahead  
11 an open the roll. Close the roll.  
12 Tabulate the vote.

13 FEMALE SPEAKER: Thirteen ayes.

14 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, the next item.

15 MALE SPEAKER: That's item 22, sir.

16 THE CHAIRMAN: Item 22, we'll go  
17 ahead an open the roll. Close the roll,  
18 and tabulate the vote.

19 FEMALE SPEAKER: Thirteen ayes.

20 THE CHAIRMAN: All right, thank you.  
21 Both of those items passed.

22 Mr. O'Farrell.

23 COUNCIL MEMBER O'FARRELL: 21 and  
24 22, go forthwith.

25 THE CHAIRMAN: Both items will go



1                   forthwith without objection.

2                                 (items 21 and 22 concluded)

3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

C E R T I F I C A T I O N

I, Esther Accardi, hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct transcription, to the best of my ability, of the sound recorded proceedings submitted for transcription.

I further certify that I am not employed by nor related to any party to this action.

In witness whereof, I hereby sign this date:  
May 27, 2014.

-----  
Esther Accardi (CET\*\*D 485)  
AAERT Certified Electronic Transcriber