

From: Tract 7260 Board

Sent: Thursday, July 14, 2005 1:22 PM

Subject: Santa Monica Project

Please find attached the association's list of concerns relative to the Santa Monica Project.

Please contact me if you have trouble opening the attached document or if you have any questions.

Tract 7260

From: TDurrell
Sent: Friday, July 15, 2005 4:32 PM
To: Tract 7260 Board
Subject: Re: Santa Monica Project

Good Afternoon Mike,

The City of Los Angeles, Department of Public Works—Santa Monica Boulevard Transit Parkway Project Team is in receipt of your letter sent by email July 14, representing the homeowner's coalition. We have carefully reviewed the document and have forwarded it to the Department of Public Works Bureau of Street Services; the City Attorney's Office, and the Department of Transportation for responses to many of the concerns. The Santa Monica Boulevard Project Team will address the issues within our purview.

We thank you for bringing your concerns to our attention. Due to the detailed nature of the letter, it will take time to research and respond to each issue. Please know that this matter has our full attention and we hope to mutually resolve these matters.

Thank you.

Tonya E. Durrell
The "Boulevard Project"
Community and Media Relations
(310) 785-2300 ext. 201

From: Tract 7260 Board
Sent: Sunday, July 17, 2005 9:39 PM
To: 'TDurrel'
Subject: RE: Santa Monica Project

Tonya,

With all due respect, the reason the homeowners have had to organize and become even more active is precisely because there is no more time to research and then respond. As you know, we have been discussing these issues for months and months. If project staff and the city had been taking our concerns seriously, the analysis should already have been done. The problem is that as we talk, the project is being built in a fashion that is inconsistent with the EIR and, more importantly, in a fashion that will have a serious detrimental impact on the community.

We raise four examples to make our point.

1. Large freeway-style signs

We raised this issue at a recent meeting, and were told that state law mandated certain sizes. Only after asking pointed questions did we learn that the signs that are being proposed are far larger than the law mandates.

2. CMS

We spent twenty minutes discussing our concerns with CMS. DOT representatives listened and nodded when appropriate. I then asked a point-blank question: Are the CMS negotiable. The answer was no, they are not. Had I not asked that point blank question, we would have left the meeting thinking that DOT was going to take our concerns into consideration. We would have been mistaken.

3. North-eastern Frontage Road Width

Members of CWW had inquired about the width of the opening and had been told it was approximately 14.7 feet. They were told this numerous times, including one time in your office where the width was measured on a CAD system. The last time they were told the width was 14.7 feet was the day before the street was poured with a width of 17 feet. Subsequently, they were told that 17' is consistent with the plans.

4. Tract 7260 Mitigations on Benecia and Fox Hills

7260 was told that it would take two weeks to come up with a response for our request for mitigations. Three weeks later I asked where the response was. A few days later, the response from DOT was....speed bumps. When I pointed out that Benecia had no where else for speed bumps to go, that Mississippi was too steep for speed bumps, and that Fox Hills had also been maxed out on speed bumps, I was told "I guess speed bumps won't work then." That was three weeks of research. Note that no mitigation has yet to occur.

The above examples highlight several sources of extreme frustration and concern felt by the homeowners:

- When we have held meetings and received information from the city, that information has often been wrong. Meaningful discussions cannot be held when inaccurate information is intentionally or unintentionally provided.
- In several cases we have been led to believe that our concerns were being considered and that change was forthcoming when there was no intention to make a change.
- When we have been asked to wait for a response, that response has often been late, non-responsive, irrelevant or does not address the initial problem raised. In many cases, project staff used the delay as an excuse not to do anything as "the next phase was now just a few weeks away."

In summary, delay is not something we are prepared to accept. We suggest that if you need time to study our document that you halt construction on the relevant sections while you do so. Only this will prevent more damage from being done.