

PROPOSITION K - L.A. FOR KIDS PROGRAM

STUDIO CITY GYM PROJECT

LVNOC Meeting No. 2

Local Volunteer Neighborhood Oversight Committee

Thursday, December 17, 2015

3:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m.

Studio City Recreation Center

(Beeman Park)

12621 Rye Street, Studio City, CA 91604

**Join us and participate
in developing the
design of the new gym**

City of Los Angeles

Council District #2 - Paul Krekorian, Council Member

cd2.lacity.org

Department of Recreation and Parks



Department of Public Works/Bureau of Engineering
Project Managers

PROPOSITION K - L.A. FOR KIDS PROGRAM
STUDIO CITY GYM PROJECT
 Project: S12 WO #E170267D

SIGN-IN SHEET

Meeting: LVNOC Meeting No. 2

DATE/TIME/LOCATION: December 17, 2015 at 3:00 pm at Beeman Park

| # | NAME | ADDRESS | ORGANIZATION | PHONE | EMAIL |
|---|----------------|--|-------------------|----------------|--|
| 1 | Jon Galatzan | 4544 Beeman St., Studio City, CA. 91604 | LVNOC | (818) 308-7658 | jsgalatzan@yahoo.com |
| 2 | Beth Dymond | 11615 Canton Place, Studio City, CA 91604 | LVNOC | (818) 980-7645 | emdymond45@gmail.com |
| 3 | Lisa Karadjian | 11340 Hendley Drive, Studio City, CA 91604 | LVNOC | (310) 283-2736 | lkaradjian@studiocitync.org |
| 4 | Paul Matloff | 12656 Rye Street, Studio City, CA 91604 | LVNOC | (818) 754-1299 | paulmatloff@sbcglobal.net |
| 5 | Bruce Thomas | 12327 Miranda Street, Valley Village, CA 91607 | PAB/LVNOC | (818) 421-7100 | bdthomas32@gmail.com |
| | Teresa May | 4606 Varna Ave., Studio City, CA 91604 | Studio City Co-Op | (818) 426-7709 | tnorland@gmail.com |
| | Jessica Snow | 1311 N. Fredrick St., Burbank, CA. | Studio City Co-Op | (818) 395-4007 | jess1311@sbcglobal.net |
| | Patryce Harris | 660 E. Costello Ave., Studio City, CA 91604 | Studio City Co-Op | (818) 288-4559 | patryceharris@gmail.com |
| | Mark C Reis | 15506 Moorpark St, #118, Studio City, CA 91604 | | (646) 320-2170 | markcreis@yahoo.com |
| | Jan Sobel | 1930 Sprucewood Lane, Los Angeles, CA 90077 | SCRA | (818) 970-9193 | jansobel7@gmail.com |
| | DJ Jenkins | 12340 Moorpark St., Studio City, CA 91604 | PAB/ Church | (818) 468-6692 | jenkins.dj@gmail.com |
| | Julie Rolland | 12632 Rye Street, Studio City, CA. 91604 | PAB | (818)769-0103 | drthenots@gmail.com |
| | Linda Matloff | 12656 Rye Street, Studio City, CA 91604 | | (818) 985-3107 | ldmatloff@yahoo.com |
| | Eric Preven | 3758 Reklar Drive, Studio City, CA 91604 | | (818) 762-7719 | esp3800@aol.com |
| | Ron Meyer | 12244 La Maida Street, Valley Village, CA | | (818) 506-7530 | ron@ronmeyer.info |

Department of Public Works/Bureau of Engineering
 Recreational and Cultural Facilities Division

| | | | | |
|---------------------|--|----------------|----------------|--|
| Abbie Phillips | 12706 Milbank St, Studio City, CA 91604 | | (818) 985-9246 | allanabbie@gmail.com |
| Rebecca Abano | | (BOE – staff) | (213) 847-4711 | rebecca.abano@lacity.org |
| Neil Drucker | | (BOE – staff) | (213) 847-4708 | neil.drucker@lacity.org |
| Melissa Lam | | (BOE – staff) | (213) 485-4863 | melissa.lam@lacity.org |
| Zohra Akhter | | (BOE – staff) | (213) 485-4789 | zohra.akhter@lacity.org |
| Courtney Hamilton | | (CD 2 – staff) | | courtney.hamilton@lacity.org |
| Brian Yamasaki | | (RAP – staff) | (818) 766-8445 | brian.yamasaki@lacity.org |
| Charles Singer | | (RAP – staff) | (818) 756-8060 | charles.singer@lacity.org |
| Julie Monroy | | (RAP – staff) | (818) 769-4415 | julie.monroy@lacity.org |
| Adam Monick | | (RAP – staff) | (818) 769-4415 | adam.monick@lacity.org |
| Veronica Buenrostro | | (BOE – staff) | (213) 847-4779 | veronica.buenrostro@lacity.org |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

PROPOSITION K - L.A. FOR KIDS PROGRAM
STUDIO CITY GYM PROJECT
Project: S12 WO #E170267D

LVNOC Meeting No. 2
Local Volunteer Neighborhood Oversight Committee (LVNOC)
Studio City Recreation Center (Beeman Park)
12621 Rye St., Studio City, CA 91604
Thursday, December 17, 2015
3:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m.

Committee Members:

Bruce Thomas
Paul Matloff
Lisa Karadijian
John Galatzan
Maria Casale-Hanulik
Nick Estorga
Beth Dymond

AGENDA

- | | |
|---|--------|
| 1. Welcome and Introduction | 5 min |
| ♦ Council District #2 | |
| ♦ City Staff (RAP & BOE) | |
| ♦ LVNOC Members | |
| 2. Recap of LVNOC Meeting #1 | 5 min |
| ♦ LVNOC #1 Meeting Minutes – ACTION ITEM | |
| 3. Project Updates | 15 min |
| ♦ Prop K Scope of Work: | |
| <i>“Construct Modern Gym, Community Center, Landscaping and Irrigation”</i> | |
| ♦ Conceptual Plan | |
| 4. LVNOC & Community Discussion and Related Action | 30 min |
| ♦ Feedback from LVNOC | |
| ♦ Public Comments | |
| ♦ LVNOC direction on project – ACTION ITEM | |
| 5. Next Steps | 5 min |

STUDIO CITY GYMNASIUM PROJECT (W.O. #E170267D)
LOCAL VOLUNTEER NEIGHBORHOOD OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE (LVNOC)
Meeting Minutes from LVNOC Meeting #2
December 17, 2015

LVNOC Committee Members Present:

*Paul Matloff, Chair; Beth Dymond; Bruce Thomas; Lisa Karadjian; John Galatza.
Maria Casale-Hanulik and Nick Estorga were absent.*

City Staff:

*Rebecca Abano, BOE; Neil Drucker, BOE; Zohra Akhter, BOE; Willis Yip, BOE; Robert Lomelin, BOE;
Melissa Lam, BOE; Charles Singer, RAP; Courtney Hamilton, CD2; Brian Yamasaki, RAP; Adam Monick,
RAP, Veronica Buenrostro, BOE.*

1. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTION

Rebecca Abano, Project Manager, Bureau of Engineering (BOE), introduced herself and introduced BOE and Department of Recreation and Parks (RAP) staff and asked LVNOC members to introduce themselves.

2. RECAP OF LVNOC MEETING #1

Ms. Abano briefly explained that at the First LVNOC Meeting, diagrams of three possible locations of the new gym at the park were presented. The LVNOC committee and the community commented on the three different schemes and selected the first of the three schemes with a slight revision. Copies of the previous LVNOC meeting minutes were made available for sharing if community members wished to read.

LVNOC ACTION ITEM: Approval of the LVNOC #1 Meeting Minutes.

Motion was introduced by Lisa Karadjian to approve the meeting minutes of the previous LVNOC Meeting. Motion was seconded by Paul Matloff. All LVNOC members voted in favor of approval without changes or objections. The minutes were unanimously approved.

3. PROJECT UPDATES

Robert Lomelin, BOE Architectural Division; Zohra Akhter and Melissa Lam also from BOE Architectural Division; presented the progress on the design of the project. Mr. Lomelin and Ms. Akhter stated that after the first LVNOC meeting, the design team took into consideration the LVNOC's comments and questions about the trees, landscaping, building location, program spaces, parking spaces, and various other concerns. The design team met with various RAP staff including an Arborist, Council Office staff among others to address the questions and concerns raised at the previous meeting.

Two alternative schematic plans (based on the previously approved design scheme from the first LVNOC meeting), were presented to the LVNOC. These plans show the proposed new construction and parking areas as well as other changes to landscaping, trees, etc. BOE staff said that after meeting with the Arborist, they had to make changes to the schematic design because there were some protected trees that could not be removed and the building needed to be placed a minimum distance away from those trees. The building orientation, wind conditions (wind study conducted), environmental impact and views of the building were also considered and incorporated in the designs. BOE staff also stated that they took into consideration the LVNOCs comments regarding

the program spaces and rooms inside the proposed new building. BOE staff then presented two different alternatives to the previously approved schematic design, which also addressed RAP's programmed use of the facility.

Alternate #1 – Includes 45 parking spaces (existing parking is 27 spaces), a recreation building with a high-school regulation size basketball court, three community rooms, one director's office, one RAP office, a small storage room for RAP office (aka. gold room), a general storage room, a maintenance storage room, a community room storage, a warm up kitchen, Custodial, Electrical and Communications rooms. The total building area is 12,000 sq. ft.

Courtney Hamilton from CD 2 (CD 2 staff), noted that two of the community rooms would have movable walls to allow the rooms to be combined into one space for flexibility of use. These will allow the Co-Op to use the space and it would meet their licensing requirements for 20 children in that space. The Co-Op would then have the opportunity to work with RAP to create a new joint-use agreement.

BOE staff further explained the Alternate #1 plan, stating the new building design consists of two areas with a covered breezeway area to help maximize the natural ventilation (from wind study). The larger area is the gymnasium and the smaller area consists of the community rooms and restrooms. The advantages of this plan are as follows:

- The building is set further into the park compared to the existing building. This setback allows for visual and noise buffer zone between the residents and the gym. The trees and landscaping in the setback area will provide screening.
- The existing Co-Op boundary stays as is.
- The new building location preserves several of the existing large trees. The building layout is set around existing trees and creates a natural courtyard entrance.
- Parking area remains in the same general location but the amount of parking spaces is increased from 27 to 45 parking spaces as requested by the community.
- The picnic area is moved closer to the existing Baseball Fields and has better access and views of the fields.
- Building entrances are accessible and allow for visual security.
- Director's Office is in a central location and has direct view of children's play area, baseball fields, inside the gymnasium and community rooms.
- Open and flexible community room layout. Design allows each room to be separated depending on use or combined into one large space.
- Kitchenette is accessible to the community room. This enables certain program activities such as kid's cooking classes or Pre-School use.
- Restrooms are centrally located and provide ease of access from within the building as well as from outdoor sports fields.

- Storage spaces are provided to accommodate the park's needs. This removes the unsightly bins and trailers.

The primary disadvantage to Alternate #1 is that the existing building will need to be demolished prior to starting construction of the new building. This means a temporary building or trailer will be used to house the park's office. Also, during construction, the picnic area will be removed as well as some of the indoor recreational programs will be suspended.

Alternate #2 – Includes the same spaces and building square footage as Alternate #1 except this plan only has 41 parking spaces (existing parking is 27 spaces). The building orientation, office locations, and building entrances are arranged differently from Alternate #1. Advantages of Alternate #2 include:

- Similar to Alternate #1, the new building is setback into the park to create visual and noise barrier between the gym and the residents.
- The existing Co-Op boundary stays as is.
- Existing Building may remain until new building construction is complete. No temporary office or trailer will be needed.
- Outdoor basketball court area and exercise area remain as is.
- The community rooms and restrooms are located closer to the Co-Op preschool and parking area.
- The picnic area is relocated closer to the children's play area.
- The parking area expansion would be minimized by restriping existing parking area and adding spaces. The number of parking spaces is increased from 27 to 41.
- Building entrances are accessible and allow for visual security.
- Open and flexible community room layout. Design allows each room to be separated depending on use or combined into one large space.
- Kitchenette is accessible to the community room. This enables certain program activities such as kid's cooking classes or Pre-School use.
- Storage spaces are provided to accommodate the park's needs. This removes the unsightly bins and trailers.

There are several disadvantages to Alternate #2 compared to Alternate #1. Cost is the primary disadvantage. In order to keep the existing building operational during construction of the new building, the existing building foundation would require underpinning which is much more costly compared to demolishing and moving RAP offices into a trailer. This provides a longer construction period. Also, having an active Recreation Center very near a construction site is high safety risk for young children. Another disadvantage is the building access and restrooms are located farther away from the children's play area and the picnic area.

4. LVNOC & COMMUNITY DISCUSSION AND RELATED ACTION

LVNOC Comments and Questions

Question: How many parking spaces?

Answer: CD 2 staff stated that currently there are only 27 parking spaces. Alternate #1 allows for 45 parking spaces, and Alternate #2 only allows for 41 spaces by providing extra bike parking. This new building construction requires that new additional parking be provided. The City is required to have more parking regardless of which design scheme is developed.

Question: What is the height elevation of the building?

Answer: Mr. Lomelin (BOE) said the community rooms would be about 16-18 feet. The Gymnasium building would be no more than 35 feet. CD 2 staff added that hopefully by the time of the next LVNOC meeting, a 3-D model of the design will be available so the LVNOC members have a better idea visually of what the buildings will look like in the park.

Question: Why did the design move the location/orientation of building?

Answer: Mr. Lomelin (BOE) stated that due to the parking variances, protected tree locations, the building had to be moved east, and placed in a location away from the trees root system, therefore, the building locations and orientations changed.

Question: In Alternate #1, the Co-Op is in the same place, does that pose a problem with the children when they want to walk across to use the bathrooms once the new building is built?

Answer: CD2 staff said there has been lots of communication regarding this subject. There will be parents available to take the children to the community rooms that the Co-Op will be using. In that smaller building where the community rooms will be located, the building design requires that bathrooms be incorporated in design. Therefore, since that is the building to be used by the Co-Op and the children will be in there, they (the children) will in essence, have their own bathrooms.

Question: What kind of time line is it from start to finish (from design to end of construction)?

Answer: CD 2 staff stated that it's too early to say since a more solid design is needed before the City can give estimates. All the funding needs to be secured, the project has to go through bid process, a contractor selected, etc. It's too soon to tell at this time.

Question: Why is there a covered breezeway between the connected buildings?

Answer: Ms. Akhter (BOE) stated that in Alternate #1, the design team wanted to emphasize the courtyard and a connection between the courtyard and the field. It will be a covered breezeway, so parents, coaches, players after a game can gather in that area.

Question: How about adding other amenities to the park, like improved lighting around the walking/running track, water fountains, additional staff in the evenings, security lighting and or cameras?

Answer: CD 2 staff stated that those issues can be discussed separately from this project, since Proposition K (Prop K) can only pay for this specific project and not for those amenities. Those amenities will have to come from other funding sources. However, the new modern building will have

more modern infrastructure which will leave the recreation center and the park in better position to add those amenities such as security cameras and lighting at a later date once funding is identified.

Question: How will the park be kept open during the time of construction?

Answer: CD 2 staff replied that the outdoor basketball court will have trailers for RAP to use as offices and possibly the trailers may have small programming area. The current parking lot will be the contractor's staging area. The baseball fields and tennis courts will be unaffected.

Question: Is landscaping part of the budget?

Answer: Mr. Drucker (BOE) said yes, Prop K funds are tied to the building and landscape.

Question: Under both schemes, 11 trees are impacted. Will those trees be replaced?

Answer: Ms. Akhter (BOE) said those 11 trees will be replaced and the park will gain more trees. CD 2 staff noted that if the LVNOC looked at both schematic drawings, all the clear tree symbols are existing trees which are staying and the shaded in tree symbols are new trees that will be planted. In Alternate #1, 34 new trees will be planted and in Alternate #2, 29 new trees will be planted.

Question: Is there a stage area, because I don't see a stage in either design?

Answer: Mr. Drucker (BOE) informed the LVNOC that Prop K cannot pay for stages, which is why it is not in either plan. The State Landscaping and Lighting Act (Prop K falls under this law), does not allow the construction of indoor stages with Prop K funding. That would require another funding source. Furthermore, a stage requires significant additional parking and much more space to the building. A stage area would make the space technically considered an assembly space requiring a minimum of approximately 150 parking spaces based on similarly sized spaces. Therefore, if 45 parking spaces seem like a lot, a stage would at minimum triple that parking requirement, reducing the green space significantly.

Question: Other than the trees you mentioned, what else will be in the space that the current building occupies?

Answer: Ms. Lam (BOE) said that trees and a plaza area, handicapped access/path of travel from parking lot to the park will be in that space. That space will be an accessible walkway with trees.

Question: Will the new upgrades cost more to maintain the building?

Answer: Mr. Singer (RAP) said that it will not cost RAP more to maintain.

Question: Will we be getting additional grant funds to offset other costs or supplement funds since the new building is going to be a 'green building'?

Answer: CD staff stated that yes, various city staff is looking into additional funding sources to supplement Quimby and Prop K funds, to help offset and supplement costs.

Community Comments and Questions

Question: These are very nice design schemes. Who drew up the plans? Was it an architectural firm?

Answer: Ms. Abano (BOE) said that the designs are being done in house by the Bureau of Engineering Architectural Division staff that is in attendance at the meeting right now.

Question: Looking at Alternate #2, in the front space of the park (on Rye Street, where current building is), Am I right in understanding that from the restrooms to the path, there will now be a building there and we will lose approx. 10,000 sq. ft. of park space, losing many beautiful trees?

Answer: Ms. Akhter (BOE) said that in Alternate #2, there will be a loss of some trees and park space through part of the path; however, that space will be gained back on the other side of the building. BOE staff also pointed out that the large protected trees will not be affected since these trees will not be removed.

Question: Why is there a proposed zoning change that is doubling the size of the building and doubling the parking? It's always weird when you are doubling the size of the building and parking and making a zoning change to make that permissible.

Answer: BOE and CD 2 staff stated that there is no zoning change, nor was there a request to the Planning and Zoning Commissions to make a zoning change to double the parking. The City is asking for a parking variance (variance is to reduce parking requirements).

Question: How can you request a parking variance to get twice the amount of parking?

Answer: Mr. Drucker (BOE) stated that the current building as it is, does not meet the current parking code requirements. The old building when it was built had a grandfathered parking variance to allow for such few parking spaces. He noted that even if the new building being built was built exactly the same size as the current existing building, the City could not get a parking variance for less than 45-50 spaces. This current building is not legally a gymnasium. Currently, this building's usage is listed as a multi-purpose room. The ballot measure states the project is to "Construct Modern Gym, Community Center, landscaping and Irrigation." As the structure is now, it does not fit the Department of Building and Safety's definition of a Modern Gymnasium. Parking requirements are different depending on usage of the facility. The parking requirements for a multi-purpose room are very different from the parking requirements of a gymnasium.

Question: Will this require more maintenance personnel to staff a larger building, because it seems like larger facilities (like larger high schools); need more people to come in and clean?

Answer: Mr. Singer (RAP) repeated that it does not require any more staff, but if it did, RAP would put in budget requests for new and expanded facilities which are included with the General Fund money any time RAP builds a new facility. It is the same operation needs with the programming, and if it does require more, there are part time staff to help. BOE staff added that Proposition K Maintenance funds will also be allocated to help with some of the maintenance costs of the facility after it has been built.

Question: Is there any way Prop K funds can be used towards the fields?

Answer: Mr. Drucker (BOE), No. It would have to be a brand new project. Prop K funds can only be used on the specified project as outlined in the Ballot Measure. If the community wants to get Prop K funds for the field, the Department (RAP) would have to apply for competitive Prop K funds for the field, and the next Prop K cycle application period opens in 1 ½ years.

Question: What will be in place of the existing facility?

Answer: CD 2 staff pointed to Alternate #1 and stated there would be a walk way, a plaza area, new trees, open park space. The majority will be lawn space. The City will add more trees and green space.

Question: Will it be safe with just trees and a walkway? At present it is very dark, poor lighting & unsafe.

Answer: CD 2 staff said it will be a safer and a larger area will be ADA Compliant. That area will have modern lighting and be a more open area. Currently, if there is an issue with the lights not working properly. We need to address that issue by notifying RAP staff so they can fix the lighting problem. CD2 will work with RAP staff to address this issue.

Question: The recommended parking is only a drop in the bucket. Is there a process on how we decide with reaches capacity, is there an actual process or is it arbitrary; and what variables are used to determine the parking area, play area, etc.?

Answer: CD 2 said the expanded parking will help alleviate some of the parking issues. There were issues with other community members that are opposed to any parking increases. There is process that is followed to determine capacity and parking, as well as building codes and Building & Safety definitions. Mr. Drucker (BOE) stated that a CEQA process is currently underway now, so in the future the LVNOC will be able to see the results of the study. At present, staff is looking into the environmental impact regarding parking and traffic. The Department of Transportation (DOT) & Planning Department will also review the study.

Question: Is a high school basketball auditorium in scale with the needs for this area, because I do not think we (the community) decided on the need for such a large gymnasium that is like a high school gymnasium, in this space? Who determined the need and who decided on the project?

Answer: CD2 staff answered, the need was determined by RAP, based the Department's experiences and on the comments RAP received from parents and people involved in the programs at the park. It was determined that the space at the site was inadequate for the programs RAP is currently running or what the community wants in the future. The new building will help RAP function at its best and highest capacity for all the programs it has.

Mr. Singer (RAP) noted that RAP could go Net-Zero because they have adult softball leagues playing on the fields outside. They can be moved to another location, if there becomes an impact with an increase of children. The adults actually are more of an impact because each drives their own cars, versus children who usually come in packs (brought by parents or in carpools), so as we move forward, you will increase this in a smaller percentage than you actually think. If it becomes out of control, RAP will cut back or more some of the other activities.

In regards to who decided on this project, Mr. Drucker (BOE) did a quick review of the history of Prop K. He noted that the voters decided in 1996, that this was one of the projects. This was one of the specified projects on the ballot measure for Proposition K, where the Los Angeles community voted and approved for a new modern gym, landscaping and irrigation. More recently, RAP has done two Community Needs Studies. The first one was done approximately 8 years ago; the second is currently on going. In those studies, soccer, softball, baseball and basketball still remain the #1 requested sporting facilities. Walking paths, trees, shade, green space, a lot of the other things seen at the parks are also requested, but those items are not as requested.

Question: In both designs, the parking is next to Co-Op; will there be barriers between Co-Op and parking lot for safety?