

To Julie Ross from Dave Mannix Committee Member Sept. 21, 2021

The document sent by LMU is not the filing document to the LA Planning Department. It is a response to our motion of support with conditions. It lays out a point by point response.

In looking over the LMU "Response and Specific Plan Language " to each of our conditions, I find a couple of interesting things -

Item #1 - Looks fine

Item #2 - LMU insert the words `` The liaison officer will, as appropriate" to our request for the Compliance Officer to attend NAC meetings quarterly and PLUC meetings semi-annually.

Item #3- LMU added to the TDMP/Mobility Study "review other scheduling considerations for Public Events at the Gersten Pavilion and the new sports arena". I am not sure why this was done.

Item #4- LMU mentions for the first time a potential "new conference center on the southwest side of University Hall". As size has never been discussed, this could be a red flag issue.

Also, LMU does not address our request to review the residential "Preferred Permit Parking Program" for potential extension/expansion/hours.

Item #5- LMU has denied our request to use Gersten for "emergency game use"

LMU has added language to re-install fixed seating in the event "LMU suspends or discontinues the operation of the new arena". More discussion is needed

LMU has also added wording that expressly authorizes ".....and/or change the use of Gersten Pavilion." More discussion is needed to ensure we do not end up with another 6000 seat facility.

Item #6 -The new Table 2 for "Permitted Combined(Existing+New)Floor Area by Land Use Category. We should also see Table 1

Item #7 - NCWP PLUC condition for "All conditions remain in effect throughout the term of the Master Plan" has not been

addressed. Instead, LMU agrees with the "no spectator vehicle use for Loyola Gate", they have restated their existing policy of "Loyola Boulevard campus entrance shall be restricted to a limited number of vehicles....". This policy currently does not work during peak travel times and should be modified with a cap.

Item #8 - Grass parking only for graduation is fine.

Item #9 - Additional notification needs to address a better way to communicate with neighbors

Item#10-No rideshare drop off or pickup in the neighborhood needs to be addressed as something LMU will require from the new parking study, not just as a potential outcome of a parking study.

Item #11- The 2-hour window between "Public Events" may need to be adjusted based on the new TDM plan. Therefore, wording should be a minimum of 2 hours between Public Events.

I'll be sending a version of this email to LMU in my capacity as a member of NAC.

But, maybe we should have the LMU Compliance Officer attend a PLUC meeting to present the formal LA City Planning request document to the committee ?