Community letters received regarding GB040711-3
Motion to support the expansion of YULA Boys High School
April 3, 2011

Terrence Gomes
South Robertson Neighborhood Council
Land Use Committee
P.O. Box 35836
Los Angeles, CA 90035

RE: YULA Boys High School Expansion Project 9760 West Pico Blvd., Los Angeles, CA 90035 (EAF No. ENV-2008-1799-DEIR)

Dear Mr. Gomes:

By way of introduction, I am writing as a stakeholder in the South Robertson Neighborhood Council community even though I now live elsewhere. I still own my former residence at 9736 Saturn Street, Los Angeles, CA 90035, and in fact recently just completed costly repairs and have rented the house to a tenant. I remain deeply concerned about the quality of residential life in Los Angeles and about over-development in Los Angeles, since Beverly Hills is surrounded by Los Angeles. I also worry about any adverse impact on the value of my property from the proposed Project. As I have stated in previous communications to the Neighborhood Council and to the Los Angeles Department of City Planning (all of which are incorporated into this letter by reference), I and we who live literally in the shadow of two large, physically interconnected, and inextricably intertwined Jewish institutions— the Museum of Tolerance and the YULA Boys High School, also referred to herein as “YULA” or “the Yeshiva”— are very concerned about their proposed expansion plans.

I would also emphasize, as I have in previous communications, that I am speaking on behalf of many of my neighbors who are unable, for a variety of reasons, to speak for themselves. Most of the Yeshiva’s immediate neighbors, especially those who live just to its south on Castello Avenue, are frail, elderly individuals in their 80s and 90s. Many others in the few blocks bounded by Roxbury Drive on the west, Beverwil Drive on the east, Pico Blvd. to the north, and Cashio Street to the south, are immigrants for whom English is not their native language. Others are preoccupied with the concerns of providing for and attempting to raise young children in these challenging times. And few
have the strength and perseverance to keep fighting large institutions which have been attacking their neighbors for more than the 2 decades that I lived on Saturn Street.

In my final introductory paragraph, I want to state that I and most of the Yeshiva’s neighbors are not opposed to the Yeshiva’s expansion as permitted in the 1999 Conditional Use Permit, Case No. A 99-0279(CUZ)(ZV)(hereinafter referred to as “the 1999 CUP” or “the CUP”). (Please be careful that this statement is not quoted partially or out of context in the future!) We think that this project, as approved by the City 12 years ago, is appropriate for the Yeshiva with all the restrictions, including street closures, traffic diverters, permitted activities, and hours of operation, to protect the Yeshiva’s neighbors. The radically modified Project discussed in the Draft Environmental Impact Report EAF No. ENV-2008-1799-DEIR, shoehorning more than 52,000 square feet of built space on a small lot, with few if any limits on activities there, represents a significant departure from what the community finds acceptable, and must be modified, limited, and restricted if it is to be built.

Unfortunately, Allen Abshez’s letter dated March 2, 2011 omits significant facts, distorts the truth, and fails to explain the full impact of this expansion Project. It also significantly understates the adverse impacts of these expansions on the quiet single family residential neighborhood surrounding and adjoining YULA. It is most important that the Neighborhood Council and the City take all necessary steps to protect and preserve the residential character of this (and of all) neighborhoods zoned for residential use.

I also want to again note that if the Yeshiva was and is truly interested in the input of its neighbors, Mr. Abshez and his client would have sent a copy of this letter to me and to other interested neighbors on March 2, and would have specifically invited us to the Land Use Committee meeting at which this Project was discussed. If the Yeshiva wants to avoid perpetuating the climate of mistrust which it and the Museum of Tolerance have engendered over the decades they have been in the community’s midst, they must communicate more openly and not present us with unpleasant surprises.

I have nothing to hide. In the interests of the fullest possible discussion of this proposed Project, please disseminate my letter to the members of the SORO NC Board, its Land Use Committee, and to as many stakeholders as possible. I will try to attend the April 7 meeting, but do not know if this will be possible due to a longstanding prior commitment. I have asked my former neighbor, Susan Gans, to speak on my behalf.

I will key my comments to various sections of Mr. Abshez’s letter.

A. Introduction and Project Overview. YULA itself has NOT “long operated as a modern orthodox Judaic high school, adult education center, and religious sanctuary”. The truth is that YULA’s predecessor institutions, with various names, owned and operated by Rabbi Marvin Hier and his associates, have been in this location- in the midst of a quiet residential neighborhood of single family homes- only
since 1977. And as Mr. Abshez himself notes, YULA has only been there since 2008! The Byzantine structure of ownership is another point of contention, but our understanding (which may be incorrect) is that YULA is located on land owned by YOLA, which leases the land to YULA. YOLA also owns the property on which the Museum is located. The Museum is operated by the Simon Wiesenthal Center. We again note that Susan Burden, who sits on the Neighborhood Council Board and on its Land Use Committee, is employed by the Wiesenthal Center and inappropriately and in possible violation of the Los Angeles City Ethics Commission Code of Conduct, did not recuse herself from deliberations on this project. In fact, Ms. Burden is the addressee of the 1999 CUP! That is how involved she was and perhaps remains in this Project.

Many if not most of YULA’s students- and especially those who attend the adult education center- do NOT live nearby, but live in remote locations and drive. If they lived close enough to walk- as do those who (in violation of the 1999 CUP) attend religious services conducted by YULA (the Yeshiva’s 1999 CUP specifies a synagogue only for use by students and teachers, NOT by the community, with a maximum of 50 attendees!)- traffic and parking would not be such issues for YULA’s neighbors!

We request that YULA provide a zip code listing of its students, faculty, and staff, as part of the Yeshiva’s application, so the veracity of Mr. Abshez’s statement can be verified.

YULA’s neighbors can understand its desire to expand the building and the “typical high school activities” at the site. But in contradistinction to what it stated, this new Project is a radical expansion and significant change in the nature and hours of permitted activities from what is currently allowed and approved by the existing 1999 CUP. We emphasize the history of the 1999 CUP, which was carefully designed by Associate Zoning Administrator Lourdes Garcia, modeling the CUP on those of other schools operating within quiet residential neighborhoods, to protect the surrounding homes and their occupants. We also note that the proposed expansion is on land zoned R-1-1 for single family homes, not for institutional development and use.

Our concerns about the expansion of the student body within the current limitations are mostly about the Boys High School. It is this unruly group of teen age boys who create most of the disturbances in the neighborhood and who constitute the traffic safety hazard to the many small children who live on Alcott Street and Saturn Street.

But (turning to Page 2) we are also concerned about the “modified site plan and building improvements” because these violate required setbacks under the Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC), violate the height limits required under the Transitional Height Ordinance, and other provisions of the LAMC. Instead of a 65 foot setback from the southern property line, the new plan provides only a 20 foot setback from YULA’s
nearest neighbor on the south, and a tiny 11 foot setback from the nearest home on the west!

Mr. Abshez misquotes Condition 21 of the 1999 CUP which states that YULA’s facilities are “open to YULA students, their families, faculty, and neighbors as limited by this grant.” He adds the word “others” which is NOT included in this Condition. Use of the religious sanctuary by persons not affiliated with the school is specifically NOT allowed by the Conditional Use Permit. In addition, Condition 7 specifies that on weekdays and weekends a maximum of 25 neighbors, and on religious holidays a maximum of 50 neighbors, may attend religious services at the YULA Beit Midrash.

If YULA desires to, and is going to be operating a Jewish synagogue serving the community, all requirements of LAMC applying to churches and other religious facilities must be applied to YULA as is required by law. This includes parking!!

As an aside, we note that (as I learned in cheder, Jewish religious school, more than five decades ago) the Jewish Talmud teaches that Jews must follow the laws of whatever community they reside in. Talmud states (in Hebrew), “Dina malchuta dina,” which can be translated as “civil law is also Jewish law.” It is embarrassing to me as a relatively non-observant Jew to have to remind Mr. Abshez, the Yeshiva’s rabbis, and its Orthodox Jewish supporters that this rabbinical injunction applies to YULA and to them.

B. The Existing CUP
1. Permitted Uses

We note that Condition 7 of the 1999 CUP states “The use of the existing facilities shall be used only (emphasis added) for the operations of the following three division of Yeshiva of Los Angeles (YOLA): (a) the private boys’ school of Yeshiva of Los Angeles High School (YOLA/HS); (b) YOLA University (YOLA/U); and (c) the adult-education Jewish Studies Institute of Yeshiva of Los Angeles (JSI). YULA Girls High School students are only allowed to use the new gymnasium for practice and for basketball and volleyball games, as specified in Condition 81 of the 1999 CUP. Condition 81 further states, “The girls’ YOLA high school shall have limited access to the gymnasium as established in the condition noted above.”

At the bottom of page 2, the references to YULA and YOLA obscure the fact that in public hearings for the 1999 CUP, the “approximately 7,153 square feet on the second and third floors of the building are known as the west wing” Rabbi Meyer May, then of YULA or YOLA and now with the Wiesenthal Center, emphasized the importance of this space for the yeshiva’s students and their education. The uses of this West Wing space are detailed very specifically in Conditions 45-52 of the existing 1999 CUP. This space has long been used by the Museum, in violation of the 1999 CUP, and was officially annexed by the Museum in 2008. Either way, this history of dishonesty and public lies
by representatives of these Orthodox Jewish institutions unfortunately has contributed to the current mistrust of these institutions by their neighbors. The relevance of this issue and its history to the proposed Project is that YULA is now asking to expand its space beyond that permitted in the 1999 CUP to compensate for the 7,153 square feet it no longer possesses, but meanwhile says that this space- which is physically on the land leased by YULA from YOLA!- no longer counts towards the space to be operated by YULA!!

One can only think of the comedian’s definition of the Yiddish word “chutzpah” (perhaps best translated as “nerve”, e.g., “he had the nerve to say that!”) as the man who kills both his parents and then throws himself on the mercy of the court because he is now an orphan! YULA gave up space to the Museum, and is now not only telling the City and its neighbors that it needs more space to replace the space it gave up, but also has the nerve to tell the City and its neighbors that because it isn’t using this space, it somehow doesn’t exist on its land? This is an outrageous distortion of reality!! The square footage impact of these changes is discussed below.

2. Permitted Improvements- see discussion below

3. Permitted Enrollment- see discussion below

C. Current Improvements- We again note that Mr. Abshez is playing loose and free with the facts concerning the actual square footage allowed and being operated, as discussed above and below under D.2.

D. Project Characteristics- We vigorously disagree with this mischaracterization of the proposed Project, which represents a radical expansion of the permitted space and of the permitted uses of and activities at the school.

D.1. Enrollment Reallocation. We note that the radical expansion of the YULA High School student body is of great concern to YULA’s neighbors. The students are noisy, often reckless teen aged boys, who run through the quiet neighborhood for gym and who drive too fast on quiet residential streets. They also park not only on Castello Avenue, but surreptitiously on Alcott Street and Saturn Street, beyond the view of the YULA security guards who are supposed to prevent them from doing this but who in reality have little or no power to do so.

D.2. Modified Site Plan The proposed project may mitigate some impacts of the proposed Project on its neighbors, but unfortunately causes many other adverse impacts which cannot be mitigated. We again note that Mr. Abshez distorts the truth about the size of the proposed Project. As stated at the top of Page 4, there are approximately 32,200 square feet of built space on the YULA site. The fact that approximately 7,153 square feet in the West Wing is being used by the Museum of
Tolerance and not by YULA is irrelevant to the LAMC! The 7,153 square feet are at the 9760 West Pico Boulevard address, not at the Museum of Tolerance at 9786 West Pico Boulevard. The 32,200 square feet, plus 19,953 square feet of new construction, is a total of 52,153 square feet at 9760 West Pico Boulevard, far in excess of the 47,100 square feet allowed by Condition 4 of the 1999 CUP. This extra 5,000 square feet makes the proposed Project just too big for its tiny site!

We ask that the Floor Area Ratio (FAR) be calculated for the YULA site and that the proposed project be required to adhere to the FAR specified in LAMC.

D.2.a. Replacement of Surface Parking Lot with Single Story Building

As Mr. Abshez notes, this is indeed the most significant change to the site plan. Instead of a 65 foot buffer at the Project’s southern border, because of the space needed to replace the classrooms taken by or given to the Museum, the new buildings are only 20 feet away from YULA’s southern neighbors! Obviously, this will increase, not decrease, the impacts to adjacent neighbors. As is readily apparent by a visit to the site, the parking lot is busy only in the morning and late afternoon or early evening. The Yeshiva students play basketball outdoors some times, but otherwise the Yeshiva’s neighbors are protected by the almost 100 feet between them and the Yeshiva. The gym and library will be much closer to the lot line and YULA’s southernmost neighbors than previously permitted under the 1999 CUP. The proposed structure would violate the Transitional Height Ordinance on the western border of the YOLA property. The proposed setbacks do not meet the requirements of LAMC.

D.2.b. Castello Avenue Cul-de-Sac

The cul-de-sac is now controversial in the neighborhood. This, however, would appear to be irrelevant to the zoning and approval process, as it is specifically required by Condition 75 of the 1999 CUP which requires the cul-de-sac (the Condition actually specifies a traffic diverter to be constructed BEFORE any Phase II construction begins!)

Furthermore, a significant omission by Mr. Abshez is failure to mention Condition 76 of the 1999 CUP, which requires a closure of southbound traffic on Roxbury Drive south of the alley south of Pico Boulevard “prior to the issuance of any building, grading or demolition permit for any development permitted pursuant to Phase II”.

D.2.d  Lighting and Signage

YULA’s neighbors are skeptical of the lighting and signage plan and want to review detailed proposals for lights and signs. Only the minimum of lighting to provide security should be allowed. Signs should be as small as possible.

D. 3. Proposed Modifications to Operating Conditions
I would emphasize that the current Operating Conditions are NOT “confusing, impractical, or obsolete.” They do impede the Yeshiva from conducting activities which would adversely impact the neighborhood even more, they do limit it from untrammeled activities by unlimited numbers of attendees without adequate parking, they do restrict the operating hours of the Yeshiva. But this is entirely appropriate for a high school so deeply inserted into a quiet residential neighborhood, and is not an adequate reason to discard them. Any modifications of the Operating Conditions must continue to protect and preserve the quiet residential character of the Yeshiva’s surrounding neighborhood. We again question the “neighborhood” character of the Yeshiva, and ask for the zip code analysis of its students, faculty, and staff.

I have commented briefly on some of the Proposed Conditions below, and tried to coordinate these comments with the relevant sections of Mr. Abshez’s letter. I will try to provide more detailed comments on the Proposed Conditions in a separate communication.

Condition 1 We again note that the maximum built space allowed by this CUP is 45,000 square feet, INCLUDING the “West Wing” space of approximately 7,153 square feet.

Condition 9 (3.a. in Mr. Abshez’s letter) Use of Facilities for Religious Activities We remain extremely concerned about this use of the Yeshiva’s facilities. Unfortunately, in land use law, “the permit runs with the land.” This is noted on Page 24 of the existing 1999 CUP (“TRANSFERABILITY”). There can be no guarantee that the Yeshiva will remain an Orthodox Jewish yeshiva whose religious attendees do not drive on their Sabbath and holy days. If the facilities at 9760 West Pico Boulevard were to be used by a Christian denomination, or Buddhists or Muslims, for example, they could and would drive to the church or temple or mosque that the Yeshiva would have become. (Such changes in the religious use of facilities is not unheard of. One merely needs to go two miles east to the Kaballah Center at 1062 South Robertson Blvd. and look at the architecture to realize that this once Christian church is now a Jewish institution!) Therefore, the law requires that all provisions of the LAMC regarding churches, including required parking, be met for this religious institution. There are numerous Orthodox and other Jewish facilities in the Pico-Robertson neighborhood, and the Yeshiva has demonstrated no need to open yet another synagogue in the community. A detailed listing of Jewish religious facilities was submitted to the Los Angeles Department of City Planning and is incorporated here by reference.

Condition 11 The intent of the expansion approved in the 1999 CUP was to limit the Yeshiva’s impact on the community. Allowing outdoor activities until 9:30 p.m. is just too late. The Yeshiva’s students are very noisy (not necessarily any noisier than a similar group of 250 teenaged boys- that’s just a lot of teenage boys!!) and any additional participants in the various activities mentioned in Conditions 8, 9, and 10 (including but
not limited to athletic events, academic enrichment programs, school plays, fundraising activities, and Special Events), if allowed, should ONLY take place indoors. We also note that existing Condition 8 limits the number of events to 8 per year. A similar limit should be put in place. The number of events should certainly not be unlimited!

I am also concerned about “kiddush” ceremonies following services. I have attended Jewish religious services where such kiddushim were as elaborate as “sit down luncheons” following Bar or Bat Mitzvah services, especially if the main party was to take place in the evening, after sundown, when music is permitted according to Orthodox Jewish tradition. No kiddush ceremonies should be allowed because it will be impossible to limit or police them.

Condition 8 (3.c in Mr. Abshez’s letter) YULA Girls High School The 1999 CUP only allows students from YULA Girls High School to use the gym. This was the original intent of the 1999 CUP. Other uses for academic enrichment, athletic competitions, tournaments, etc. were not and should not be permitted. We again question how the Yeshiva will enforce any parking limitation for YULA girls and their parents and friends on the neighborhood streets, since the Yeshiva’s current enforcement of parking restrictions for its male students is so ineffective. We also ask: how can the City keep anyone from parking on its streets, other than by permit parking or time restrictions or no-parking zones? These zones and restrictions have been discussed, but obviously would have major impacts on the residents of the neighborhood. If permit parking is established, YULA should pay for the residents’ annual permits and for guest parking permits for their visitors.

Condition 14 YULA students should not be allowed to leave the campus for lunch. If they drive or walk to the kosher eating establishments approximately a mile to the east—there will be unavoidable noise and traffic impacts. Current Condition 14 in the 1999 CUP should be kept in force. The Yeshiva should be required to provide sufficient indoor eating facilities for its student body. If enrollment is allowed to increase (see Condition 17 below), sufficient facilities to meet the increased enrollment should be required including toilets, showers, cafeteria facilities, classrooms, etc.

Condition 17 Enrollment should remain limited to 250 high school students. The increase of 40% above this limit, to 350 students, is a radical expansion of the school beyond that anticipated in the 1999 CUP.

Conditions 21 and 22 All applicable parking requirements of LAMC should be enforced. This expansion project needs several hundred parking spaces, not a mere 100 spaces. It remains unclear how YULA, which can’t or won’t enforce parking restrictions for its students, faculty, staff, and visitors, will do this. In addition, as discussed above, how can the City prevent anyone from parking on public streets? Will the Yeshiva’s neighbors have to become vigilantes, noting license plates and reporting
them to YULA, or perhaps even taking other actions? They don’t want to have to do this!

Condition 61  The traffic diverter or cul-de-sac is still required by this condition. It is not an option! As noted in previous communications, additional signage must be required to prevent what I call “race track” traffic patterns in which parents will go east from Beverwil on Alcott to Castello, drop off the students, and proceed southbound on Castello to Cashio, or the reverse, in which they will proceed northbound on Castello from Cashio, turn east on Alcott, drop the student, and proceed eastbound to Beverwil. The intent of the 1999 CUP and of the Associate Zoning Administrator was that all entrance and egress to the Yeshiva’s facilities be from the north, from Pico Boulevard. This was the reason for the cul-de-sac or traffic diverter. This is specified in existing Condition 86, and Proposed Condition 69 also states this intent. This intent should be respected and needed steps to prevent the “race track” traffic pattern with student drop off south of the traffic diverter or cul-de-sac must be implemented. I have recommended specific sign language and placement in other comments to the Los Angeles Department of City Planning, which are incorporated here by reference.

Condition 66  (3.e Other Changes in Mr. Abshez’s letter) The proposed occupancies of 400 for athletic events and 700 for auditorium seating are just too big for this facility and this space with only 100 parking spaces. Appropriate occupancies are 300 for athletic events and 400 at most for other events. Even then, we have serious concerns about the inadequate parking, and the noise and traffic that will occur when those attending these events disperse, especially if these events are ending in the evening hours after 8 p.m.

Condition 68  The City should require that events be coordinated not just between the Beit Midrash and the gymnasium, but also between the Museum of Tolerance and the Yeshiva to make certain that there aren’t two or more large events occurring in the adjacent and interconnected buildings simultaneously. Two such events- the Museum wants to have events with 800 attendees, and an event at the Yeshiva with even “only” 300 attendees, let alone 700 attendees!- would generate too much noise, too much traffic, and too many cars for the totally inadequate number of parking spaces at both institutions. And events of this size require scores if not hundreds of support staff, especially for dinners, banquets, and other meetings, who would contribute to the noise, traffic, and parking problems.

All events, special or otherwise, at the Yeshiva must be coordinated with the events taking place at the Museum of Tolerance so that only one event is taking place on each day. There must be some limit established on events, otherwise an event could take place at one or both of these institutions every except Friday evening (the start of the Jewish Sabbath) and Jewish holy days! This could in theory be more than 200 events per year, which is far too many for institutions built partly on land zoned R-1-1, in the midst of a quiet residential neighborhood!!
E. Environmental Review

We note that the DEIR concludes that there will be significant and unavoidable adverse impacts if the traffic diverter or cul-de-sac is not installed. It is imperative, as specified in the 1999 CUP, that the cul-de-sac be installed and also that the southbound traffic on Roxbury Drive be blocked, before this proposed expansion takes place.

Conclusion

As stated earlier, I personally and most of my neighbors are not opposed to the Yeshiva’s expansion as proposed in the 1999 CUP (again, please make certain this statement is not misquoted or quoted partially or used out of context!), which has already been approved. We remain strongly opposed to this project in its current form.

I will summarize the main reasons for this opposition here:

1. The expansion to a total of 52,000 square feet of space on the Yeshiva’s small lot is just “too much building for too little land.”
2. The gym is too tall and too close to the Yeshiva’s neighbors.
3. The proposed uses of the gym facility especially, with hundreds of attendees going to a wide variety of events, is just too much for a school right across the street from single family homes, in a quiet neighborhood of single family homes. The number of events must be limited, and events at YULA must be coordinated with events at the Museum of Tolerance.
4. Outdoor activities especially must be restricted after 6:30 p.m.
5. The use of the facilities by YULA Girls High School students will lead to added noise, traffic, and parking issues beyond those already suffered by the Yeshiva’s neighbors, and should not be allowed beyond those permitted by the 1999 CUP.
6. The proposed project ignores the height limitations and parking requirements of LAMC, as well as the requirements for a church or religious facility which the Yeshiva also wants to operate for the community. These important restrictions must be enforced.
7. There is no need for yet another synagogue in the community. If it is going to be built, all requirements of LAMC for churches, including parking requirements, must be followed because “the permit runs with the land.”
8. The parking restrictions on YULA students and visitors are not currently enforced by YULA’s security guards, and cannot be enforced. Without the establishment of permit parking zones on all streets surrounding the Yeshiva, enforcement of any parking restriction by YULA or by the City is impossible!

We urge you and the South Robertson Neighborhoods Council Board to oppose this expansion project in its current form. Additional steps must be taken to protect the Yeshiva’s neighbors before this expanded project can be approved. We urge you to
support the Yeshiva expansion project already approved in the existing 1999 CUP in all its details, including the traffic diverter on Castello Avenue and the partial street closure of Roxbury Drive required before construction can begin.

Thank you in advance for your consideration. Again, please disseminate this letter to the other members of the Land Use Committee, to the entire Board, and to any and all stakeholders.

Sincerely,

Daniel J. Fink

cc: Allen Abshez
    Susan Gans
    Department of City Planning
April 6, 2011

Mr. Doug Fitzsimmons, President
South Robertson Neighborhood Council
Land Use Committee
PO Box 35836
Los Angeles, CA 90035

Re: YULA Boys High School, 9760 Pico Boulevard

Dear Mr. Fitzsimmons:

We are writing on behalf of our client, YULA Boys High School (YULA) to address the April 3rd and April 6th, 2011 letters to the Neighborhood Council in which Mr. Fink unfairly lashes out at YULA. YULA’s outreach to the community in connection with its Phase II plans has been ongoing for approximately three years. Mr. Fink, who now lives in north Beverly Hills, disengaged himself from that dialogue some time ago and is wholly out of touch with the facts, process and the community. This letter responds to the primary issues raised by Mr. Fink, and we will be happy to answer any other questions of interest to the Board at tomorrow evening’s hearing.

A. Who Is YULA Boys High School?

Mr. Fink’s inflammatory April 3, 2011 letter calls YULA’s students “unruly” and “dangerous.” This is rubbish.

YULA Boys High School is one of the premier and few Modern Orthodox Judaic Boys High Schools in the City. The school, which fronts Pico Boulevard, has continuously operated in its location since 1977. 44% of YULA’s students live within SORO’s boundaries, and 55% of them live within SORO or immediately adjacent zip codes. As the attached list of college destinations for the Class of 2010 indicates, YULA enjoys one of the highest acceptance rates from Ivy League and highly-ranked colleges in the nation, and 100% of all YULA Boys go on to college or yeshiva studies.
after graduation. At YULA, students receive a broad and balanced program of religious and general studies.

"Who are YULA Boys students?" They are your neighbors and very good kids (just young and growing up, like your kids).

YULA itself is an independent 501(c)(3) corporation. It was formed in 2008 to own and operate the high school as part of a separation from the Simon Wiesenthal Center and Yeshiva of Los Angeles ("YOLA"). YULA has a 99-year ground lease for use of the property as an orthodox Judaic school, and has the right to acquire the property from YOLA at the end of the lease term.

B. Why is YULA Requesting a CUP Amendment?

Mr. Fink’s inflammatory April 3, 2011 letter calls YULA’s request for an amendment “radical.” This is rubbish.

On March 8th, after a public hearing agendized and noticed by SORO NC, your Land Use Committee voted unanimously (3-0) to recommend SORO NC’s support of YULA’s application for its modified Phase II plan. Ms. Burden, who is not affiliated with YULA, was one of only 3 votes cast.

The basic reason for YULA’s amendment request is that there are not enough spots in Modern Orthodox Boys High Schools in Los Angeles to serve existing students. At present, the four Modern Orthodox elementary schools graduate 120 boys a year. However, the three Modern Orthodox boys high schools (including YULA) provide only 90 spots. This critical and current shortfall is also growing every year as the Modern Orthodox community expands.

YULA’s response has been to shift its focus from adult education to boys high school education -- one of the primary needs in the community -- while remaining within the overall student population limits set by the City in 1999.

YULA’s proposal to grow its high school body from a maximum of 250 to 350 (a process that will be phased over several years) is reasonable -- not “radical.”

C. Does YULA’s Revised Facility Plan Protect the Neighborhood?

Mr. Fink’s inflammatory April 3, 2011 letter claims YULA’s revised facility plan will increase effects to the neighborhood as compared to the 1999 plan. That’s wrong too. YULA’s revised plan is more compatible with the neighborhood than the 1999 plan.

YULA currently has permission to build and operate 47,100 square feet of facilities. YULA’s revised plan reduces the proposed square footage to 45,000. Mr. Fink objects that some of YULA’s previous square footage has been permanently taken over by the Museum of
Tolerance. This was not a decision within YULA’s control, and only occurred after the City’s approval.

YULA’s currently approved plan allows an outdoor parking lot adjacent to residential uses with an 8 foot setback. YULA’s revised plan envisions completely enclosed facilities with underground parking. The amount of on-campus parking will be increased from 85 spaces to 100 spaces. YULA’s revised plan provides 20 foot setbacks along Castello and to the south. These setbacks meet or exceed R1 standards. Behind the setbacks will be one-story (16 foot high) classroom buildings with no operable windows. YULA’s gym will be in the same (interior) location at the property as previously approved by the City. The revised plan proposes that the gym be allowed 45 feet (only 5 feet higher than permitted by the 1999 CUP) consistent with standards for a high school gym and as consistent with LAMC 12.24.X.10.

YULA’s revised plan will be quieter, greener and smarter, and will reduce effects on the surrounding neighborhood as compared to the approved 1999 plan.

D. What About the Gym and What About YULA Girls High School Use of the Gym?

YULA’s current CUP allows it to build a gym. YULA’s updated plans envisions a gym that can host indoor high school sporting events (basketball, volleyball) with adequate spectator seating. Spectator attendance at typical events is usually small (as one would expect for a small school), but bleacher seating accommodating 400 spectators is reasonable and might be used for a high school tournament or championship. Though attendance would rarely approach those levels, seating for that capacity is not unreasonable for a school of 350 students and their families.

YULA’s gym will also be used as an auditorium for school plays and events such as assemblies and graduations. An auditorium capacity of 700, though unlikely to be filled to capacity often, is not unreasonable for a school of 350 students and their families.

YULA Girls High School (YULA Girls) is an independent Modern Orthodox Girls High School located at 1619 South Robertson in SORO. It is independent of YULA Boys High School, but the two schools are inter-related by the parent body they share. YULA Girls does not have a full gym or a real auditorium. The current CUP allows YULA Girls to use the proposed gym for basketball and volleyball games and practices. YULA proposes that YULA Girls use of the gym be allowed for all indoor sports, as well as school play and large assembly functions. This is reasonable, and avoids the needs to build a separate gym/auditorium for YULA Girls within another SORO neighborhood, which would be inefficient, as well as a waste of money, land and energy.

E. Why Does YULA Want to Get Rid of the Limits on Special Events?

YULA’s 1999 CUP provides that there can be no more than eight “Special Events” each year. This is an unworkable concept because a “Special Event” is defined as any event open to persons other than enrolled students, their families, faculty and staff. Virtually every
high school in the City, whether public or private, holds many more than eight special events each year: ceremonies, lectures, meetings, social gatherings, fundraising events, athletic competitions, open houses, plays and performances. Community meetings (such as SORO’s Board meetings at Hamilton High) would be considered a “Special Event.” No high school can honestly operate within these unrealistic and ill-considered limits.

YULA proposes to eliminate this numeric limitation, although it would retain the requirement that the only “Special Events” permitted at the facility are those in which YULA Boys substantially participates. This will not increase the number of events YULA conducts. After all, YULA is only a high school, and conducts only such “Special Events” as are basic to its educational mission. That number should not be unreasonably or arbitrarily limited. In addition, in response to its dialogue with Ms. Gans YULA agreed that with the exception of Purim, Simchat Torah and Shavuos, “Special Events” would be conducted indoors after 7 p.m. Off-street parking will be provided for all attendees, and YULA has committed that it will use reasonable efforts to coordinate the scheduling of Special Events with the Museum of Tolerance’s Special Events so that parking impacts to residential neighborhoods from YULA Special Events are avoided.

F. What about the Castello Avenue Cul-de-Sac?

The 1999 CUP requires the installation of a cul-de-sac along Castello Avenue (south of the school driveway) in connection with Phase Two of the expansion. YULA believes the cul de sac is a good idea and that it would benefit the neighborhood. However, since 1999 a strong disagreement has emerged in the local neighborhood about the desirability of the cul de sac. The prevailing community sentiment, confirmed in a survey earlier this year, is to not install the cul de sac for now and to re-explore community views after Phase II is completed. YULA is willing to install the cul de sac now or to revisit the issue after Phase II is completed.

G. Why is YULA Proposing to Permit Increased Use of the Beit Midrash?

YULA is proposing to increase the number of persons permitted to use the Beit Midrash for religious worship during non-school hours. The 1999 CUP currently allows neighborhood use of the facilities for religious activities but restricts the number of participants to 25 individuals on weekdays and weekends and 50 individuals on religious holidays. The Modern Orthodox population of the immediate area has grown and continues to grow, and YULA proposes to increase the permitted numbers to 100 persons on weekdays and weekends, and 200 persons on religious holidays to respond to this need. As the Board is aware, Orthodox Judaic practice requires its members to refrain from driving on the sabbath and religious holidays. Therefore, houses of worship within walking distance of homes are critical for Modern Orthodox families and their children. The Beit Midrash, which currently seats 200 persons, would not be expanded. No weddings, or Bar or Bat Mitzvah banquets or receptions would be held at YULA.
H. Does the Neighborhood Oppose YULA’s Plans?

The answer is “No.” Many immediate neighbors worship at YULA, send their children to school there, or have themselves graduated from YULA. Rabbi Glass, YULA’s headmaster, regularly receives compliments on the efforts of the school to improve its relationship with the neighborhood. Over the past three years, YULA has conducted about a dozen meetings with local neighbors to discuss the details of its plans and proposed conditions of operation. There is no significant local opposition to YULA’s proposals. Indeed, to clarify the confusion engendered by Ms. Gans and Mr. Fink, the Rox-Bev HOA wrote to Mr. Fitzsimmons on April 4th that its Board had not taken any position on YULA’s project and that the comments received from Mr. Fink and Ms. Gans represented their individual opinions only. They may be outspoken, but their sentiments are not shared by their neighbors.

Conclusion

YULA has worked with local neighbors for approximately three years. Its proposal responds to the local community’s needs, is reasonable, and deserves SORO NC’s support. We look forward to answering any questions you may have at tomorrow night’s hearing.

Very truly yours,

Allan J. Abshez

cc: Mr. David Nagel
Rabbi Heshy Glass
Councilman Paul Koretz
Mr. Dan Fink
YULA Boys
April 6, 2011

Summary Data
Settings: Start Class Year/Grade: class of 2010; End Class Year/Grade: class of 2010
Sorting: Colleges data sorted by College, Ascending

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Accept</th>
<th>WL Accept</th>
<th>DF Accept</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baruch College of the CUNY</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston College</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston University</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandeis University</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown University</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California State University, Long Beach</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California State University, Northridge</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnegie Mellon University</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Western Reserve University</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia University</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell College</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell University</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dartmouth College</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drexel University</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duke University</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emory University</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goucher College</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvard University</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hofstra University</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana University at Bloomington</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johns Hopkins University</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts Institute of Technology</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York University</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeastern University</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwestern University</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occidental College</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania State University, University Park</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pepperdine University</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pomona College</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Princeton University</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>WL Accept</td>
<td>DF Accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey at New Brunswick</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey at Newark</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego State University</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanford University</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syracuse University</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The George Washington University</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The University of Arizona</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The University of Texas, Austin</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulane University</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California at Berkeley</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California at Davis</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California at Irvine</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California at Los Angeles</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California at Riverside</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California at San Diego</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California at Santa Barbara</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California at Santa Cruz</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Chicago</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Connecticut</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Maryland, College Park</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Massachusetts, Amherst</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Miami</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Michigan</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Pennsylvania</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Southern California</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Virginia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Wisconsin, Madison</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>WL Accept</td>
<td>DF Accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanderbilt University</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Commonwealth University</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington University in St. Louis</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yale University</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeshiva University</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td>121</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
April 6, 2011

Doug Fitzsimmons, President  
South Robertson Neighborhoods Council  
PO Box 35836  
Los Angeles, CA 90035

RE: Proposed Expansion Project, YULA Boys High School, 9760 West Pico Blvd.  
Los Angeles, CA 90035

Dear Doug:

Unfortunately, I must respond vigorously to Allen Abshez’s angry letter dated today. Although I do not live anymore where I can see the Yeshiva from my front window, I have been remodeling my house on Saturn Street so have been there almost every day - some days twice a day- since October 2010. I speak with my neighbors about what is happening. And I see what is happening myself. I have keyed this response to the organization of Mr. Abshez’s letter.

Who is YULA Boys High School

Mr. Abshez doesn’t think his client’s students are unruly and dangerous. Unfortunately, we who live near YULA know differently. Under separate copy, I will send correspondence and pictures about the infamous drag race which led to a YULA student’s car ending up on a lawn at 9748 Saturn Street where two toddlers usually played. I will send the pictures of the swimming pool the YULA students erected in the school’s parking lot. I will send pictures of YULA students loitering in front of 9732 Saturn Street, out of sight of the Yeshiva’s ineffective security guards. Having raised two sons to maturity myself, I don’t think the YULA students are any worse than any similar sized group of teen aged boys, but they are not much better, either.

Mr. Abshez apparently agrees with me when he concedes that YULA is not a neighborhood school, with fewer than half of its students living within the SORO NC boundaries. I thank him for providing this important fact. As I stated previously, if the students lived close enough to walk, traffic and parking would not be such major issues to YULA’s neighbors. I have never questioned the academic excellence of YULA, and in my last letter stated that it is an asset to the broader community.

Turning to his second page, even though it has been explained to me several times, I still find the many interrelated entities located at 1399 South Roxbury Drive, 9786 West...
Pico Blvd., and 9760 West Pico Blvd. confusing. The number of entities and my inability to keep them straight reminds me of the “Three Card Monte” games that my father warned me about when I was a boy. I apologize for my confusion.

**Why is YULA Requesting a CUP Amendment?**

I am not questioning the need for Jewish education, and think that in general this is a good thing. It's just a question of where this should most appropriately take place. Mr. Abshez and his client may not think that an almost doubling of the high school student from to 350 is radical, but I do. We can quibble over the definition of radical- my dictionary defines it as extreme- but a doubling seems pretty extreme to me. As stated previously, it is the high school boys who are most disruptive to the neighborhood.

**Does YULA’s Revised Facility Plan Protect the Neighborhood?**

Mr. Abshez and I can agree to disagree about whether the expanded facility is better or worse for the neighborhood. He doesn't think a much taller building and a setback reduced from 65 feet to only 20 feet on the southern end of YULA’s land (or is it YOLA’s land?) with only an 11 foot setback on the side, will have a greater effect on YULA’s neighbors than the bigger setbacks. I disagree.

Mr. Abshez and I also disagree about how to add. YULA may plan on operating 45,000 square feet of space instead of 47,000 square feet of space, but he seems to forget about the 7,153 square feet in the Yeshiva’s “West Wing” that now belongs to the Museum of Tolerance. 45,000 + 7,000 = 52,000 square feet at 9760 West Pico Blvd! That's just “too much building for too little land.”

Mr. Abshez doesn’t think that having 52,000 square feet of built space on a very small lot will have a greater impact than only 45,000 square feet. I disagree. We fought the Museum of Tolerance’s takeover of YULA’s “West Wing” space, but the City did approve that project. That does not make it appropriate to shoehorn 10,000 more square feet on the YULA land. Again, Mr. Abshez and I can disagree.

And it certainly isn't obvious how something 10% taller and 10% bigger can be “quieter, greener and smarter, and will reduce effects on the surrounding neighborhood as compared to the approved 1999 plan”, as Mr. Abshez so glibly states. I disagree. You should disagree, too.

**What About the Gym and What About YULA Girls High School Use of the Gym?**

YULA’s current 1999 Conditional Use Permit (CUP) does allow a gym, but YULA wants a bigger gym. The problem isn’t the size of the gym itself, but the 400 to 700 attendees that the gym can accommodate. These size crowds need more parking than the meager 100 spaces in the new plan. I note that the current CUP permits the YULA girls to use it for gym uses- and that’s okay- but not for other uses such as plays and assemblies. Again, parking is the major issue, as are traffic and noise. How will the
Why Does YULA Want to Get Rid of the Limits on Special Events?

Nobody likes limits so I can understand why YULA doesn’t want any. But I remain extremely concerned about YULA’s desire to have no limits on special events. Again, what makes YULA different from other high schools including Jewish high schools like Milken, is that it is in the midst of a quiet residential neighborhood. Eight events annually may be too few, but a reasonable person would agree that there must be some limit on the number of events to protect YULA’s neighbors. Otherwise there could be events every night of the week! The statement that there will be “reasonable efforts” at coordinating events between YULA and the adjacent and interconnected Museum of Tolerance is the first I have heard of this, although “weasel words” like “reasonable efforts” do not give me any assurance.

What about the Castello Avenue Cul-de-Sac?

The cul-de-sac and closure of southbound traffic lanes on Roxbury Drive are required by the 1999 CUP and by the proposed CUP. Without these traffic changes, there will be severe and unmitigated impacts on the neighborhood. I think that with appropriate education of those who live on Alcott Street, Saturn Street, and Castello Avenue, and with the design of a cul-de-sac with a rolled curb passable by emergency vehicles, YULA’s neighbors would accept the inconvenience of a few household changing their driving patterns for the elimination of 400 vehicle trips each day. And I note that if YULA’s expert says 400 trips, the real number is probably 800 or 1200 trips, especially if 700 people will be in the gym!

Why is YULA Proposing to Permit Increased Use of the Beit Midrash?

As stated in other communications, my concern about the Beit Midrash is that there appear to be sufficient Orthodox Jewish synagogues in the neighborhood. If there really is a need for a synagogue, all requirements of the Los Angeles Municipal Code pertaining to religious institutions and facilities, including parking requirements, must be met. As an attorney, Mr. Abshez undoubtedly knows that “the permit runs with the land”. So even though Orthodox Jews walk to services on the Sabbath and holy days, those of other beliefs do not and the neighborhood must be protected from the possibility that another religious group might take over the facility.

Does the Neighborhood Oppose YULA’s Plans?

Finally, Mr. Abshez and Rabbi Glass clearly speak with a different group of people from the ones I speak with. My guess is they speak with people who aren’t really YULA’s neighbors. Very few “immediate neighbors”- those who live within the area most
affected by YULA, bordered on the west by Roxbury Drive, on the east by Beverwil Drive, on the north by Pico Blvd., and on the south by Cashio Street or Horner Street, worship at YULA. I can think of no more than 3 or 4 families in this area who do. As I have noted in previous communications, many of those who reside in this area are frail, elderly individuals with major health problems. Others are trying to raise young children. Most do not have the strength to speak out on this important issue. Over the years I have documented numerous Code and CUP violations by YULA. I will also send these to you. These are only a very small percentage- the proverbial tip of the iceberg- of the daily onslaught of problems from YULA and its predecessor organizations. I have far better things to do with my time than to document how badly YULA treats its neighbors.

Conclusion

YULA’s new expansion proposal is not reasonable. It needs to be scaled down, and to be governed by appropriate conditions, with vigorous enforcement of these conditions by the City, before its immediate neighbors and the Neighborhood Council can support this oversized and under-regulated project.

Unfortunately, I cannot attend tomorrow’s meeting. Thank you in advance for your consideration. PLEASE help us protect our neighborhood. If this project gets built as proposed, a dangerous precedent will have been established for all neighborhoods and all citizens of Los Angeles.

Sincerely,

Daniel J. Fink, M.D.

cc: David Nagel
    Rabbi Glass
    Councilmember Koretz
    Susan Gans
VIA EMAIL

April 6, 2011

Doug Fitzsimmons
Terrence Gomes
South Robertson Neighborhood Council
P.O. Box 35836
Los Angeles, CA 90035

RE: YULA Boys High School Expansion Project 9760 West Pico Blvd., Los Angeles, CA 90035 (EAF No. ENV-2008-1799-DEIR)

Dear Mr. Fitzsimmons and Mr. Gomes:

I am writing to summarize my concerns about the proposed YULA Boys High School expansion project as succinctly as possible. As stated earlier, I personally and most of my neighbors are not opposed to the Yeshiva’s expansion as proposed in the Yeshiva’s 1999 Conditional Use Permit (CUP), Case No. ZA 99-0279 (CUZ)(ZV), which has already been approved. That project was appropriate in scale for the Yeshiva’s small lot, and the Conditions in the CUP minimized the expansion’s impact on its neighbors. We remain strongly opposed to the radically expanded project in its current form with its too permissive Conditions.

Our opposition has nothing to do with the Yeshiva per se, or with its students. It is a fine institution, and an asset to the broader community. But it is not a neighborhood school-almost none of its students walk to school, most drive or are driven from Beverly Hills, Hancock Park, the San Fernando Valley, and elsewhere- and its impacts on the immediate neighborhood must be minimized.

I will summarize the main reasons for this opposition here:

1. Shoehorning 52,000 square feet of space on the Yeshiva’s small lot is just “too much building for too little land.” The limit of 45,000 square feet allowed by the 1999 CUP at 9760 West Pico Blvd. must be maintained.
2. The gym is too tall and the buildings are too close to the Yeshiva’s neighbors. The 1999 CUP specified a 65 foot setback from the new gym to the Yeshiva’s southern property line. The new plan has a mere 20 feet to the south and only 11 feet to the west! Larger setbacks must be required. All zoning laws must be enforced.
3. The number of high school students proposed is too many for the facility and must be limited to how many can be educated and fed on a “closed” campus. Students cannot be allowed to leave the YULA campus for lunch.

4. The proposed uses of the gym, with up to 700 attendees at an unlimited number of events, are just too much for a school surrounded by a quiet neighborhood of single family homes. The number of attendees should be restricted to those who can be accommodated by the very limited parking (only 100 spaces!). The number of events (other than games in which YULA teams are playing) must be limited to some reasonable number- 2 or 3 a month, perhaps?-, and events at YULA must be coordinated with events at the Museum of Tolerance.

5. Outdoor activities must be prohibited after 6:30 p.m.

6. The use of the facilities by YULA Girls High School students must be limited to that permitted by the 1999 CUP.

7. There is no need for yet another synagogue in the community. If it is going to be built, all zoning requirements for churches, including parking requirements, must be followed because “the permit runs with the land”. If YULA ends up being sold or leased to adherents of a different religion which allows driving to its church or temple or mosque, there will be too much vehicular traffic and noise on their religious holy days. No kiddush ceremonies should be allowed at the Beit Midrash.

8. The parking restrictions on YULA students and visitors are not currently enforced by YULA’s security guards, and it is not clear to anyone how YULA can prevent its visitors from parking on the small, crowded neighborhood streets. Without the establishment of permit parking zones on all streets surrounding the Yeshiva, enforcement of any parking restriction by YULA or by the City is impossible! If permit parking is established, YULA should pay the fees for its neighbors.

Finally, both the 1999 CUP and other documents submitted by YULA require both the construction of a cul-de-sac or traffic diverter on Castello Avenue south of the Yeshiva’s parking lot entrance (to have all entry and egress from YULA be from and to Pico Blvd. to the north, as is mentioned in both the 1999 CUP and in the Proposed Conditions) and closure of the southbound traffic lanes on Roxbury Drive south of the alley south of Pico Blvd. This is not an option dependent on neighborhood opinion, but is required by the current plans approved by the City. Both must take place before any further Phase II construction can begin.

We urge you and the South Robertson Neighborhoods Council Board to oppose this expansion project in its current form. Additional steps must be taken to protect the Yeshiva’s neighbors before this radically expanded project can be approved. Thank you in advance for your consideration. Please disseminate this letter to the other members of the Land Use Committee, to the entire Board, and to any and all stakeholders.

Sincerely,

Daniel J. Fink

cc: Allen Abshez
Susan Gans
Department of City Planning
April 7, 2011

VIA E-MAIL

Doug Fitzsimmons
President
South Robertson Neighborhood Council
P.O. Box 35836
Los Angeles, CA 90034

RE: Yeshiva University Boys High School ("YULA")
Proposed Expansion and Conditions of Approval

Dear Doug:

It appears that some of my notes and comments on the “Amended and Restated Permit Conditions” (the “Proposed Conditions”), which I sent to you and Allan Abshez on Monday, have been misinterpreted by Allan and others. They apparently perceived my comments as a repudiation of all of the progress that has been made during the course of extensive negotiations between YULA and neighborhood representatives. That certainly was not the intention.

It is true that YULA representatives have met with me and other neighborhood residents in the hope of reaching an accord regarding the conditions that will govern the construction and operations of the expanded high school, and a lot of progress has indeed been made. Such discussions have been very cordial and productive. However, after reviewing the most recent draft of the Proposed Conditions, which was not sent to me until after the March 8th meeting of the Land Use Committee (which was a little over four months since the date of our last meeting [held November 4, 2010] with YULA representatives), and having had an opportunity to discuss the Proposed Conditions with area residents, I feel that there are several very important concerns that still need to be addressed, as summarized below, and that any approval of the expansion project and/or of the Proposed Conditions by the South Robertson Neighborhood Council (“SORONC”) would be premature at this time. I sincerely believe that, given additional time for one or two more meetings, both sides can come to an agreement regarding the conditions, which will sufficiently mitigate our concerns regarding the expansion itself.

The community realizes that it cannot stop the expansion altogether, nor is it realistic to demand (as much as we would prefer) that the expansion proceed within the parameters established in 1999.

All we are saying is that there is still much that can be done (without impairing YULA’s ability to be an excellent educational institution and to continue to grow, within reasonable limits), should be done (in order to preserve the quiet, peaceful nature of the surrounding residential neighborhood), and needs to be done, before the project and any conditions of a Conditional Use Permit can be approved by SORONC or any other government body.

Accordingly, I am requesting, on behalf of myself and many of my neighbors, that SORONC not approve the YULA expansion and the Proposed Conditions as they are...
being presented to SORONC at this time, but rather ask YULA to continue to meet in good faith with community representatives (for such additional period of time as the SORONC Executive Board determines to be appropriate) to resolve the outstanding issues as set forth in this letter.

I want to reiterate that our goal is not to stop the expansion, but rather to ensure that the conditions imposed on the project make sense, are capable of enforcement, and will truly protect the adjacent homeowners and preserve the very long-standing quiet and tranquil nature of the residential community of single-family homes into which YOLA/YULA transplanted itself.

This letter is divided into three sections:
I. Deficiencies in the Proposed Conditions
II. Responses to Allan Abshez's letter of March 2, 2011 to Terrence Gomes
III. Conclusion

I. Deficiencies in the Proposed Conditions

Paragraph numbers below correspond to the paragraph numbers in the Proposed Conditions.

It is very important that the conditions be CLEAR, lacking in ambiguity or loopholes, and ENFORCEABLE. Unfortunately, the previous management of the high school (which ran the school up until 2008) flagrantly and frequently violated the conditions of the 1999 Conditional Use Permit (the "1999 CUP") and of earlier conditional use permits, with total disregard for the welfare of their residential neighbors (we have many photographs and complaint letters to back up these claims). While we believe that the new management and administration at YULA is indeed a breath of fresh air, the prior regime left a legacy of distrust and anger, which necessitates that the conditions be very carefully drafted, leaving nothing to interpretation or up to the homeowners to have to police and enforce.

I also want to mention that I hold Rabbi Glass in very high regard, and he is very well liked in the community. I believe that he truly cares about both his students and YULA's neighbors, and he has always been available and has reacted promptly to complaints. However, the school and the conditions will eventually outlast even Rabbi Glass, and we need to have conditions which are capable of being enforced regardless of who the school principal is.

Note: I asked Allan Abshez for a copy of the Proposed Conditions in Word format, so that I could create a redlined copy that would show the further changes we believe are necessary and which would have been very easy for everyone to review, but this request was denied.

The comments are in order of the paragraphs to which they relate, and not in order of significance.

4. **Size of the Beit Midrash.** We were informed that the Beit Midrash (i.e., the prayer hall, where religious services are and should continue to be held) is not expanding in square footage or seating capacity. Thus, the last sentence should be revised to read: “The Beit Midrash shall not exceed its current size of ______ sq. ft. and current seating capacity of ________ persons.” [the blanks to be filled in with accurate current numbers]

7. **Users of YULA Facilities.** This paragraph should be revised to clarify that the “activities ordinary and incidental to high school operations” are those that are ordinary and
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incidental to “YULA high school operations”. Fundraising activities should be for YULA school activities (e.g., to raise money to buy new school or athletic equipment), not for non-school related “causes”, which can attract large crowds of people not affiliated with the school, and can easily be held elsewhere. *No other schools* can use the YULA facilities for *their* school plays, sports practices, graduation ceremonies, etc. This is not clear as currently proposed. Except for (a) customary high school-related events and activities in which YULA Boys HS students substantially and actively participate, (b) athletic tournaments of the leagues in which YULA Boys HS competes, (c) the use by YULA Girls HS as expressly set forth in Par. 8, (d) the use by community members for meetings as set forth in Par. 67, and (e) a limited number of "Special Events" in accordance with Par. 10) - - the gym/multi-purpose facility cannot be used for any other events, activities, functions or purposes.

The key concept is that this is a school, and that is what the YULA representatives have consistently said to us - - they simply want to run a school and be able to have school-related activities. Our concern is that it should not be used as a venue for such disruptive and noisy events as rallies and protests, as it was in the past, or (except for a limited number of permitted "Special Events") for dances and other social events, and community events.

The 1999 CUP contained the following sentence, which YULA has deleted from the Proposed Conditions, but which should be put back in: “*The YULA Girls High School athletic teams and any visiting teams (for either YULA Boys High School or YULA Girls High School competitions) shall be required to be bused to the YULA Facilities.*” This is important not only for purposes of reducing traffic in the area (especially since such teams will usually be arriving after-school, coinciding with peak PM traffic periods on Pico Blvd.) but also because of the very limited number of on-site parking spaces (which is well below normal L.A.M.C. requirements, due to a variance that was approved as part of the 1999 CUP, which allowed 85 spaces instead of the 215 spaces otherwise required by Section 12.21-A.4 of the L.A.M.C., which would presumably be closer to 300 spaces based on the even larger expansion contemplated in the current plans and Proposed Conditions).

This paragraph should also include a representation to the effect that: “All activities and events at the YULA Facilities, and all uses of the YULA Facilities (whether by YULA Boys High School, JSI, YOLA University and/or YOLA Synagogue) shall be and remain under the sole and exclusive jurisdiction of the officers and directors of YULA Boys High School, and subject to all of the conditions contained herein.” This is very important, because the community is concerned that the synagogue, in particular (why is it referred to as “YOLA” and not “YULA” synagogue??) may be or become partially or entirely run by Yeshiva of Los Angeles (“YOLA”), which is a separate corporate entity and is closely affiliated with the Simon Wiesenthal Center, which runs the adjacent Museum of Tolerance. YOLA is also the entity that owned and operated the high school before YULA took over, and YOLA's egregious conduct is the reason for much of the community’s animosity towards the school. Although it is the ground lessor of the YULA property, YOLA should have NO jurisdiction over the operations of the YULA Facilities. We have been assured that the synagogue is solely under the jurisdiction of YULA, not YOLA, and this needs to be reflected in the conditions.

**8. Use by YULA Girls High School.** Delete “if it is determined” in lines 10 and 11, because it’s unclear who will make such determination and how it will be made. Suffice it to say that YULA will make arrangements to provide adequate off-site parking *whenever* the on-site parking will not accommodate all users of the YULA Facilities.
9. **YOLA Synagogue.** Revise this paragraph as follows:

(a) It should be called “YULA Synagogue” if it is truly a part of and run by YULA;

(b) The paragraph is far more complicated than it needs to be, and thus incapable of enforcement. To make things simple, all religious services should be conducted indoors in the Beit Midrash, except for a brief Kiddush ceremony that can be conducted in the inner courtyard in accordance with condition # 11. With such a limitation, it is no longer necessary to distinguish between people affiliated or not affiliated with YULA, or talk about numbers of people on weekdays vs. weekends vs. religious holidays. Such limitations (as currently drafted) are impossible to police and enforce, and have not worked in the past - - in this regard, note that YOLA has long advertised itself as a “synagogue” in Jewish newspapers, even though such use is not allowed under the 1999 CUP!

The current seating capacity of the existing Beit Midrash (which we have been told is not going to increase) is a sufficient limitation on size. Add that no religious services can be held in the gym / “multi-purpose facility”, since capacity could easily greatly exceed the 200 person cap that YULA has already accepted.

10. **Special Events.** This is a very significant issue. The Proposed Conditions define a “Special Event” as any event that isn’t a school-related event or religious service, which is open to people other than students, their families, faculty and staff. **THERE IS NO LIMIT IN THE PROPOSED CONDITIONS ON THE NUMBER, THE SIZE, OR THE PURPOSE OF “SPECIAL EVENTS” - - this goes far beyond the terms of the 1999 cup and is unacceptable!** The 1999 CUP (in Par. 8) contained a similar definition of “Special Event” (but it included school dances and school fund-raising events as Special Events, which the Proposed Conditions do not) AND it limited the number of Special Events to EIGHT in a single calendar year. We are proposing that we start with FIVE Special Events, and allow for the number to be increased by one Special Event per year, up to a maximum of eight, provided that such Special Events are not disruptive or annoying to area residents (as determined by complaints received by the Council Office, the Roxbury-Beverwil Homeowners Alliance ["RBHA"] and/or the Community Relations Committee [as defined in Par. 28]).

The reason for the reduction from 8 to 5 is that the 1999 CUP did not contemplate the expansion of the adjacent Museum of Tolerance into an enormous banquet / catering / event venue, capable of holding events for 800 or more people. In addition, the 1999 CUP contemplated that additional parking for YULA events would be available in the Museum garage, which is now no longer available. The impact on the surrounding residential community of simultaneous events being held at both YULA and the Museum, with the potential of over 1,500 people arriving and looking for parking (with a total of only 300 on-site parking spaces between the two properties, and very little off-site parking guaranteed to be available if needed), will be horrific. Accordingly, we recommend that we start conservatively with five “Special Events” per year, and see how that works out.

Note that YULA representatives often mention the property (formerly the Love's BBQ and the Beverly Hills Ford dealership, at the southeast corner of Pico and Castello) as being available
for additional YULA parking. However, this property is owned by a third party which is not affiliated with YULA or YOLA, and there is no guarantee (or even reason to believe) that it will be available for YULA overflow parking by the time the YULA expansion is completed. Moreover, YULA and the Museum may well be in competition for the very limited amounts of nearby off-site parking, if simultaneous events at both facilities require more than the aggregate 300 on-site parking spaces.

Regarding the definition of “Special Event”, let’s keep it simple. Any event that is advertised to the general public and/or is attended by more than 400 people (the number of fixed seats in the gym) should be deemed to be a “Special Event”.

Please note: the 1999 CUP was the result of extensive negotiations between representatives of YOLA, the community and the Council Office (then Councilman Mike Feuer), and was very carefully drafted by Zoning Administrator Lourdes Green, after numerous public hearings, and reviewing the conditional use permits of several other schools located in residential areas (including The Archer School, Harvard-Westlake, Buckley, and Oakwood). Ms. Green did an excellent job. The conditions she drafted were based on conditions in effect and working at other schools in virtually identical situations, and they should not be discarded so cavalierly.

11. Religious Ceremonies. A sentence should be added that: “All religious ceremonies allowed under these conditions will be conducted entirely indoors, except for a brief Kiddush ceremony which may be held in the inner courtyard, provided no noise is audible outside the boundaries of the YULA Facilities. If two or more residential neighbors complain of noise, the Kiddush ceremonies will thereafter be held indoors.”

12. Outdoor Activities. The 1999 CUP (Par. 13) required that use of any outdoor area for athletic activities or Special Events be limited to the hours of 8:30 AM to 6:30 PM. and also (in Par. 10) that except for certain Special Events (and only under very strict conditions), the outdoor areas could only be used for athletic, meditation and individual study activities and student eating.

The rationale provided by YOLA in 1999 for the Phase II expansion was that all of the noisy activities that had been conducted outdoors would be brought indoors, which would be a substantial benefit to the adjacent neighbors (which is true).

We only want what we were promised in 1999, and which was one of the primary reasons the Planning Department approved the expansion - - peace and quiet for YULA’s long-suffering neighbors. Accordingly, the only activities that should be permitted outdoors are meditation, individual (and perhaps some limited small class) study activities, and student eating (and Kiddush ceremonies, subject to the limitations set forth in Par. 11 above). All athletic activity (including basketball) should be conducted in the new gym, as was promised to the City Planning Department and the community. And all outdoor activities (other than such Kiddush ceremonies) should end promptly at 6:30 PM. We are o.k. with the requested exceptions for Purim, Simchat Torah and Shavuos, provided that activities on such holidays will be moved indoors, if anyone in the neighborhood complains of noise coming from the YULA Facilities after 11:30 PM.

In this regard, please note that many neighborhood residents are either elderly or else families with young children, and such residents (even more than others) must go to sleep early for general health reasons.
Alternatively, rather than basing future outdoor use on the number of complaints from neighbors (as provided above and in Par. 11), YULA can install sound measuring equipment (by technicians mutually approved by YULA and the RBHA) which will be able to determine whether noise is audible outside the YULA property line in violation of the conditions.

In addition, this paragraph should provide that gym classes should not traverse through or be conducted in residential neighborhoods. In the past, groups of students have gone running in the residential neighborhood, often talking loudly while running. The students should run along Pico Blvd. over to Roxbury Park or Rancho Park.

14. **Off-campus Eating Privileges for YULA Boys High School Students.** The 1999 CUP (Par. 14) prohibited students from eating off-campus except as part of an organized, supervised activity outside of the residential neighborhood, or as a special privilege program extended only to 12th graders, and only at normal lunch time, and limited to only 25 students at a time.

The Proposed Conditions, which also provide for a student body that is 40% LARGER than what was permitted under the 1999 CUP (300, phasing up to 350 high school students, versus the maximum of 250 high school students allowed under the 1999 CUP, Par. 85), would also allow ALL 11th and 12th graders (approximately 175 students!!) to eat off-campus. There is no reason for this, and it is unacceptable, since there is no way to keep students from loitering in the neighborhood and littering our lawns and playing their car radios loudly - - all of which have been very serious problems. Allowing off-campus eating will also increase neighborhood traffic during lunch time (and the number of teenage drivers with proven poor driving skills speeding down our streets where young children play), because there is only one kosher restaurant within a short walking distance. Other than the Museum café, which is supposed to be only for Museum visitors, and the Fish Grill one block away, the closest kosher restaurant is several blocks to the east - - not a manageable walking distance during a one-hour lunch period.

In short, there is simply no need or reason to let 175 teenagers lose in a residential neighborhood every day for lunch.

15. **Sound Amplification Outdoors.** This condition should be expanded to provide that there will be no musical performances (whether or not amplified) of any kind in any outdoor areas.

17. **Size of Enrollment:** While we’re certainly not thrilled about the proposed increase in the high school enrollment, since it is the high school students who create virtually all of the problems for the neighborhood (noise, traffic, reckless driving, littering and loitering), we do not object to the increase provided that the other conditions are modified as set forth in this letter. My handwritten notes on the Proposed Conditions, which I sent to you earlier this week, merely served to point out the increase over the number of high school students permitted in the 1999 CUP). If these notes were misinterpreted as an objection to the increased enrollment, that was certainly not the intention. However, it is because of the 40% increase in enrollment over what was approved in the 1999 CUP, that the tightening of the conditions and elimination of ambiguity and loopholes is so important.

18. **Future Increases in Enrollment:** Since the high school enrollment is already substantially increased over what was allowed in 1999, we feel that future requests for
increases should be subject to plan approval review if the request doesn’t exceed 15% (rather than 20%), and to a full conditional use review if the request exceeds 15% (rather than 20%).

21. **Prohibition of Parking on Residential Streets.** YULA needs to include some specific, viable and workable means for enforcing this condition. The residents do not want to be forced to be vigilantes in this regard, taking down license plate numbers and reporting them to YULA. YULA security guards and other YULA employees (or perhaps even parent volunteers) must be very proactive in this regard.

22. **Parking.** The last sentence should be revised to clarify that YULA will be required to use reasonable efforts to coordinate all events and activities (and any combination thereof at a given time) which will exceed on-site parking availability of 100 spaces, with any events at the Museum (other than normal day-time museum visitors).

23. **Drop-offs/Pick-ups.** Delete the obvious loophole of “to the extent feasible”. The loading and unloading of students on-site should be a firm requirement (although area residents would not object to drop-offs and pick-ups on Castello NORTH of the required traffic diverter or on Pico Boulevard during non-peak hours).

23A. **Connection to the Museum.** YULA’s representatives have repeatedly insisted that there is no longer any affiliation between YULA and YOLA or the Simon Wiesenthal Center. Likewise, the alleged need for the bridge that physically connects YULA and the Museum (i.e., so that YULA students could carry art from the Museum into the school, without going outside and possibly damaging the art) no longer exists (if it ever did, since the rationale for the bridge always seemed to be implausible and spurious, and the 2nd and 3rd floors have never been used for the classroom and art studio space for which they were required to be used pursuant to the 1999 CUP). The Museum has now officially annexed the 2nd and 3rd floors of the West Wing, the first floor of which is occupied by YULA. There is no need (other than to have a stairwell that can provide access to the first floor in case of an emergency and in which an alarm will sound if the door is opened in a non-emergency) to provide access from YULA’s first floor to the Museum’s 2nd and 3rd floors. Likewise, the elevator in the West Wing would be set to operate only between the 2nd and 3rd floors (the elevator would not be used in an emergency, so emergency access to the 1st floor is not an issue). In other words, people who are in the Museum should not be able to use the bridge to enter the YULA Facilities, and vice versa. If YULA and the Museum/Simon Wiesenthal Center are indeed completely separate entities and spaces, there is no justification for such interior access and physical connection.

31. **Signage.** We are requesting that “Hollywood Bowl” and “Greek Theatre” type signage be placed in prominent locations at the driveway exit, requesting all persons leaving the premises to be quiet and respectful of area residents as they drive or walk through the adjacent neighborhood.

37. **Private Agreement.** In addition to recording a covenant that runs with the land (which in the case of the Museum proved to be absolutely worthless), YULA representatives have already agreed that the conditions would be codified in a binding, enforceable agreement between YULA and the RBHA, giving the RBHA a private right of enforcement, and making the conditions binding upon the successors, licensees and assigns of YULA. Even though this was agreed to, it is not reflected in the conditions and should be.
38. **Rooftop Equipment.** Should be set back to the maximum extent feasible from both Castello Avenue and from the southerly property line.

39. **dBA Levels.** We would like to have the opportunity to review the cited decibel levels with a noise engineer/expert.

40. **Equipment Noise/ Light.** We have been informed that the fan room (located, in the plans submitted to SORONC by YULA, immediately adjacent to the single family residence on the west) has been moved to an area farther away from any homes. It should be a requirement that the fan room be located as far away as possible from, and the equipment in the fan room inaudible by YULA's residential neighbors. The last sentence of this paragraph should be revised to provide that light from any windows and doors along the southerly property line (or facing south) will not disturb any neighborhood residents.

57. **Catering trucks (during construction).** This paragraph should be revised to provide that truck drivers who disregard instructions will not be allowed to return to the jobsite or vicinity.

61. **Traffic diverter.** The traffic diverter/ cul de sac was required in the 1999 CUP. Furthermore, the Draft EIR for the YULA expansion project provides that:

   “If the cul de sac [is] not included in the future conditions, it is estimated that 398 project trips would travel along Castello Avenue, resulting in a significant impact.” [Recirculated Traffic/Transportation/Parking Chapter, Page II-43]

   “. . . in the event the cul-de-sac were not constructed as required by Condition 75 of the 199 [sic] CUP, significant traffic impacts would occur at three intersections [i.e., Pico and Castello, Pico and Beverwil, and Pico and Beverly Drive] during one or both peak hours.” [same, Pages II-37 and II-48]

I am personally strongly in favor of the cul de sac. I think the traffic impacts of the YULA expansion on the neighborhood, if there is no cul de sac, will be disastrous, with numerous car accidents and increasing risk of serious bodily injury to neighborhood residents, including young children and the elderly. This is not speculation – several residents still have indelible memories of the afternoon when two YULA students, drag racing south on Castello Avenue, lost control of their vehicles, and one of the cars ended up on the front lawn of the house at the southeast corner of Saturn and Castello, where infant children often played at that time of day (which same house is currently occupied by two other infant children).

In addition, (a) since the cul de sac is to be completed prior to commencement of construction, it will prevent large construction vehicles from using the narrow residential streets to access the construction site; and (b) it will help substantially in keeping Museum traffic from cutting south on Castello and attempting to loop back to the Simon Wiesenthal Center building to park or look for parking on residential streets. However, I am aware that several people in the area do not want a cul de sac, or else think that we should take a "wait and see" approach. The problem with the latter is that there is no guarantee (unless YULA is willing to put the necessary funds in an escrow account) that the funds needed to install a cul de sac and redesign and relandscape the driveway area, will be available when the community finally realizes that the cul de sac is necessary (and we only pray that they don't come to that realization after a vehicle speeding down Castello runs over a pedestrian!). The survey conducted by YULA in this regard was a
farce (see below), and we intend to conduct a thorough door-to-door in person survey within the next several weeks, in order to get a more reliable and more extensive response.

However, assuming that there will be a cul de sac, the following should be added to the conditions:

(a) The traffic diverter should be designed in such a manner as to prevent regular through-traffic but provide access for emergency vehicles. In this regard, there should be no landscaping on the street north of the diverter (i.e., nothing to get in the path of emergency vehicle drivers) and a sufficient portion of the curb should have a rolled curb which emergency vehicles can easily drive over. Indeed, the Draft EIR expressly states that "THE CUL DE SAC REQUIRED BY THE 1999 CUP WOULD NOT INTERFERE WITH EMERGENCY ACCESS AS IT WOULD BE DESIGNED WITH A ROLLED-CURB SO THAT FIRE TRUCKS, EMERGENCY AND POLICE VEHICLES COULD DRIVE OVER THE CURB IN THE EVENT OF AN EMERGENCY." (Emphasis added, Draft EIR, February 26, 2009, Page I-19).

(b) The "no right turn" sign at the corner of Pico and Castello will be removed.

(c) Except for the people who live in the homes located on the north side of Alcott Street, whose garages can only be accessed via the alley behind their homes, traffic should be prohibited in the alley. Cut-through traffic heading to or from YULA from either the Castello or Beverwil entrance to the alley will put these residents at risk and be very noisy and disruptive, especially late at night. And there will otherwise be a lot of such cut-through traffic, due to the difficulty of making a left-hand turn to go west on Pico. It may become necessary for YULA to install a gate at each end of the block long alley, which will open with card keys which will only be given to drivers who live on the north side of Alcott. Note that the discussion of the cul de sac in the Recirculated Traffic/Transportation/Parking Chapter of the Draft EIR makes no mention of the very serious problem of cut-through traffic in the alleyway that provides the sole access to the garages of approximately 15 homes - - this is a serious defect in the Draft EIR!

(d) The entire curb area on the south side of the diverter, as well as the entire curb running parallel to the easterly border of the YULA property should be painted red to create a "No Stopping Any Time" zone, in order to prevent pick-ups and drop-offs on the south side of the diverter.

(e) YULA will need to provide monitors during morning and evening drop-off/pick-up periods and during Special Events, not only at the diverter but also at least randomly along Alcott, Castello and Saturn Street, to prevent pick-ups and drop-offs on residential streets.

(f) YULA can't use the sidewalk or roadway on Castello Avenue north of the diverter, for any purposes other than as a driveway into the YULA garage, vehicular circulation,
and student drop-offs and pick-ups; i.e., there can be no street festivals, exhibit space, rallies, protests, seating, dining or any other events or activities, on these sidewalks or streets.

62. **Traffic reports.** Should be submitted annually, not just “for a minimum of the first 3 years following the first year of full enrollment” (and “full enrollment” wouldn’t occur until three years after completion of construction - - which is much too long to wait for a traffic report).

66. **Maximum Occupancy of Gym.** Maximum occupancy per the Proposed Conditions is **700 people!!** (with only 100 on-site parking spaces). This is too many people, especially in light of the potential for the Museum next door to have events with 800 or more people, possibly concurrently. The 1999 CUP (and remember that the Museum’s 800 seat banquet facility was not even contemplated in 1999) limited the capacity of the gym to only 300 plus the number of YOLA Boys High School students under the age of 16 (i.e., because it was assumed that boys of that age would not be driving to school and needing parking); thus, the maximum occupancy under the 1999 CUP was approximately 450 persons (increasing to approx. 475 when enrollment reaches its peak pursuant to Par. 17, assuming approx. half of the total enrollment is under 16 [9th and 10th graders]) - - versus the 700 now being proposed, and yet there are only 15 more parking spaces than provided for in the 1999 plans (see Par. 7 above re: variance from L.A.M.C. parking requirements of 215 spaces).

71. **Landscaped Buffer.** A sentence should be added to provide that there will be no seating areas in the 20 foot buffer area along the southerly side of the YULA property.

II. **Responses to Allan Abshez’s letter of March 2, 2011 to Terrence Gomes**

In light of several e-mails and letters that have been exchanged this week regarding Allan Abshez’s letter of March 2, 2011 (the "Letter") to Terrence Gomes, Chairperson of the SORONC Land Use Committee, I feel that it’s important to set the record straight.

The Letter is very well-crafted, evidencing a skilled lawyer’s ability to slant the facts, to omit certain material facts, and to make statements that are unsubstantiated by any evidence - - resulting in a presentation that portrays the plans in a very favorable light. As a result, although the Letter is factually correct (for the most part), it is at the same time very misleading to anyone who is not already well-informed about the situation and cannot read "between the lines".

Much of the background history Allan describes in his letter is “water under the bridge” at this point, but it helps to establish the context for the outrage that many residents feel regarding the proposed expansion, which unfortunately follows so closely on the heels of the highly controversial expansion of the adjacent Museum of Tolerance. (Note: Allan may argue that the two expansions are unrelated and that this was proven in court; however, the inescapable fact is that the DEIR for the YULA expansion project was issued not long after the DEIR for the adjacent Museum expansion project was issued, and the YULA DEIR actually assumed that the annexation described in the Museum’s DEIR had already been approved and the transfer of ownership been effectuated. The lawyers for the Museum and YULA had to have coordinated their strategy and their timing to figure out the entire, very complicated scheme. With respect to the court case, it never went to trial and no decision was ever entered, because the parties reached a settlement prior to trial.
With respect to the specifics of the Letter, taking one fallacy at a time, in order (the following being only a few highlights, and by no means a comprehensive list):

- "YULA Boys High School has long operated as a modern orthodox Judaic high school..." YULA Boys High School was actually not incorporated until 2008. The high school was previously run by Yeshiva of Los Angeles. All of the surrounding homes were built long before YOLA purchased the property from the Reiss Davis Childcare Center in the late 1970's, and many of these homes are still occupied by the original or second owners, who moved into the neighborhood between 1946 and the 1960's, when 9760 W. Pico was the site of a childcare center that closed every day by mid-afternoon.

- "Many YULA Boys High School families live in the surrounding neighborhood..." There is no support provided for this statement nor any definition of the boundaries of the "surrounding neighborhood", and we believe that at least as many, if not more, students live far enough away that they must be driven or take a bus or van to school.

- "...the Project proposes to maximize the use of the site..." This is actually true - - indeed, the F.A.R. and footprint of the structures have greatly increased, with much less open space and much smaller setbacks than in the plans that were approved in the 1999 CUP. The footprint is about as maximized as it can get. The only real open space will be in an inner courtyard, not visible to surrounding residences. The view of neighborhood residents will be of a much larger building than exists now or than was proposed in 1999, adjacent to a much larger building next door which was never contemplated in 1999. The YULA DEIR describes the visual character in an understatement that would be amusing if it weren't so disturbing: "Given the proximity of Related Project No. 53 [i.e., the Museum expansion], which would introduce expanded facilities with a maximum height of up to 64 feet eight inches high, it is conservative to conclude that implementation of Related Project No. 53 with the proposed [YULA expansion] project would result in a significant and unavoidable cumulative impact with respect to visual character." [YULA DEIR, page IV.B-9]

- "First, the Project seeks to reallocate enrollment by increasing the number of high school students..." This is true but, as explained above, it is the high school students who are the source of most of the complaints from the neighborhood (see page 6, par. 17 above). Thus, although it sounds great that the total number of students is not increasing from the number approved in 1999, the reallocation has a substantial impact. Again, we are not objecting to this, provided that the conditions of the CUP are revised so as to afford greater protections for the neighborhood.

- "...YULA Boys High School has engaged in a sustained and productive dialogue with neighbors". **This is absolutely correct**, and that is why we are so baffled and troubled about the fact that, although we had provided a list of various concerns to YULA's representatives at the last neighborhood meeting (held on November 4, 2010), we did not receive a copy of YULA's Proposed Conditions until **after** the March 8, 2011 Land Use Committee meeting (and only at my request), and no one from YULA or the Council Office notified any of the people who had participated in the previous meetings, about the Land Use Committee meeting. That being said, we are very receptive and eager to continue that dialogue so that we can reach an accord - - and that is why we are asking the SORONC Board not to approve the expansion at Thursday's meeting, and instead to allow the parties time to continue the dialogue. And the last thing we want is to drag this out much longer!
One way or another, the expansion is going to happen, so the important thing is to make sure there are conditions that truly protect the interests of the neighborhood.

- "... the Project includes a reduction of the site to eliminate the approximately 7,153 square feet West Wing from the premises governed by the CUP." While it is factually correct that the Museum has annexed these 7,153 square feet, this footage has not evaporated into thin air - - the 2nd and 3rd stories are still there, in the same place as always, so the density of development at the 9760 West Pico Blvd. address is only increasing, not decreasing. YULA's frequent references to a reduction in the new square footage approved in the 1999 CUP are a subterfuge. The YULA DEIR does acknowledge, as discreetly as possible: "The project adds some square footage to offset the elimination of the approximately 7,153 square foot West Wing area which is no longer part of the school premises." [YULA DEIR, page II-2].

These are the facts:

1. The 1999 CUP authorized 10,500 sq. feet of NEW construction in Phase II [1999 CUP, Par. 4].
2. YULA now seeks to authorization for 19,953 sq. feet of NEW construction [YULA DEIR, page II-3; Letter, page 4].
3. 19,953 minus 10,500 = 9,453 sq. feet (the additional sq. footage per YULA's new plans).
4. The 9,543 sq. feet is the "some square footage" to offset the elimination of the 7,153 square feet.
5. 9,543 minus 7,153 = 2,390 sq. feet (the amount of new construction in EXCESS of the amount annexed by the Museum).

Bottom line: the Museum annexed 7,153 sq. feet of space that was originally approved to be classroom/art studio space for YOLA (now YULA). YULA now wants to build new classroom and office space to compensate for "offset" the annexed space, but it is using 9,453 sq. ft. of new construction to compensate for the 7,153 sq. feet that were "eliminated" (but which of course are still there, but just not available for YULA's use).

- "The Project proposes a maximum total build-out of 45,000 square feet, which is approximately 2,100 sq. ft. less than the 47,100 sq. feet approved by the 1999 CUP." Again, that 7,153 sq. feet in the West Wing has not disappeared.

These are the facts:

1. Total build-out of 45,000 sq. feet + 7,153 sq. feet that REMAINS at 9760 W. Pico Blvd. = 52,153 sq. feet.
2. 52,153 sq. ft. (total developed square footage at 9760 W. Pico Blvd.) minus 47,100 sq. ft. (approved by the 1999 CUP) = 5,053 MORE sq. feet of developed square footage at 9760 W. Pico Blvd. than the 1999 CUP contemplated/approved.
"The classroom structures . . . would be set back . . . with a full 20-foot wide landscape buffer." This subtle and clever "half-full/half empty" drafting technique is used throughout YULA's documents, including the DEIR. What some might regard as a "full 20 feet", most would deem to be "only 20 feet", which is a very narrow and insufficient buffer, about the length of a Ford F-150 pick-up truck - - not a heck of a lot of space to separate one's single-story home from a high school building.

We recognize and appreciate the fact that the height of the structure at the end of the buffer area is only 16 feet, but the attempt to inflate the concept of a meager 20 foot setback by use of the adjective "full" is an insult to our intelligence.

". . . the remaining outdoor spaces on campus will be internally oriented and enclosed, providing improved noise containment to benefit adjacent neighbors." It is the use of the word "improved" here which is of concern. Any "improvement" is better than nothing, but how much "improvement" will there be, and will it be significant enough to justify all that YULA wants to do? YULA's neighbors have put up with a lot of noise in the past, and the objective, in light of YULA's location surrounded on three sides by single-family homes, should be virtually total noise containment.

. . . the school conducted a survey to determine whether the required cul-de-sac is currently supported by neighbors surrounding the school . . . the prevailing sentiment of those who responded is against the installation of the cul-de-sac, at least at the present time." The fact is that the "survey" was a farce, and the results are worthless, for the following reasons:

1. The survey contained no information whatsoever about the reasons why the 1999 CUP had required the cul-de-sac, or the "pros" and "cons" of the cul-de-sac, and very few recipients know enough about the proposed expansion (such as the size of the new gym/auditorium, the hours of operation, the lack of any limits on the number or size of special events, the proposed size of the synagogue, the increase in high school enrollment, and most of all, the anticipated significant traffic impacts on Castello and at three intersections, as described in the DEIR).

2. The survey did not mention that the conditions REQUIRE that the cul-de-sac not interfere with emergency access, and that it is required to be designed with a rolled-curb so that fire trucks, emergency and police vehicles can drive over the curb. Instead, homeowners were led to believe that the traffic diverter would have a regular-height curb and that there would be a large circle of landscaping in the center of Castello Avenue, effectively deterring emergency vehicles from turning onto Castello.

3. The response was extremely low, and not enough to arrive at any decision as to community sentiment on the issue.

4. Those who voted to "wait and see" do not understand that there is no guarantee that funds will be available in the future to install the cul de sac, if they later decide that it's necessary after all. Thus, the neighborhood could end up stuck with an intolerable traffic situation.

5. The survey did not include information addressing other concerns that have been raised, including how to prevent cut-through traffic in the alley north of Alcott Street, and how YULA would prevent pick-ups and drop-offs south and east of the diverter. If such
information had been included in the survey form, there might have been more responses in favor of the cul-de-sac.

Accordingly, we intend to conduct our own door-to-door survey and use that to determine whether there is a majority opinion on this important issue.

- "The Project proposes to modify the current operating conditions, many of which are confusing, impractical or obsolete." YULA has been saying this for years, and it is simply their opinion, with which we strongly disagree. Those of us who worked alongside Zoning Administrator Lourdes Green and then-Councilman Mike Feuer to draft the conditions know that a lot of thought went into them, and that they are very largely based on conditions that were in the CUP's for several other private high schools situated in residential communities (see Par. 10 on page 5 above). The conditions in the 1999 CUP probably seem "impractical" to YULA, because they don't allow YULA to do everything it wants to do. This is because the conditions were designed to limit activities at the school in order to better protect the neighborhood. Unfortunately, the Proposed Conditions eliminate too many of the limitations that were intentionally included in the 1999 CUP, particularly with respect to "Special Events" (see Par. 10 on page 5 above).

- "... the proposed conditions... reflect the general substance of those discussions [with adjacent neighbors]." See above - - we did not receive the current draft of the Proposed Conditions until a few weeks ago, and as this letter evidences, there are still substantial issues of concern. Although the Proposed Comments do reflect some of what we discussed with YULA's representatives, a lot of what we requested is not reflected therein, and some of the things that were agreed to are also not reflected therein.

- "The Project proposes to increase the number of persons permitted to use the facilities for religious activities and prayer services during non-school hours." Fact: The Project actually seeks to create an entirely NEW operation that was not even mentioned, and certainly not authorized or approved, in the 1999 CUP - - that of the "YOLA Synagogue" [compare Par. 7 in the 1999 CUP to Par. 7 in the Proposed Conditions, which adds "Yeshiva of Los Angeles synagogue as a new subpart (d). There has never been a synagogue (or at least not one that was authorized to be) on the premises. Rather, the 1999 CUP authorized a prayer hall for faculty, students and their families, and a very limited number of neighborhood residents who would walk to YULA for religious services. The proposed increase in the number of participants is enormous - - an increase of 300% over the number approved in 1999. There are already numerous Orthodox synagogues in the immediate area, and no facts are asserted to substantiate the need for another one. In light of the fact that YOLA owns both the property on which YULA is located and likewise owns directly or indirectly the property on which the Museum is located, we have long suspected that the real reason for the official creation of "YOLA Synagogue" is to provide a built-in clientele for the new banquet facility next door in the Museum. If this is not the case, then YULA should have no reason to have internal access between the first floor of the West Wing and the Museum building and thus no objection to the request made in our proposed new condition 23A, as set forth on page 7 above.

- "The Project would not permit wedding ceremonies, banquets or receptions, nor would it permit Bar or Bat Mitzvah banquets or receptions." This may sound great, but it omits the fact that such banquets and receptions will simply take place next door, in the Museum's new banquet/catering facility (when built) - - and it was very likely planned from inception.
that the religious ceremonies will take place at the YOLA Synagogue, with the festivities to follow in the adjacent Museum.

- "Several of the changes increase flexibility of operating conditions . . . . consistent with that of other public and private high schools throughout the area." First, conditions should only be compared to those of other private (not public) high schools, and only those that are located on property zoned R1-1 and surrounded by single-family residences. Second, no evidence has been provided to substantiate this claim. To the contrary, the conditions in the 1999 CUP, which YULA is rejecting as being "impractical", are in fact based directly on the conditions governing the operations of other similarly situated private schools.

- "... the Project proposes only a modification to an existing project that was approved following environmental review . . . ." The referenced "environmental review" was merely a Mitigated Negative Declaration, which is basically no environmental review whatsoever. The reason there was no environmental review required in 1999, and there was one required in 2008-2009, is that there was no Museum expansion contemplated in 1999, but in 2008 it became necessary to study the cumulative impacts.

**CONCLUSION**

I hope that the foregoing has provided sufficient information for you to "read between the lines" of Allan's letter and to listen to YULA's presentation on Thursday evening with an objective, open mind.

As I've written in this letter, and said in person to Allan and other YULA representatives, it is not my goal to stop the expansion or turn back the clock to 1999. However, I hope that I have convinced you and the SORONC Board, and perhaps even YULA's representatives, that the concerns expressed herein have real merit, that the Proposed Conditions require further work and fine-tuning, that it is in everyone's best interests to continue our efforts to reach an accord and avoid a protracted, costly battle - - and that the ONLY way to accomplish this is to not "rush to judgment" and approve the project tonight. Instead, we request that you express concern about the issues raised in this letter and that you ask YULA to meet with me and other homeowners in the neighborhood, to continue what we think has been and will continue to be a "productive dialogue."

Sincerely,

/s/ Susan Gans
SORONC Stakeholder,
Member of the Roxbury-Beverwil Homeowners Alliance
November 14, 2007

Susan Burden
Yeshiva of Los Angeles
9760 W. Pico Blvd.
Los Angeles, CA 90035

Re: Drag Racing by YOLA Students

Dear Susan:

This is just UNBELIEVABLE! Especially right now, at this delicate time!!

At approximately 6:15 p.m. this evening, I was walking home from a pleasant street corner discussion with Liebe Geft about the proposed Museum of Tolerance expansion when I saw my neighbor, Sol de Picciotto (9741 Saturn Street) taking pictures of a black late-model Lexus sedan, license 5YWU020. The vehicle had two flat tires! I asked him what had had happened since I knew that wasn’t his vehicle.

He told me that his wife, Carol, was at home between 4:30 and 4:45 p.m. when she heard a loud crash. She ran outside and saw this car on the front lawn of the vacant house at 9748 Saturn Street. The back tires were at the curb. There was another vehicle filled with YOLA students headed south on Castello Avenue. This vehicle stopped and the students got out. One got into a black SUV in front of Carol’s house and sped away. The student driving the Lexus somehow backed his car off the sidewalk and was able to move it to the curb on Castello just next to the house at 9751 Saturn Street. He told Carol that the car in front of him stopped suddenly and he had to swerve up on the sidewalk to avoid hitting it. We think he was lying, and that the Yeshiva bochurim were drag racing on Castello. At the very least, the Lexus was going far too fast and following the other vehicle too closely. The pictures document the license plate number, the two flat front tires, and tire tracks on the sidewalk. There is “front end damage” but the picture was too dark. Sol had come home, and was taking pictures to document this. I took my own pictures, which are attached!

I called LAPD but they said that if there was no damage to City property, and if the driver wasn’t there, they didn’t have any authority to do anything so no police unit came.
The two children who live at 9742 Saturn frequently play right there where the car ran up on the lawn. Other neighbors walk their dogs right there. It was only a matter of sheer luck - the rabbis might invoke Divine providence - that no one was killed!

Since Rabbi Tendler left, I don’t know who is in charge at YOLA. Please bring this to his immediate attention and have him take appropriate administrative action(s) with the student(s) involved. I assume you will be able to identify the driver from school records. He should be able to provide the names of the other student drivers and passengers involved. I have spoken with Ms. de Picciotto, and she also will be glad to discuss this with you. She can be reached at 310.551.1505.

We don’t know why the YOLA guards, who are right there in the guard house, didn’t intervene. Didn’t they hear the crash? Didn’t they see the car up on the sidewalk? Was this accident captured by the video cameras that record our daily comings and goings on public sidewalks?

And to Councilman Weiss, who says the sky isn’t falling in our neighborhood, it is! To Sarah Rigamat and Maya Zaitzevsky, PLEASE PROTECT OUR NEIGHBORHOOD from Rabbi Hier and his 3 institutions! They must be shut down. They can’t even follow the existing 1986 and 1999 Conditional Use Permits. They can’t be allowed to expand.

Sincerely,

Daniel J. Fink, M.D.

cc: Councilman Weiss
    Maya Zaitzevsky
    Sarah Rigamat
    Susan Gans
    Sol and Carol de Picciotto
    Duke Helfand
Photographs and comments from Daniel Fink

Subject: YULA student vehicle that went up on lawn at 9748 Saturn Street during drag race southbound on Castello Ave during YULA evening dismissal time Nov 14, 2007  note front-end damage. Picture taken Nov 15, 2007  parked on Castello Ave at 9751 Saturn

Subject: overflowing trash bins at YULA's western property boundary, Yomtob home in background  May 11, 2008
Subject: swimming pool on YULA parking lot  Feb 26, 2009
Subject: YULA students parked/loitering on Saturn St in front of 9732 Saturn St May 12, 2009 approximately 5:30 p.m.

Subject: YULA students loitering next to their parked vehicle, 9732 Saturn St May 12, 2009 approx 5:30 pm
Subject: YULA morning traffic chaos on Castello Avenue  Feb 27, 2009

this picture and the next document the morning traffic chaos on Castello Avenue during morning YULA student drop off
	his is why the cul-de-sac was required by the City in the 1999 Conditional Use Permit BEFORE any construction could begin

both existing and proposed Conditions specify that entry and egress to the YULA campus should take place from the north, from Pico Blvd., to minimize disruption to YULA's neighbors and our quiet residential streets

In letters to the Los Angeles Department of City Planning, I have proposed signage that will eliminate what I call "race track" traffic on Castello Avenue and Alcott Street when the cul-de-sac is built

What I mean by "race track" traffic is parents driving west on Alcott dropping off the students south of the cul-de-sac, and then proceeding south on Castello to Cashio, or vice versa.

Traffic is like water. Just like water standing on a roof will find a way to leak in, traffic will find a way to get around what the City planners and traffic engineers intended.

So the correct signage, and vigorous enforcement, are needed to protect our neighborhood.

Obviously, those students parking (and YULA staff and visitors) would have to enter Castello from north of the cul-de-sac to get into the YULA parking lot or structure.
the line of YULA cars extended from the entrance to the parking lot almost all the way south to Cashio Street on this Friday morning
From Daniel Fink:
enclosed is a traffic study I personally performed in 2008, because the numbers provided by YULA’s traffic consultant seemed to underestimate reality by a significant factor.
they re-did the traffic study, and resubmitted it, but again the numbers didn’t add up.
more cars entered than left. Are YULA students’ cars able to levitate?
of note is the VERY small number of students who walked.
in a true neighborhood school, the students walk
As Allen Abshez states in his April 6 letter, YULA is a community school. It is NOT a neighborhood school.
Our quiet residential neighborhood must be protected!

TRAFFIC STUDY  YULA BOYS HIGH SCHOOL  9760 West Pico Blvd.  (FIRST DRAFT)
Thursday, December 18, 2008
Methodology: I parked on Castello Avenue just south of Alcott Street, on the side of the house at 9750 Alcott, from 0700 until 0745. Cars were counted as they stopped on Castello to drop off students, or entered the parking lot. I attempted to count cars that parked and did not enter but this count may not be accurate. Pedestrians and bicycle riders were also counted.
I also noted whether the car entered Castello from the north (i.e., from Pico Blvd.) or from the south (i.e., Cashio). I was not able to document if the cars had come from the east or west. Several cars entered Castello from the alley north of Alcott and south of the former restaurant, and one or two came down Alcott.
The parking gate was closed and was opened and closed for one car a 0702. It was then opened for the day at 0706.
Peak traffic was between 0715 and 0730 (I think the religious service before school starts at 0730. I will try to check this.) when 82 cars were counted.
The YULA bus entered the lot at 0715, carrying 8-10 students. At approximately 0720 it backed up to park, emitting a loud warning noise.
There were 115 total cars. 58 cars entered from the north, 57 from the south. Of these, 2 came to Castello via the alley, and one on Alcott. Approximately 16 cars did not enter
the alley, but just dropped off the student at various locations on Castello. Most cars only carried one student, a few carried 2 students. I was unable to record this in any detail.

There were 9 students who walked (pedestrians) and 4 who arrived on bicycle.

Approximately 10 cars parked. These mainly appeared to be faculty.

Counting arriving and leaving the YULA campus each way as a trip, the total trips generated was 210 during this time period.