

Agenda Report

TO: CITY COUNCIL

DATE: November 1, 2004

FROM: CITY MANAGER

SUBJECT: PROPOSED CENTRAL DISTRICT SPECIFIC PLAN, AMENDMENTS TO THE LAND USE ELEMENT AND THE MOBILITY ELEMENT OF THE COMPREHENSIVE GENERAL PLAN, AND REVISION OF TITLE 17 OF THE PASADENA MUNICIPAL CODE

RECOMMENDATION

There is no recommendation. This report is for information and discussion.

BACKGROUND

The City Council held public hearings and discussions on the Central District Specific Plan, amendments to the Land Use and Mobility Elements of the General Plan, revision of the Zoning Code, and Environmental Impact Report at the meetings of September 27, October 4, and October 25, 2004.

On November 1, 2004 staff will conclude the presentation on the Central District Specific Plan. The Specific Plan provides land use policy, design standards and guidelines, and implementation strategies for Pasadena's urban core to accomplish the City's goal of a vibrant downtown.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 6.A. (7:00 P.M.)

In addition, on October 25, the Council requested a list of funding sources for transportation and how this funding is allocated. This list is included as Attachment A.

Respectfully submitted, Cynthia J. Kurtz

City Manager

Prepared by Jala-

Jason Kruckeberg
Assistant to the City Manager

A triamhosttA

City of Pasadena Transportation Funding

Pasadena collects and spends approximately \$6.7 million in transportation funding annually. Of this amount, about \$3.7 million, or 56 percent, is spent, or capital projects.

_	эрьтэүА		эрызуд	
Percent	Expenditures		Revenue	Funding Source
31%	275,100	Operating Expense	104,888,S	xeT seð
%69	846,286,1	Capital Appropriation		
·	5,484,320	Total Gas Tax	. <u> </u>	
%0	0	operating Expense	1,044,900	Commercial Development Fee
%00I	612'229	Capital Appropriation		
	612'229	Total Comm Dev Fee		
% Þ 6	2,808,151	Operating Expense	2,333,124	Proposition C Local Transit Fund
%9	299°161	Capital Appropriation		
	2,999,818	Total Prop C		
%0 <u></u>	0		458'020	Surface Transportation Program (STP)
	091'11	noitsingongqA IstigsO		
	091'11	9T2 letoT		
%0	0	esneqx∃ pnitereqO	144`665	Street Occupation Rental Fees
%00L	58'333 58'333	Capital Appropriation Total St Occup.		
		idnoso vo imo i	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
%0	0	Operating Expense	72,733	TDA Article 3/Bikeway Fund
	000'97	Capital Appropriation		
	42'000	AdT letoT		
7035	072'979'9 \$	ZOTAL EXPENDITURES	Z68'904'9 \$	TOTAL REVENUE
%99	£29'602'E	Operating		
%77	818,859,5	letiqeO		

Note: The figures shown represent the average revenue collected. O and M expenditures and capital appropriations over the last three fiscal years. Because STP can only be used on select system streets it is used in varying sums each year.

Rodriguez, Jane

From:	Robert Wittry [wittry@datast.net]	
Sent:	Tuesday, October 26, 2004 12:13 AM	
То:	Bill Bogaard; Jane Rodriguez	
Cc:	Cynthia Kurtz	
Subject:	Summary of Council Comment - TAZ area development	

Dear Bill & City Council,

In quick summary of what I stated this evening, GARBAGE IN, can only produce GARBAGE out.

The Transportation model was based on existing development in 2000 for the TAZ areas (Transportation Analysis Zones). By a careful block by block comparison, using the existing FAR and 2000 Census housing units, it is determined that the Commercial & Institutional floor area in each zone is substantially different than what was given to the traffic consultant for modeling. Similarly, the housing units were substantially different than what the traffic consultant analyzed.

We also have data for what the city considers "likely net-new development" in each TAZ area, both for Non-Residential square footage, and dwelling units. This also substantially disagrees with the development intensities that the city is allocating on the maps.

Thus the data needs to be revised to remove the inconsistencies, and the analysis properly done for the actual conditions.

Regardless, analyzing less than 12% of the critical intersections is not acceptable.

We don't need to adopt "overriding considerations", there is an alternative presented that can mitigate the majority of the impacts to "less than significant" level. And even if PM10 cannot be reduced to less than significant impact for our regional air quality, that is no excuse to allow additional unnecessary air pollution.

The city keeps stating that "growth must be targeted", but they keep forgetting that growth is to SERVE the NEEDS of the COMMUNITY!!!!

- Robert Wittry (626)791-7974 244 Flower St. Pasadena, CA 91104