

Jomsky, Mark

From: Jack Dawson <jbdawson@att.net>
Sent: Monday, December 10, 2012 2:08 PM
To: Jomsky, Mark
Subject: #710

as La Canada residents and local business man we do NOT want to see any #710 extension. Jack and Barbara Dawson,
5278 La Canada Blvd.

Jomsky, Mark

To: Jonathan Edwards
Subject: RE: SR710 Recommendation

From: Jonathan Edwards [mailto:jedwards@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, December 10, 2012 2:31 PM
To: Jomsky, Mark
Cc: cityclerk
Subject: SR710 Recommendation

Dear Mark, please pass on the following comments to the council regarding tonight's action on the 710 Extension:

I suggest that the council hold off on officially endorsing either LRT or BRT option until the SR710 Open Houses in January are conducted, and instead direct staff to explore further options in regards to Fred Dock's comments on the significance of the 2035 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP).

In particular, I suggest that Pasadena urge Metro to expand the LRT-4A alternative to continue that light rail option beyond the Fillmore Station and into Glendale, Burbank, and the San Fernando Valley. The benefits to Pasadena would be:

- 1. Strengthen the air quality results of the LRT option and thus avoid the tunnel option.**
- 2. Improve transportation options for Pasadena residents.**
- 3. Avoid the proposed Maintenance Yard in South Fair Oaks. South Fair Oaks is the area of Pasadena with the greatest opportunity and potential, with a phenomenal connection to Southern California's entire transportation network, and we mustn't waste it on a Maintenance Yard (or on its current use).**
- 4. Extending the LRT-4A option to connect with the Fillmore, Del Mar, and perhaps Memorial Park stations, and then continue west on to Glendale/Burbank/etc may be our best chance to go back and "fix" the Gold Line so that we get a grade separation at California Blvd and Del Mar Blvd.**

I think that this portion of Fred Dock's analysis is key:

Role of SR710 Extension in Achieving Air Quality Conformity for the Region

The recently unanimously adopted 2035 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) uses the SR710 Extension as a major element for achieving conformity with the State Implementation Plan for air quality. In the RTP modeling, the SR710 Extension as a tolled eight-lane freeway tunnel is shown to provide substantial congestion relief to the north-south freeway corridors in the central portion of the region. Without the on-going level of freeway capacity that is anticipated by the SR710 Extension, the RTP would not be able to achieve conformity and therefore other proposals would be required.

Regions that do not achieve conformity with their RTPs are subject to sanctions from the federal government that restrict the use of federal funds. In non-conformity areas, Federal Transit Administration (FTA) and Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) funds can only be spent on exempt projects, such as safety and certain public transportation projects, Transportation Control Measures from an approved State Implementation Plan, and project phases that were authorized by FHWA and FTA prior to the lapse in conformity.

I interpret this to mean that Metro is pushing the tunnel/highway option because they are counting on it to relieve commuter congestion on the 5 Freeway and thus reduce vehicle emissions. The Light Rail & Bus Options would not take a significant number of cars off of the road and therefore would not meet the air quality goals. Thus to achieve those air quality goals, additional projects or solutions must be proposed. If we don't meet those air quality goals, the region will lose federal funds. See the chart on pg 18 of the TAC PPT for an evaluation of the alternatives. F-7x is the tunnel. The damning numbers are the poor results in the top 4 categories, related to regional, local, and freeway transportation systems.

Therefore, Pasadena should explore Light Rail options that expand LRT-4A to not end at Fillmore, but rather continue on to the Del Mar & Memorial Park stations, and then break off to continue to Glendale and Burbank. That might take more cars off of the road, improve the air quality, and have a sufficiently substantial impact on commuting. And, if the light rail line continued on into the San Fernando Valley, that would resolve the maintenance yard issue for Pasadena.

Acting as an individual, and not in my capacity as president of the DPNA, sincerely,

Jonathan Edwards • DOWNTOWN PASADENA NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION

507 S Madison Ave, Apt #5 • Pasadena, California • cell (626) 676-3466 • home (626) 529-3089

www.downtownpasadena.org

"Like" us on [Facebook!](#)

<image001.jpg>

December 10, 2012

Pasadena City Council
100 N. Garfield Avenue
Pasadena, CA 91109

Re: Agenda Item No. 1 – City of Pasadena Position Related to SR-710 Alternatives

Dear Mayor Bogaard and Honorable City Council:



The Staff Report prepared for tonight's discussion indicates that Measure A prohibits the Council from opposing the Freeway Tunnel Alternative. If you are unable to express formal opposition, please express to Caltrans and Metro your strong concern that the tunnel will have serious negative effects on the City of Pasadena, and request that these impacts be fully analyzed in the Draft EIR/EIS. In particular, we support the staff's recommendation to authorize the Mayor to send a letter to the Metro Board of Directors with concerns for adequate resolution of the issues listed in Attachment A, but ask that you add "impacts to historic resources" as an issue to be resolved for each of the alternatives.

As the City of Pasadena's local historic preservation organization, Pasadena Heritage has been consistent since its founding in 1977 in opposing any proposed 710 freeway extension that would have detrimental impacts on historic buildings and districts in Pasadena. In evaluating the current SR-710 Study, Pasadena Heritage continues to advocate for this mission-based position.

Of the five alternatives currently under consideration in the SR-710 Study, the Freeway Tunnel Alternative is of particular concern for Pasadena Heritage due to its potential for drastic negative effects on historic resources in Pasadena. The freeway tunnel alignment along Pasadena and Saint John Avenues would cut through historic residential neighborhoods, including two highly intact historic districts previously identified by Caltrans as eligible for the National Register of Historic Places. These include the Markham Place Historic District and Pasadena Avenue Historic District. In addition, the Governor Markham Landmark District, a designated Pasadena Landmark District, is in the path of these alignments.

Pasadena Heritage has long advocated on behalf of the historic homes owned by Caltrans in these districts. We hold historic preservation covenants on six former Caltrans properties and continue to advocate for the release of the other historic residences back into private ownership. We also initiated and worked with then State Senator (now U.S. Representative) Adam Schiff to create the Historic Property Maintenance Fund, passed in 1999, that specifies rental income from Caltrans properties be set aside for repairs and maintenance of these historic homes.

We have recently submitted a nomination for the Markham Place Historic District to the National Register of Historic Places, which will soon elevate its status from "determined

eligible” to officially designated. Consistent with our previous position, Pasadena Heritage is seriously concerned with the Freeway Tunnel Alternative because of potential damage to, or demolition of, these historic resources.

The exceptional quality of life and economic viability of the City of Pasadena is owed in large part to its commitment to preserving the remarkable historic, cultural and architectural resources that make Pasadena unique. **It seems implausible that the Freeway Tunnel Alternative will not have significant negative impacts with respect to historic resources in Pasadena. Pasadena Heritage is watching closely as the alternatives are evaluated in the Draft EIR/EIS and will strongly oppose any of the alternatives that prove to have a detrimental impact.**

Sincerely,



Susan N. Mossman
Executive Director



Jenna Kachour
Preservation Director