

651 South Saint John Avenue
Pasadena, California 91105 2913
Telephone 626 441 6333
Facsimile 626 441 2917
www.pasadenaheritage.org

P A S A D E N A H E R I T A G E

August 10, 2012

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

Re: Pasadena Heritage Concerns Regarding SR-710 Study

Dear Mayor Bogaard and Honorable City Council:



The Staff Report prepared for your consideration of this matter urges you to formally oppose Alternatives H-2, H-6, and F-5 of the SR-710 Study. Pasadena Heritage, too, is concerned with these three alternatives, but would also like to bring your attention to Alternatives F-6 and F-7, which would potentially have as much, if not more, detrimental impacts.

The Staff Report indicates that the Council is limited in expressing its formal opposition to these two alternatives by Measure A, which was passed in 2001. **If you are unable to express formal opposition, then at the very least, please express to Caltrans and Metro your strong concern that Alternatives F-6 and F-7 will have serious negative effects on the City of Pasadena, and demand that these impacts be fully analyzed in the Draft EIR/EIS.**

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 12 alternatives currently under consideration in the SR-710 Study, five are of particular concern for Pasadena Heritage due to their potential for drastic negative effects on historic resources in Pasadena. These are:

- **Alternative H-2:** A new four or more lane highway alignment along portions of Avenue 64 and Colorado Boulevard.
- **Alternative H-6:** A new four or more lane highway alignment along portions of Columbia Street, Pasadena Avenue, and Saint John Avenue.
- **Alternative F-5:** A new high-speed, limited access freeway alignment along portions of Avenue 64 and Colorado Boulevard that could include tunnel, depressed, at-grade and/or elevated segments.
- **Alternative F-6:** A new high-speed, limited access freeway alignment utilizing the Caltrans-owned property along Pasadena Avenue and Saint John Avenue that would include at-grade and depressed segments.
- **Alternative F-7:** A new high-speed, limited access freeway alignment utilizing the Caltrans-owned property along Pasadena Avenue and Saint John Avenue that would be a tunnel with some depressed and at-grade segments.

South Pasadena Avenue & South Saint John Avenue (Alternatives H-6, F-6, and F-7)

The alternatives calling for highway or freeway alignments 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 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 Alternatives H-6, F-6, and F-7 because of potential damage to, or demolition of, these historic resources.

Avenue 64 & West Colorado Boulevard (Alternatives H-2 and F-5)

The comparatively new proposals for a highway or freeway alignment along Avenue 64 and Colorado Boulevard are also of concern to Pasadena Heritage, as they too have the potential for damage to, or demolition of, historic resources.

There are numerous known historic resources on Avenue 64, including the 1889 Church of the Angels, a designated Pasadena Landmark, and several properties identified in historic surveys by the City of Pasadena, such as the National Register-eligible Kono Kort, the Pasadena Landmark-eligible Annandale Court, and the West Colorado Boulevard/Avenue 64 Landmark District, an eligible Pasadena Landmark District.

Depending on the width of the proposed right-of-way, there could be risks to historic resources adjacent to Avenue 64 as well, not just those that front on the Avenue. For example, the designated Poppy Peak National Register Historic District, the designated Weston-Bungalowcraft Pasadena Landmark District, and the eligible Burleigh/Brentnal Pasadena Landmark District, as well as other known historic resources in proximity could be negatively impacted. For these reasons, Pasadena Heritage is also seriously concerned with Alternatives H-2 and F-5.

The West Pasadena Residents Association and the San Rafael Neighborhood Association, which represent the neighborhoods directly affected by these alternatives, have expressed their opposition to these alternatives for reasons that include not just threats to historic resources, but also other serious concerns for quality of life in the area, including additional traffic, noise, and pollution, isolating portions of the neighborhood, and reducing the tax base.

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 unavoidable that Alternatives H-2, H-6, F-5, F-6, and F-7 will 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

Via E-Mail
Mayor William Bogaard
Members of the City Council
100 N. Garfield Ave. Room S228
Pasadena, CA 91109

RE: 710 Alternatives

Dear Mayor Bogaard and Council Members,

I oppose all 710 extension options that would run through Pasadena. I believe that the F2, F5, F6 and F7 alternatives will not fix the problem they purport to solve and will diminish the culture, heritage and quality of life of our city.

Mark a center point between the city of South Pasadena on the south and the 134/210 freeways at Colorado Boulevard to the north and the F2, F5, F6 and F7 alternatives. What lies within that 3 to 5 mile radius? Homes; Churches; Huntington Hospital; the major medical center adjoining that hospital; Ronald McDonald House, Senior Living Residences; Community Gardens; Norton Simon Museum; Schools (San Rafael Elementary, Sequoia, Maranatha, Westridge, Mayfield, Chandler, Waverly to name a few); the central Arroyo Seco; Old Pasadena business district and other small businesses along the proposed corridors.

Currently, there is commuter traffic traveling from the 110 to the 134 and 210 via Pasadena and St. John Avenues. There are no trucks. Once an alternative is built, there will be trucks. And there will be increased car traffic on Pasadena's contiguous streets as commuters seek to avoid slow freeway traffic, some to avoid the slow truck traffic that will be coming our way. If it is a toll corridor, it will be even worse, with cars jumping to surface streets to avoid paying the toll.

Retaining the F-6 and F-7 options will turn Pasadena into one of the largest freeway intersections in Los Angeles: Pasadena will be the interchange center for four major freeways (710, 210, 134 and 110). WHO IS GOING TO WANT TO LIVE OR BUY A HOME ANYWHERE NEAR THIS? Certainly, they will not pay top dollar. And the charm of Old Pasadena and other restaurants and businesses throughout this area will be lost as well.

Metro doesn't deny that their intention is to create a new major trucking corridor that will lead from the Ports of LA and Long Beach to points north and east. The traffic, noise and pollution that would accompany this would forever change the landscape and quality of life of Pasadena and all surrounding communities that are near these freeways.

The tunnel option (Option F-7) does not spare Pasadena and may not be implemented as Metro has proposed. While the tunnel is shown to open around California Boulevard on the Metro maps, it has already been noted that there may not be enough room to make the grades and turns. The tunnel could end further south, Columbia Avenue for example, affecting a much larger swath of Pasadena

than currently indicated. The result would be a new 8-lane freeway through our city. The impact to Pasadena would be devastating

The grade from Valley Blvd. to California Blvd. is all uphill. The pollution that will be generated by slow-moving or stopped eighteen-wheelers through the tunnel will be dumped at its exit point; currently proposed between California and Del Mar Boulevards. It is documented that living in such proximity to such pollution affects the health and well being of all, especially those of children, the infirm, and the elderly—of which this corridor has in abundance.

Pasadena's key assets will be significantly and negatively affected:

Old Pasadena, restored with great effort and expense, will be negatively impacted. Efforts to extend Old Pasadena to the northwest will be crippled if this core area is diminished. Who wants to shop or sit in an outside café with an 8-lane freeway passing by and truck-filled overpasses overhead? Other cities have been developing their old towns and city centers. Glendale has Americana. People will simply go elsewhere. Loss of businesses will mean a loss of jobs and revenue.

The central Arroyo Seco, a major recreational venue, already traps noise and pollution from the 134 and 210 freeways. It is unlikely to remain a pleasant venue or place to live with the increased truck and car traffic and close proximity to the proposed major-freeway interchange.

We know the damage that the 210 Freeway did to our city, cutting it in half and displacing entire neighborhoods. The damage caused by the proposed 710 build out will be far greater. Please remember the promises made by transportation agencies in the past that have not been delivered. Study carefully the methodology and process that have yielded these Alternatives. The impact of any one of these on our city, not just during construction but forever after, will be to diminish our community.

It is time for transportation experts to step back from all of the 710 freeway extension proposals and come up with 21st century solutions to move goods from the Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach to points north and east.

I support the no build alternative and encourage exploration of rail alternatives.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Audrey O'Kelley
640 South San Rafael
Pasadena, CA 91105

cc: Michael Beck, City Manager

Jomsky, Mark

From: Fuller, Margo
Sent: Monday, August 13, 2012 11:08 AM
To: Jomsky, Mark
Subject: FW: 710 Freeway Extension

*Margo Morales
District 2 Field Representative
(626) 744-4742
(626) 744-3814 fax*

From: Jenifer Aldridge [<mailto:jeniferaldridge@sbcglobal.net>]
Sent: Thursday, August 09, 2012 8:32 PM
To: Fuller, Margo
Subject: 710 Freeway Extension

This email is to let you know that I will be attending the City Council meeting on Monday night and am vehemently opposed to the proposed extension of the 710 Freeway through ANY part of Pasadena. While I no longer live in the San Rafael area, I am a life long resident of Pasadena and my parents still live in the same house on Glen Summer Road that we moved to in 1964. I have copied the letter that I received today from Margaret McAustin's office and am forwarding it to everyone on my email list who resides in Pasadena.

Respectfully,
Jenifer Aldridge
1653 North Holliston Avenue
Pasadena

Jomsky, Mark

From: Susan Bauman <sbauman11@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, August 13, 2012 11:32 AM
To: Jomsky, Mark
Subject: Fw: Freeway 710 extension

Mr. Mark Jomsky
City Clerk
City of Pasadena, CA.

Please present this letter at the meeting this evening to be considered during deliberations regarding the 710 Extension.

William & Susan Bauman
1060 Lagunita Road
Pasadena, CA. 91105

RE; COUNCIL MEETING-MONDAY AUG. 13th
710 FREEWAY EXTENSION-ALTERNATIVES H-2 & F-5

Dear Mr. Tornek

We have resided in the San Rafael Neighborhood since 1964 and feel the two proposals for the 710 Freeway extension (H2 & F5 from Metro and Cal Trans) are totally unacceptable. How any board or branch of city or state government could even consider approving these two routes is incomprehensible.

Both routes would completely destroy the historical residential neighborhood of West Pasadena which showcases the best of Pasadena.

Both San Rafael and Ave. 64 have numerous important architectural structures set in well maintained and arbored grounds. The San Rafael Library and School, Hillside Home, Church of the Angels are all one the proposed routes. Not to mention the commercial area on Colorado and Ave.64 and Annandale Golf Course.

Since these two routes have only recently come to light for the general public I question if the pending decisions to restore our fire station and possibly closing and moving the school are influenced by the freeway extension proposals? Any development in the area has been regulated under the Hillside Ordinance and now the possibility of a freeway destroying it all is outrageous!

South Pasadena and West Pasadena defeated the 710 Freeway extension via Pasadena Avenue. Senator Lui has introduced a bill in Sacramento for Cal Trans to return the Pasadena Ave Property to Pasadena in order to restore the existing properties. The fact that Pasadena residents voted to approve the eventual extension of the 710 Freeway does not mean that this proposed extension is a viable alternative.

The approval of either H2 or F5 will create the following facts.

- 1 Destruction of many homes/ causing families to relocate.
- 2 Destruction of commercial buildings and businesses
- 3 Destruction of community establishments
- 4 Create intolerable freeway noise
- 5 Pollution
- 6 Severe decline in property values

In addition to the above this action will undoubtedly prompt a substantial "Inverse Condemnation" law suite from all property owners affected.

In conclusion we can not see any positive outcome resulting from the approval of either of the two extension routs in question. We therefore request that the Pasadena City Council, support our position and vote against any further consideration of either the two proposals.

Respectfully yours,

William M Bauman

Susan M Bauman

Jomsky, Mark

From: roseybell@rocketmail.com
Sent: Monday, August 13, 2012 11:51 AM
To: Jomsky, Mark
Subject: Fwd: 710 on Avenue 64

Dear Mark,

Would you please include my comments in the meeting tonight.

Many Thanks,
Rosey Bell

Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

From: roseybell@rocketmail.com
Date: August 10, 2012 11:33:55 AM PDT
To: "metroboard@wpra.net" <metroboard@wpra.net>
Subject: Fwd: 710 on Avenue 64

This is the letter I sent to the Mayor and City Council...could you please pass it along for me? Is this ok? Please let me know if there is anything else you would like me to do.

Many Thanks,
Rosey

Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

From: Rosey Bell <roseybell@rocketmail.com>
Date: August 9, 2012 2:16:53 PM PDT
To: "bbogaard@cityofpasadena.net" <bbogaard@cityofpasadena.net>, "mmcaustin@cityofpasadena.net" <mmcaustin@cityofpasadena.net>, "jmcintyre@cityofpasadena.net" <jmcintyre@cityofpasadena.net>, "nsullivan@cityofpasadena.net" <nsullivan@cityofpasadena.net>, "vdelacuba@cityofpasadena.net" <vdelacuba@cityofpasadena.net>, Terry Tornek <ttornek@charter.net>, "fifthdistrict@lacbos.org" <fifthdistrict@lacbos.org>
Subject: 710 on Avenue 64
Reply-To: Rosey Bell <roseybell@rocketmail.com>

Dear Mayor Bogaard and Council Representatives,

My name is Rosey Bell. I am a real estate agent with Coldwell Banker Pasadena. But most importantly I

am a third generation Pasadena native. My Grandfather built many of the lovely homes in West Pasadena, homes on San Miguel, Annendale and Glen Summer Roads. When he built his home on Mountain Street, it was in the country, there were only two other homes on the street.

My parents built their home at 377 Laguna Road as newlyweds in 1948. I was raised in that house and my heart and heritage is firmly planted in the West Pasadena neighborhood. It was a wonderful community to grow up in. It still is. San Rafael School is where all 5 of us Bell children attended. The key to San Rafael is that it is more than a community, it is a neighborhood.

If this Avenue 64/710/Caltrans/Metro project were to be approved it would decimate a very unique, and lovely place. It would be ruining a big part of the charm and heritage that is Pasadena. Not only would it make San Rafael area unrecognizable it would affect all of Pasadena. Between the smog and noise from the truck, and not to mention all the additional traffic all property values across Pasadena will be affected.

As a real estate agent it also become a huge disclosure issue and will definitely have a negative impact on sales prices...which in turn will have a negative affect the Pasadena tax base.

I strongly urge the City Council to take a position against the the implementation of the Ave 64 route. Is ruining San Rafael worth a short cut for truckers to access the 110?

Many Thanks,
Rosey Bell
(626) 675-5185

Jomsky, Mark

From: Fuller, Margo
Sent: Monday, August 13, 2012 10:59 AM
To: Jomsky, Mark
Subject: FW: Stop the Freeway from going through San Rafael and Avenue 64

From: Pamela Burk [mailto:pamela_burk@yahoo.com]
Sent: Saturday, August 11, 2012 10:32 PM
To: Fuller, Margo
Subject: Stop the Freeway from going through San Rafael and Avenue 64

Gentlemen

To whom it may concern:

Greetings from one of your neighbors who is very concerned about this ludicrous idea of setting a freeway where it obviously DOESN'T BELONG, since you know as well as I that there's no way that this exclusive area being dug up and planted with such an abhorrent sight will EVER bring in ANY REVENUE WHATSOEVER for your ball games, and for those who come TO Pasadena in order to enjoy such a beautiful city as this; this incredible sight as the Colorado Street bridge which has had MANY photos taken because this is the most beautiful place to *be* in Southern California...only to see such an ABHORRENT sight as this miserable freeway! This ATROCITY which you set before all people as if you KNEW what you are doing, and yet, it's obvious that it's just a way to RUIN our neighborhoods so that they shall look like downtown slums-ville, as if you'd *like* to have just ordinary housing here and there, INSTEAD of such a beautiful sight as the San Rafael hills. And not only will you RUIN, absolutely RUIN the exclusive housing that's left behind, you plan to PLOW THROUGH the greatest houses in MY neighborhood, being on CLUB street which offers so much to ALL of the surrounding neighborhoods who consider this to be the most exclusive sight of all, since the houses over there are the FIRST to be built so that they are NOT considered to be EXPENDABLE by the many who OWN this property in their hearts.

Gentlemen, dear gentlemen, please consider the *other* offers that are left; for it means that you will be doing the ENTIRE COMMUNITY a disservice if ever you decide to mow down THIS PART of our heritage. And that's what it comes to; our heritage which *must* be preserved so that we can offer others who come after us the beauty of this wondrous land... the way that it was for *us* when beauty of peace and tranquility could be called "Old Pasadena:" MY Pasadena...YOUR Pasadena. Lets keep Pasadena the way that it SHOULD be: which is to become a part of every heart which passes through this place, who say to themselves "gee, I wish that I COULD live here! ...But at least it exists, while I visit its beauty of spirit, and its pleasure," which is the pleasure of our hearts who call ourselves Pasadena residence.

I thank you for your time.

God Bless you all.

Sincerely,

Pamela Burk

Poppy Peak, Pasadena

Jomsky, Mark

From: Fuller, Margo
Sent: Monday, August 13, 2012 11:10 AM
To: Jomsky, Mark
Subject: FW: 710 frw opinion

Margo Morales
District 2 Field Representative
(626) 744-4742
(626) 744-3814 fax

From: Mary Lea Carroll [<mailto:maryleacarroll@earthlink.net>]
Sent: Friday, August 10, 2012 8:23 PM
To: Fuller, Margo
Subject: 710 frw opinion

From:

Hi Margo --

I am not in favor of finishing the 710 because I can see no =
good route and we've gotten along this long. A tunnel seems ludicrous. =
I understand the amount of truck onto the 210 will multiply =
dramatically. Thanks.

Mary Lea Carroll
maryleacarroll@earthlink.net
626- 221-8602

Jomsky, Mark

From: Fuller, Margo
Sent: Monday, August 13, 2012 11:00 AM
To: Jomsky, Mark
Subject: FW: 710 Freeway Extension

From: Barbara Ciolino [mailto:barbara_ciolino@yahoo.com]
Sent: Saturday, August 11, 2012 10:35 AM
To: Fuller, Margo
Cc: McAustin, Margaret
Subject: 710 Freeway Extension

I'm responding to Council Member Margaret McAustin's August 7, 2012 letter regarding the 710 freeway gap. I looked at the alternatives and came to the conclusion that a thoughtful response would probably take a year's worth of study. Suffice it to say there should be another vote. I can say without exaggeration that I do not know anyone living in Pasadena who is in favor of more freeways or any road that would cut a wider swath through Pasadena and South Pasadena. Even the suggestion of such a thing is shameful. Rather pressure should be exerted on CalTrans to sell the properties along St. John and Pasadena Avenues to restore the neighborhood. It is baffling why this conversation is still continuing.

Thank you for your consideration and thank you Council Member McAustin for your service.

Barbara Ciolino
1881 Paloma Street, Pasadena 91104

Jomsky, Mark

From: Fuller, Margo
Sent: Monday, August 13, 2012 10:45 AM
To: Jomsky, Mark
Subject: FW: I AM OPPOSED TO THE 710 FREEWAY

*Margo Morales
District 2 Field Representative
(626) 744-4742
(626) 744-3814 fax*

From: dcody1@aol.com [<mailto:dcody1@aol.com>]
Sent: Saturday, August 11, 2012 9:49 AM
To: Fuller, Margo
Cc: j.picone@yahoo.com; dloNeill@hotmail.com
Subject: I AM OPPOSED TO THE 710 FREEWAY

Since it's been determined that an NFL team would significantly negatively impact our air quality, noise and traffic, what possible justification can there be for supporting the alternate extensions of the 710 being proposed. It wasn't too long ago that the 134 Freeway was cut through our northern border, sacrificing homes, businesses and public buildings and the noise level and air quality in this area has already suffered as a consequence.

Measure A focused on the completion of the 710 from the stub to the 210 freeway. There was never a "hint" that a detour through a historic residential district was being considered. As tax payers, we have already paid to have the Pasadena Avenue route readied for this purpose. Homeowners along this route were forced out of their homes, apparently for nothing. What a travesty! I do hope you've all taken the time to study the information on Measure A provided by our neighbor Debra O'Neill.

It's time Caltrans and Metro realize it's not their right to do anything they wish with our properties. We've had enough of their "dirty little secrets". We know where the money is and it's the trucking industry. It's time to focus on a rail system to move freight from our port. That would also take a lot of the burden off our existing freeways, hopefully making them more efficient.

The freeway system is broken and none of the proposed extensions will fix it.

It's time to accept NO BUILD as the only acceptable alternative.

Dee Cody

1622 Poppy Peak Drive
Pasadena, Ca., 91105

Jomsky, Mark

From: Fuller, Margo
Sent: Monday, August 13, 2012 10:49 AM
To: Jomsky, Mark
Subject: FW: 710 Freeway.

Margo Morales
District 2 Field Representative
(626) 744-4742
(626) 744-3814 fax

-----Original Message-----

From: Fuller, Margo
Sent: Thursday, August 09, 2012 12:14 PM
To: 'James Conley'
Cc: McAustin, Margaret
Subject: RE: 710 Freeway.

Thank you.

Margo Morales
District 2 Field Representative
(626) 744-4742
(626) 744-3814 fax

-----Original Message-----

From: James Conley [<mailto:tvjc39@gmail.com>]
Sent: Thursday, August 09, 2012 10:54 AM
To: Fuller, Margo
Subject: 710 Freeway.

I am definitely in favor of complete the freeway.

Jim Conley

Jomsky, Mark

From: Fuller, Margo
Sent: Monday, August 13, 2012 10:59 AM
To: Jomsky, Mark
Subject: FW: 710 fwy

From: julie smith [<mailto:julienjoe@charter.net>]
Sent: Sunday, August 12, 2012 1:34 PM
To: Fuller, Margo
Subject: 710 fwy

We support the completion where ever the route.

Joe Corral and Julie Smith
1050 N. Holliston Ave
Pasadena, 91104

Jomsky, Mark

From: Fuller, Margo
Sent: Monday, August 13, 2012 10:45 AM
To: Jomsky, Mark
Subject: FW: 710 freeway extension

Margo Morales
District 2 Field Representative
(626) 744-4742
(626) 744-3814 fax

-----Original Message-----

From: drjime@aol.com [<mailto:drjime@aol.com>]
Sent: Saturday, August 11, 2012 9:36 AM
To: Fuller, Margo
Subject: 710 freeway extension

I am a 24 year Pasadena resident and homeowner residing at 1535 Poppy Peak Dr. I request that City Council ADAMANTLY OPPOSE METRO'S 710 extension plan through Pasadena.
Sent from my Verizon Wireless BlackBerry

Jomsky, Mark

From: Jackie Darling <jackiedarlingrealtor@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, August 13, 2012 11:39 AM
To: Jomsky, Mark
Subject: 710 Expansion

I vehemently oppose the Avenue 64 Proposed Fr-710-0 route. The impact on the city of Pasadena would be disastrous! It would reduce real estate values, property taxes, more pollution to our city and divide the city. Don't we have enough freeways coming through our city already?
STOP THE 710 SAVE PASADENA

Jackie Darling
Coldwell Banker
626-356-8133
DREfLicense#00892848

Jomsky, Mark

From: Fuller, Margo
Sent: Monday, August 13, 2012 10:42 AM
To: Jomsky, Mark
Subject: FW: OPPOSING 710 EXTENSION

Margo Morales
District 2 Field Representative
(626) 744-4742
(626) 744-3814 fax

From: Jane Demian [<mailto:janedemian@earthlink.net>]
Sent: Friday, August 10, 2012 9:59 AM
To: Fuller, Margo
Subject: OPPOSING 710 EXTENSION

I am writing in opposition to the proposed SR710 extension project regarding proposed routes H2 (Ave 64 Highway) or F5 (Tunnel freeway emerging in the middle of the San Rafael neighborhood).

I understand that this freeway or tunnel is being built in order to relieve congestion of trucks on the 5 freeway, and also to route trucks from the Port of Long Beach on the 710 to the 210 freeway so that trucks can move cargo more quickly. Apparently, this is all being done in order to make the Port of Los Angeles and Long Beach more competitive in view of the Panama Canal project which should near completion in 2014.

But destroying communities is not the answer. Mega-Rail projects are a better option for moving large amounts of cargo. For example, the Alameda corridor is available for such large shipments. There are other options that Metro / Caltrans is studying that would preclude such vast destruction of prime neighborhoods.

I believe that destroying neighborhoods along this project trajectory will be enormously detrimental to businesses, homes, schools, and churches in Pasadena, Garvanza (which is an Historical Overlay Zone), Highland Park and surrounding areas. In the wake of these construction projects, home values will diminish sharply, air quality will suffer tremendously, the water table from the Arroyo Seco will be affected negatively causing flooding, blight will appear near and along all the freeway and/ or tunnel entrances.

Please support the "No Build" option.

Thank you.

Jane Demian

2132 Ridgeview Avenue

Los Angeles, CA 90041

323-243-3113

Jomsky, Mark

From: Fuller, Margo
Sent: Monday, August 13, 2012 10:57 AM
To: Jomsky, Mark
Subject: FW: SUPPORT SAN RAFAEL NEIGHBORS In Their "710: No Build" FIGHT AGAINST METRO

From: Joan Dooley [<mailto:dooleyjoan@mac.com>]
Sent: Sunday, August 12, 2012 7:00 PM
To: Fuller, Margo
Subject: Fwd: SUPPORT SAN RAFAEL NEIGHBORS In Their "710: No Build" FIGHT AGAINST METRO

from:
Joan and Michael Dooley
91105

"We fully support the recommendations regarding the MTA (Metro) SR-710 Extension Alternatives Special Item No. 1 as well as articles One, Two and Three which outlines the city of Pasadena's OPPOSITION to SR-710 Extension proposals, H2, F5 and H6 on the agenda."

Begin forwarded message:

From: Joan Dooley <joandooley@charter.net>
Subject: SUPPORT SAN RAFAEL NEIGHBORS In Their "710: No Build" FIGHT AGAINST METRO
Date: August 11, 2012 5:50:25 PM PDT
To: Mayor Bill Bogaard <bbogaard@cityofpasadena.net>
Cc: Steve Madison <smadison@cityofpasadena.net>, district1@cityofpasadena.net, 2-MARGARET McAUSTIN <mmcaustin@cityofpasadena.net>, Chris Holden <jmcintyre@cityofpasadena.net>, nsullivan@cityofpasadena.net, field rep5-Gordo <vdelacuba@cityofpasadena.net>, ttornek@cityofpasadena.net, fifthdistrict@lacbos.org, Ron Paler <rpaler@earthlink.net>, Sylvia Plummer <sylviavplummer@gmail.com>, Michael Dooley <michael@michaeldooley.com>

Dear Mayor Bogaard and Pasadena City Council members ~

As South Pasadena's City Council took a stand to support their citizens, I urge you to take a stand to support the citizens of the San Rafael section of your city against Metro's proposed 710 building projects through our beautiful, historic and environmentally fragile neighborhood.

Metro's lack of communication with the San Rafael neighbors is egregious and unjust. They said they were forming a Community Liaison Council, yet they did not such thing. In fact, they have been more than remiss in communicating. They appear to be trying to keep information from the neighbors and have begun to shift deadlines of their decisions by several

months without warning. They are not playing fair, and we truly need your full support to protect and preserve this large neighborhood that is such an intrinsic part of our city's character.

PLEASE TAKE A STAND WITH US AGAINST METRO's FOOLHARDY PLAN TO BUILD A FREEWAY THROUGH SAN RAFAEL!

Please read our letter to Metro below here.

We will be there at your Monday council meeting.

Joan and Michael Dooley
1188 Romney Drive
Pasadena, CA 91105

20-year San Rafael residents

Neighborhood Watch Block Captain
Romney/Brentnal Neighborhood
(close to Ave. 64 behind Church of the Angels)

Dear Metro Board Members ~

The current Metro /Caltrans proposals turning Avenue 64 into a freeway connector are absurd, ridiculous, and archaic in their lack of vision and foresight. We (and all of our surrounding neighbors) are shocked and angered at Metro/Caltrans bullying tactics and refusal to provide any real community participation in the process.

Metro's current plans would devastate our historic and environmentally fragile neighborhood. Furthermore, Metro scammed our whole neighborhood by 1) keeping information about their plans a secret from the neighbors and, then, 2) scamming the neighbors who happened to discover the plan by telling them they could sign up for a Community Liaison Council that would be an effective avenue for community input. In reality, that council didn't even exist outside of an unused list of contact info and emails that Metro never utilized. CLC "members" (those who signed up to join the fictitious group on the Metro website) were never contacted by Metro. No meetings were ever held other than the "meetings" held last week in which Metro PR simply presented info already available on their website, and managed crowd control of rightfully angry neighbors who have been totally left out of the loop as Metro prepares to destroy their homes, their neighborhoods and their livelihoods.
<http://www.coa-pasadena.org/church-history/>

SHAME ON YOU, METRO!!!

Any build plan - widening Avenue 64 or tunneling nearby - would absolutely destroy this treasured, quiet, historic neighborhood. This neighborhood is graced with a profusion of historic and architecturally significant buildings and homes protected by preservation statutes. For instance, the Church of the Angels at 1100 Avenue 64 built in 1889, is the 3rd oldest, still-operating church in the entire United States! It, and the large amount of property surrounding it, are remnants of the historic 2000-acre Campbell Johnson ranch. Nearby spring-fed Johnson Lake* and some surrounding homes were part of that early ranch, and are some of the oldest in L.A. The substantial amount of green space remaining still in the area, especially around the church and Hillside School, is treasured by the entire surrounding community. Also, there are countless other historic homes all along the immediate area of Avenue 64 that would be effected negatively. Still, it is the quiet peacefulness of this unique community that would be most jeopardized by your plan, and that peace that defines the very character of our neighborhood is the most precious commodity of our neighborhood.

Our neighborhood will NOT stand for it and will fight this to the bitter end. A few years back, our neighborhood created a coalition to wage a lengthy, 3-year battle against an AT&T cell tower on the top of a treasured historic hill behind Hillside School on Avenue 64. I am happy to report that the neighbors persevered and prevailed. It was a David and Goliath fight, as this would be, but we will prevail again. There are too many people in this neighborhood who treasure it too much to see it destroyed by callous, uncaring bureaucrats.

Please abandon this archaic, mid-20th-century plan involving Avenue 64, and DO YOUR JOB by coming up with a 21st-century, non-destructive solution.

We will not, and you should no even be considering, a truck route through such a historic residential neighborhood.

NOBODY IN WEST PASADENA WANTS YOU TO BUILD THIS 710 CONNECTOR!

STOP NOW before you waste more millions and millions of taxpayer dollars on this travesty!

Joan and Michael Dooley
1188 Romney Drive
Pasadena, CA 91105

20-year San Rafael residents

Neighborhood Watch Block Captain
Romney/Brentnal Neighborhood
(close to Ave. 64 behind Church of the Angels)

*

Lakeside living in Pasadena is unheard of, except for a fortunate few whose homes encircle historic Johnston Lake. This exclusive residential neighborhood, nestled in a secluded corner of San Rafael, is today virtually unknown. Yet Johnston Lake was once a hub of commerce. In the late 1800s, Southern California was a premium wine producing region; San Rafael Winery, on the banks of Johnston Lake, was one of the most successful. Pasadena Museum of History will give the public a rare opportunity to explore this historic region, tour three stunning lakeside residences – including the original winery restored as a residential property - and learn about the origins and development of the area. Docent-led tours are timed so that all ticket holders may attend the 2:00 pm lecture by Donald Crocker, author of "Within the Vale of Annandale."

Jomsky, Mark

From: Fuller, Margo
Sent: Monday, August 13, 2012 11:09 AM
To: 'Jim Fogg'
Cc: Jomsky, Mark; McAustin, Margaret
Subject: RE: Proposed Completion of 710 Freeway

Thank you for your e-mail.

Margo Morales
District 2 Field Representative
(626) 744-4742
(626) 744-3814 fax

From: Jim Fogg [<mailto:jimfogg44@gmail.com>]
Sent: Friday, August 10, 2012 2:18 PM
To: Fuller, Margo
Subject: Proposed Completion of 710 Freeway

Dear Pasadena City Council,

I regret that I am unable to attend the council meeting on Monday, August 13, 2012, regarding the completion of the 710 Freeway.

However, I wish to let you know that I am in complete favor of finishing that freeway as quickly as possible. I feel the route to be selected should be the shortest distance between the two ends that currently exist.

Please make my opinions known to whomever it may concern.

Thank you for your service.

Sincerely,

James C. Fogg
Pasadena Resident and Homeowner
65 N. Allen Avenue #323
Pasadena, CA 91106
(626) 664-0400

Jomsky, Mark

From: Fuller, Margo
Sent: Monday, August 13, 2012 10:53 AM
To: Jomsky, Mark
Subject: FW: 710 Freeway Extention

From: mcfru@aol.com [<mailto:mcfru@aol.com>]
Sent: Thursday, August 09, 2012 4:16 PM
To: Fuller, Margo
Subject: 710 Freeway Extention

I worked at Cal State LA for 42 years (until I retired) and always hoped that construction on the 710 Freeway would have been completed by the time I retired....BUT it NEVER happened. I understand South Pasadena's position BUT there are ways that can be used to work around their arguments. I hope that I'll live long enough to see the 710 go all the way before I croak.

Sincerely,

Michael & Beatrice Fruchter
1472 N. Michigan Ave.
Pasadena, CA 91104
(626) 797-2048
email: mcfru@aol.com

Jomsky, Mark

From: Fuller, Margo
Sent: Monday, August 13, 2012 11:10 AM
To: Jomsky, Mark
Subject: FW: No 710 Extenson

Margo Morales
District 2 Field Representative
(626) 744-4742
(626) 744-3814 fax

From: Chris Garcia [<mailto:chrischuk@aol.com>]
Sent: Friday, August 10, 2012 7:32 PM
To: Fuller, Margo
Subject: No 710 Extenson

I wish to share my shock & dismay upon learning the reason that houses on the current 710 right of way are being sold is to enable the 710 extension to destroy the historic Poppy Peak district along Ave 64 or the serenity of Pasadena's singular signature feature, the Arroyo, and adjacent San Rafael district.

The projected 100,000 daily autos & trucks will bring unhealthful air, as it is well documented that freeway adjacent living harms the lungs. Also well documented is the impact of ceaseless noise that impairs the ability to achieve deep sleep, ever.

Beyond the considerations of health are the considerations of improved transportation & traffic flow. Each extension of the 210 Fwy has resulted in greater & greater gridlock during the commuting hours; quite the opposite of improving traffic flow. How would the 710 extension be any different? Does putting the freeway in a tunnel resolve these concerns? Commuter tunnels in Europe have exploded as a result of fires caused by truck accidents. Recently a bridge over the Pomona freeway was rendered unsafe as the result of a truck fire. Do we want such events under our housing in any part of the LA basin?

Commerce across the LA area will be enhanced by riling it out of the port to trucking centers out of the urban center; not by destroying historic neighborhoods, the property values in some of Pasadena's nicest communities and the lives of the people who have worked so hard to be able to live in them. Please stand by your citizens and oppose the 710 extension. Thank you. Chris Garcia 1535 Poppy Peak Dr. Pasadena, Ca

– Sent from my Palm Pre

Jomsky, Mark

From: Fuller, Margo
Sent: Monday, August 13, 2012 10:43 AM
To: Jomsky, Mark
Subject: FW: I am OPPOSED to the 710 Extension!

*Margo Morales
District 2 Field Representative
(626) 744-4742
(626) 744-3814 fax*

From: Elizabeth Garrison [<mailto:lizgarrison@sbcglobal.net>]
Sent: Friday, August 10, 2012 12:40 PM
To: Fuller, Margo
Subject: I am OPPOSED to the 710 Extension!

As a citizen of Garvanza/Highland Park and adjacent neighbor to Pasadena, I'm not only against the inclusion of my neighborhood in the nefarious 710 extension, but ALL 710 extensions. A cleverly played hand has been felt by Cal Trans and Metro, in order to turn one community against the other, one race against another, rich against poor; and what ever else they can throw against the wall to divide and conquer us. My hope, through action, is to see a united front for all those communities that have been placed in their cross hairs.

No on the 710 Extension

Elizabeth Garrison

Jomsky, Mark

From: Fuller, Margo
Sent: Monday, August 13, 2012 11:09 AM
To: Jomsky, Mark
Subject: FW: 710 extension project

*Margo Morales
District 2 Field Representative
(626) 744-4742
(626) 744-3814 fax*

From: trisha gossett [<mailto:trisha.gossett@gmail.com>]
Sent: Friday, August 10, 2012 10:33 AM
To: Fuller, Margo
Subject: 710 extension project

No 710 in any form(toll tunnel, or tollway) should be built. We the people, want MODERN technology to prevail over old school thinking. Out with the old cronies, and in with the new "compassion for the future of people" movement.

Jomsky, Mark

From: Fuller, Margo
Sent: Monday, August 13, 2012 10:49 AM
To: Jomsky, Mark
Subject: FW: 710 freeway gap closure

Margo Morales
District 2 Field Representative
(626) 744-4742
(626) 744-3814 fax

From: Fuller, Margo
Sent: Thursday, August 09, 2012 12:16 PM
To: 'Philip Grant'
Cc: McAustin, Margaret
Subject: RE: 710 freeway gap closure

Thank you

Margo Morales
District 2 Field Representative
(626) 744-4742
(626) 744-3814 fax

From: Philip Grant [<mailto:pggrant@charter.net>]
Sent: Thursday, August 09, 2012 11:08 AM
To: Fuller, Margo
Subject: 710 freeway gap closure

I got your letter this morning. The site you reference apparently no longer exists.

In any case, I am firmly in favor of completion of the 710 freeway between the 10 and 210 freeways. My only concern is that there apparently will not be on and off ramps at the 110 freeway. The people of Pasadena voted strongly in favor of completion and I see no reason to change that position, especially when the alternative routes are still up in the air. If it looks like a particularly bad alternative will be approved, the people of Pasadena are free to have another vote specifically aimed at that alternative. To have another vote today would be essentially nothing more than an attempt to vote against any extension, including the one favored in the original vote. In other words, it is too early to ask the people to vote again. We should wait until more facts are available. If I had to vote today, I would vote in favor of extension, even if I did not like the route that I thought was most likely, because to vote otherwise would condemn us to never completing any extension. Any campaign for another vote would be filled with distortions and scare mongering and be conducted by the people who oppose anything that changes Pasadena. Philip G. Grant, 885 N. Holliston Avenue

Jomsky, Mark

From: Fuller, Margo
Sent: Monday, August 13, 2012 10:42 AM
To: Jomsky, Mark
Subject: FW: I am OPPOSED to the 710 Extension!

*Margo Morales
District 2 Field Representative
(626) 744-4742
(626) 744-3814 fax*

From: Michelle Greenawalt [<mailto:mrgreenawalt@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Friday, August 10, 2012 12:26 PM
To: Fuller, Margo
Subject: I am OPPOSED to the 710 Extension!

Dear M. Fuller and City of Pasadena:

According to Highland Park Patch :
Doug "Failing praised Metro for holding extensive community meetings through the Spring of 2011, and for establishing Community Liaison Councils (CLC) to bridge the gap between the public and the transportation authority."

I have been a homeowner in the Arroyo View Estates for 15 years. I worked hard to get a piece of the American Dream by owning my own home, and I am going to protect it fiercely. Metro has been selective with releasing information regarding the 710 Extension Plan. None of the CLA has reached out, so we are getting information about the alternate routes in small chunks. Metro has not been transparent about plans that will ruin our lives and property. Failing's statement is just plain absurd.

Please add my name to the many who strongly oppose the 710 Extension through Highland Park, Pasadena, So. Pasadena and El Sereno.

Sincerely,
Michelle Greenawalt

Jomsky, Mark

From: Fuller, Margo
Sent: Monday, August 13, 2012 11:25 AM
To: Jomsky, Mark
Subject: FW: 710 Freeway

From: John Hazlet [<mailto:johnhazlet@sbcglobal.net>]
Sent: Thursday, August 09, 2012 5:34 PM
To: Fuller, Margo
Subject: 710 Freeway

Re the 7Aug letter from Ms. McAustin, I continue to be IN FAVOR of closing the 710 Freeway "gap." When the time came, Pasadena bit the bullet, tore down lots of houses, and allowed the 210 and 134 Freeways to be built through the middle of our city -- as did numerous other Southern California communities as the freeway and Interstate networks expanded. It is time for the citizens and government of South Pasadena to recognize the public interest benefit to citizens of Southern California, the advantages in their own city of significant surface street traffic reductions, bring an end to the expenditure of more money on delaying tactics, and get out of the way so we can FINISH THE FREEWAY TO NOWHERE!

John Hazlet
Gerri Hazlet
1095 N Chester

Jomsky, Mark

From: Fuller, Margo
Sent: Monday, August 13, 2012 10:40 AM
To: Jomsky, Mark
Subject: FW: 710 freeway gap closure

For the record

Margo Morales
District 2 Field Representative
(626) 744-4742
(626) 744-3814 fax

From: Brant Himes [<mailto:bmhimes@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, August 12, 2012 2:38 PM
To: Fuller, Margo
Subject: 710 freeway gap closure

Hello,

Thank you for your recent letter inviting citizen feedback on the 710 freeway gap closure. I have been a resident of Pasadena since June 2010, and so have not been around for much of the long history of conversation on this issue. Nevertheless, I am invested in this community and appreciate the opportunity to voice my opinion.

After review of the alternative concepts document, I want to say that I am in strong support of freeway alternative concepts F-6 and F-7 - completing the freeway where it seems to be left unfinished by connecting the 210/134 interchange in Pasadena, south with the 710. The tunnel option would seem to disrupt the existing community the least, but with either design I do think that this route in particular should be by far the favored option. The route is the most direct, and existing infrastructure seems to beg for the gap to be completed with either the F-6 or F-7 designs.

Again, thank you for your work and for the opportunity to participate in the conversation.

Sincerely,

Brant Himes

Jomsky, Mark

From: Bill and Vicki Kea <wkea01@charter.net>
Sent: Monday, August 13, 2012 11:09 AM
To: Jomsky, Mark
Subject: SR 710 comment

I cannot get there in time to fill out a card for tomorrow's meeting. However, I do want to give some food for thought.

My name is Vicki Kea. I have been a resident of West Pasadena for 59 years. I am opposed to the plans H-2, F-5, F-6, and F-7 for the obvious reasons, loss of homes, loss of tranquility, loss of historical structures, loss of clean environment, loss of property value, among other reasons.

While perusing the City of Pasadena website, I came across your Green City page. As I read this page, some topics jumped out at me, which I will relate verbatim:

First: WHAT IS A GREEN AND SUSTAINABLE CITY?

A green and sustainable city is a community of residents, neighbors, workers, and visitors who strive together to balance ecological, economic, and social needs to ensure a clean, healthy and safe environment for all members of society and for generations to come.

Second, your ENVIRONMENTAL CHARTER, which states:

The City of Pasadena elects to be an environmental advocate and a leader in environmental compliance and protection. The City shall cultivate superior environmental standards that will provide for sustainable municipal development.

The City recognizes that growth and opportunity cannot be conducted at the expense of environmental protection and enhancement, and that growth and environmental stewardship are intimately related.

The City believes that the implementation of an environmental ethic need not interfere with economic development, and that practicing such environmental ethic can ultimately be expected to enhance economic affairs and provide for responsible, farsighted development.

The City believes that the protection of the urban and natural environments is a social responsibility and a fundamental obligation of a democratic government, and that an ecologically impoverished and polluted environment adversely impacts human health.

The City is striving to become a model for environmental excellence and a prevailing force in environmental protection. To accomplish these goals, the City shall establish policies that will incorporate environmental responsibility into its daily management of urban and industrial growth, education, energy and water use, air quality, transportation, waste reduction, economic development, and open space and natural habitats.

In the City of Pasadena's Green City Action Plan under Environmental Health, Action No. 18, it states:

Establish an Air Quality Index (AQI) to measure the level of air pollution and set the goal of reducing by 10% in seven years the number of days categorized in the AQI range as "unhealthy" or "hazardous."

It goes on to explain: Pasadena is creating a plan for analyzing and developing recommendations to improve air quality in the City. Close attention will also be paid to the progress of California Senate Bill 44 which may require local cities to adopt an Air Quality Element as part of their General Plan.

As a lay-person, it appears to me that the above –mentioned Action 18 would be difficult to fulfill with a new freeway/highway through West Pasadena or any area of Pasadena. This puts the City in a position of contradicting itself should the City not stand against the Metro/CalTrans plan for H-2, F-5, F-6, and F-7. There is no boundary for the pollution in the air around Pasadena, polluting more than just our West Pasadena area. The City cannot state it is concerned about air quality, yet allow these plans to become a reality all in the same breath.

We, as residents of the City of Pasadena, regardless of area of the city, are asking the City to stand with its residents in fighting these plans in order to maintain the quality of life we have come to know and appreciate and to unite with our neighboring communities in this fight.

No on 710 in any way, shape, or form -- nowhere!

Jomsky, Mark

From: kosakowski <kosakowski@earthlink.net>
Sent: Monday, August 13, 2012 1:45 PM
To: Jomsky, Mark
Subject: 710 Fwy Extension comments - Council mtg
Attachments: header.htm

Hello Mark

Three comments regarding the 710 Freeway extension that I believe the City Council should look into, in determining whether to oppose or remain neutral toward the project:

- #1. **Financial Impact:** What is the financial impact on the City of losing the real estate tax revenue of the several hundred displaced homes?
What is the financial impact on the City of losing the sales tax revenue of the several hundred families who are displaced from Pasadena?
What is the financial impact on the City of losing the sales tax revenue of the several dozen small businesses displaced from Pasadena?
- #2. **Environmental Health Impact:** What is the impact on the health of Pasadena residents in general from an additional 52,000 trucks per dayⁱ pouring air pollution into the area by using whatever 710 extension is chosen?
- #3. **Benefit to Pasadena:** Is there any benefit whatsoever to Pasadena from the selection of any alternative (other than the "do nothing" alternative)?

Best regards to you,

Tom J Kosakowski
Pasadena, CA

ⁱ Source: Metro "2009 Long Range Transportation Plan – Technical Document", pg 18.
http://www.metro.net/projects_studies/images/2009_lrtptechdoc.pdf
Retrieved 8/10/2012.

Jomsky, Mark

From: Fuller, Margo
Sent: Monday, August 13, 2012 11:13 AM
To: 'Kevin Kubarycz'
Cc: McAustin, Margaret; Jomsky, Mark
Subject: RE: Public Comment for the Record to Pasadena City Council Meeting of August 13, 2012

*Margo Morales
District 2 Field Representative
(626) 744-4742
(626) 744-3814 fax*

From: Kevin Kubarycz [<mailto:kubarycz@gmail.com>]
Sent: Monday, August 13, 2012 10:36 AM
To: Fuller, Margo
Subject: Public Comment for the Record to Pasadena City Council Meeting of August 13, 2012

RE: METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY (METRO) SR-710 EXTENSION
ALTERNATIVES

I fully support the recommendations regarding the MTA (Metro) SR-710 Extension Alternatives Special Item No. 1 as well as articles One, Two and Three which outlines the city of Pasadena's OPPOSITION to SR-710 Extension proposals, H2, F5 and H6 on the agenda.

Kevin Kubarycz
6510 Crescent St
Los Angeles CA 90042

Jomsky, Mark

From: Fuller, Margo
Sent: Monday, August 13, 2012 11:23 AM
To: Jomsky, Mark
Subject: FW: (no subject)

*Margo Morales
District 2 Field Representative
(626) 744-4742
(626) 744-3814 fax*

From: DKunstt@aol.com [<mailto:DKunstt@aol.com>]
Sent: Thursday, August 09, 2012 8:41 PM
To: Fuller, Margo
Subject: (no subject)

Dear Margaret McAustin

We Bob and Diane Kunstt are for the 710 freeway completion.

Jomsky, Mark

From: Fuller, Margo
Sent: Monday, August 13, 2012 11:11 AM
To: Jomsky, Mark
Subject: FW: I am opposed to the 710 extension

Margo Morales
District 2 Field Representative
(626) 744-4742
(626) 744-3814 fax

-----Original Message-----

From: Adele Levitt [<mailto:aolevitt@gmail.com>]
Sent: Saturday, August 11, 2012 2:24 PM
To: Fuller, Margo
Subject: I am opposed to the 710 extension

Please help stop the insanity now. The residents of Pasadena will relentlessly oppose these cynical, deceptive, regressive, corrupt plans to make our city into a freight thoroughfare corridor. Let's drive a stake into this monster's heart before even more valuable resources have been wasted. Adele Levitt

Jomsky, Mark

From: Fuller, Margo
Sent: Monday, August 13, 2012 10:51 AM
To: Jomsky, Mark
Subject: FW: 710 Extension

From: Kelly McCune [<mailto:kelly.mccune@gmail.com>]
Sent: Thursday, August 09, 2012 1:06 PM
To: Fuller, Margo
Subject: 710 Extension

I believe that Pasadena should take an OFFICIAL position AGAINST any extension of the 710 Freeway through our city. This would join us with South Pasadena's official position. I firmly believe that Metro should be exploring alternative transportation methods, not building more freeways.

Thank you.

Kelly McCune
1491 N. Holliston Ave.
Pasadena, CA

Jomsky, Mark

From: Fuller, Margo
Sent: Monday, August 13, 2012 11:18 AM
To: McAustin, Margaret; Jomsky, Mark
Subject: FW: WWW COMMENT---710 fwy

The comment about the 710 is at the near bottom of the e-mail.

Margo Morales
District 2 Field Representative
(626) 744-4742
(626) 744-3814 fax

From: CityWeb-Server@cityofpasadena.net [mailto:CityWeb-Server@cityofpasadena.net]
Sent: Monday, August 13, 2012 10:40 AM
To: Fuller, Margo
Subject: WWW COMMENT

Data from form "Contact Vice Mayor Margaret McAustin" was received on 8/13/2012 10:40:26 AM.

Send Comments

Field	Value
Your Name	Michael
Phone	
Email	
Comments	Hello MARGARET MCAUSTIN, I am currently a resident of Pasadena, I have been living in Pasadena for 4 years with my wife. I used to live in the San Fernando Valley, but since moving to Pasadena I have completely fallen in love with this area. I love Rose Bowl area each weekend I travel over to the area and Run, Mtn. Bike, Swim, Hike & even do archery. I do these activities every weekend even when there are other activities going on, however I find it difficult to go when there are big events at this location (such as a college football game). Currently the law in Pasadena only allows 12 events each year at this location this benefits everyone in Pasadena and this is what makes this place great and our city. I am very against having a NFL football team use the Rose Bowl. I understand that the Rose Bowl is currently having a \$30-million gap between available funding and construction costs. Why did you guys over spend? It seems most city councils up and down this state have wasted tax payer money on pet projects. Now I don't know all the in's and out's about the budget problems, but don't ruin our city buy selling out our recreation area to a NFL team that will carry the Los Angeles name and not even the name of the city it plays in. Also what happens when they build a new improved stadium in Los Angeles in 5 years? What would happen then to the Rose Bowl? It would loose the NFL team in addition it would also loose out on other sporting events. So the very short fall you are trying to close gets fixed, but now you ruined any revenue in the future plus you opened the stadium up to 25 events a year. If you vote to increase the amount of events at the Rose Bowel I will not support

Field	Value
	<p>you and I will do everything in my power to remove you from your current position. Other things that I oppose are the connecting on of the 710 and the 210 freeway. My wife and I plan on buying a house in Pasadena in the next year or two. However with recent news that the Rose Bowl will have 25 events instead of 12 each year are huge red flags that I should think twice before buying anything in Pasadena. Thank You for your time and please make the right choice keep the NFL out of the Rose Bowl. Michael</p>

Email "WWW COMMENT" originally sent to mfuller@cityofpasadena.net from CityWeb-Server@cityofpasadena.net on 8/13/2012 10:40:26 AM.

Jomsky, Mark

From: Fuller, Margo
Sent: Monday, August 13, 2012 11:28 AM
To: 'Joyce Millikan'; Millikan Gregory
Cc: Jomsky, Mark; McAustin, Margaret
Subject: RE: 710 freeway gap closure

Thank you

Margo Morales
District 2 Field Representative
(626) 744-4742
(626) 744-3814 fax

-----Original Message-----

From: Joyce Millikan [<mailto:jmillikan@workingfaith.com>]
Sent: Monday, August 13, 2012 11:28 AM
To: Fuller, Margo
Cc: Millikan Gregory
Subject: 710 freeway gap closure

Thank you for your recent letter.
Greg Millikan and I have reviewed the options online.

We agree that the F5 option seems best from our perspective; however, the F2 option is also okay with us.

With all the best to each of you tonight at the meeting,

Joyce Millikan
For Greg and Joyce Millikan
626-486-0691

Sent from my iPhone

Jomsky, Mark

From: Fuller, Margo
Sent: Monday, August 13, 2012 10:41 AM
To: Jomsky, Mark
Subject: FW: I am OPPOSED to the 710 Extension!

*Margo Morales
District 2 Field Representative
(626) 744-4742
(626) 744-3814 fax*

From: lmushegain@aol.com [<mailto:lmushegain@aol.com>]
Sent: Friday, August 10, 2012 10:00 AM
To: Fuller, Margo
Subject: I am OPPOSED to the 710 Extension!

Hi Ms. Fuller,

I am writing to express my absolute and unequivocal opposition to the 710 extension plans presented by Metro for the Pasadena Community. I would appreciate if you could send me a mailing address as well to voice opposition. My grandfather, a resident of District 2, wanted to voice his opposition as well, but he is 87 and does not have an email account to do so.

Thank you,

Lorig Mushegain
1245 Church Street

Jomsky, Mark

From: John Odell <odell@dornsife.usc.edu>
Sent: Monday, August 13, 2012 12:03 PM
To: Jomsky, Mark
Subject: No to 710 freeway extension routes F 5 and H 2

Mark Jomsky
City Clerk

Dear Mr. Jomsky:

Please record me as a citizen opposed to closing the I 710 free gap by building proposed route H-2 or route F-5.

I am shocked and dismayed to learn of alarming new ideas to build new freeways through densely settled residential neighborhoods in southwest Pasadena and Highland Park. I write to ask the Council in the strongest terms to oppose any plan to destroy more homes and neighborhoods in Pasadena. I am one who has to live with the local surface traffic congestion that comes with the status quo, but we certainly need better solutions than these awful ideas.

Thank you.

John Odell
1370 Chamberlain Road
Pasadena, California 91103

Jomsky, Mark

From: Fuller, Margo
Sent: Monday, August 13, 2012 11:08 AM
To: Jomsky, Mark
Subject: FW: WWW COMMENT

Margo Morales
District 2 Field Representative
(626) 744-4742
(626) 744-3814 fax

From: CityWeb-Server@cityofpasadena.net [<mailto:CityWeb-Server@cityofpasadena.net>]
Sent: Friday, August 10, 2012 7:20 AM
To: Fuller, Margo
Subject: WWW COMMENT

Data from form "Contact Vice Mayor Margaret McAustin" was received on 8/10/2012 7:20:04 AM.

Send Comments

Field	Value
Your Name	Cindy Pesek
Phone	
Email	cindyclyde@gmail.com
Comments	I am NOT in favor of extending the 710 Fwy

Email "WWW COMMENT" originally sent to mfuller@cityofpasadena.net from CityWeb-Server@cityofpasadena.net on 8/10/2012 7:20:04 AM.