

Flores, Silvia

From: Jomsky, Mark
Date: Monday, December 10, 2012 5:17 PM
To: Flores, Silvia
Subject: Fwd: 710 Freeway Project

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Ann Scheid <scheid@usc.edu>
Date: December 10, 2012, 4:54:46 PM PST
To: Mark Jomsky <mjomsky@cityofpasadena.net>
Subject: 710 Freeway Project

Dear Mark,

Please distribute the following to Members of the City Council before their meeting this evening.

Thank you very much,
Ann Scheid

Dear Members of the Pasadena City Council,

I urge you to carefully consider the impacts of the proposed 710 Freeway gap closure on Pasadena and its neighborhoods. For years, our neighbors in South Pasadena have fought to keep this freeway from cutting their community in two.

Now the tunnel alternative is proposed to answer their objections, but what does it really do? It is, in its long-term effects, just as damaging to both our communities and in addition to all the communities along the 210 and 134 Freeways, east and west. Truck traffic from the ports will be carried from the end of the tunnel in Pasadena through the San Gabriel Valley, as well as along the 210 and 134 to the west, bringing with it vastly increased air and noise pollution to the region. Tall exhaust ventilation towers will only partially clean the air from the tunnels. Most of the polluted air will be expelled from the tunnels into the air of Pasadena. Nearby schools and our only hospital, the Huntington Hospital, will suffer some of the worst effects.

As we know from experience and as traffic engineers continue to tell us, building new freeways in the end only increases congestion and pollution. We are still applying a 20th century solution to a 21st century problem.

On a geopolitical scale, this push for "closing the gap" is part of a reaction to the widening of the Panama Canal currently underway, which is expected to draw shipping traffic away from Los Angeles ports. In order to compete, Los Angeles will have to serve the largest ships, those that cannot pass through the canal, or those carrying goods destined only for the Western United States. Speeding up goods traffic movement through the Los Angeles basin will improve the ports' position in their global competition for shipping traffic.

It is time to make the capital investment in railroad transport for goods coming from the ports and in public transit for people.

Please don't aid in perpetuating this short-term and wildly expensive plan, which will negatively impact our communities.

Sincerely yours,

Ann Scheid
500 South Arroyo Boulevard
Pasadena, CA 91105

Flores, Silvia

From: Jomsky, Mark
ent: Monday, December 10, 2012 4:21 PM
To: Flores, Silvia
Subject: Fwd: 710 extension makes no sense!

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Renee LaBran <renee@rcfontis.com>
Date: December 10, 2012, 3:52:49 PM PST
To: "mjomsky@cityofpasadena.net" <mjomsky@cityofpasadena.net>
Subject: 710 extension makes no sense!

This proposed project will have an enormous negative impact on our community.

December 10, 2012

Pasadena City Council
100 North Garfield Avenue
Pasadena, CA 91101

Re: Support for Transportation Alternatives - 710 Freeway Project Extension

Dear Mayor Bogaard and Council Members,

Day One is a Pasadena-based community-based organization with a 24-year history of providing effective, high quality and culturally sensitive public health education, intervention, policy development and environmental prevention strategies. As an agency committed to improving the health and well-being of residents of the communities we serve, we are deeply concerned by the detrimental health and environmental implications of the proposed 710-freeway tunnel and lane widening from the ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach.

In particular, Day One is concerned by the project's impact in the following areas:

- **Air Quality/Health** - Over a decade of scientific research has linked air pollution from freeways to asthma, impaired lung development, cancer, cardiovascular disease, stroke, premature birth weight, and autism. Expanding any freeway project in southern California, an urban area with some of the worst air quality in the United States, will only hinder efforts to address this serious public health problem. This is especially the case for freeways heavily used by truck traffic, such as the 710.
- **Public Safety** - With gross weights over 10,000 pounds and lengths of up to 75 feet, trucks pose a serious danger to smaller road users. In 2008 it was estimated that 1 in 9 traffic fatalities resulted from a collision involving a large truck (NHTSA, 2008). Of these fatalities, 74% were the occupants of another vehicle, 10% were non-occupants, and 16% occupants of the truck itself. In short, reducing superfluous truck trips (e.g., non local trips for port cargo) by transporting them via rail would increase safety for other road users.

- **Opportunity Cost of a \$5+ billion dollar transportation project** - At a time when there is increasing public support of and demand for transportation alternatives, limited taxpayer dollars should be spent judiciously. By allocating such a huge sum of money for this project, Metro would at best draw from funds that could be used expedite the development of a host of other worthwhile, publicly-supported projects, including the Metro Gold Line Extension to Ontario and “Subway to the Sea.” At worst it could jeopardize taxpayer support for future funding measures (e.g., sales tax increases). Either option would needlessly slow efforts to transform Southern California into a region composed a pedestrian-friendly communities linked via a convenient, multi-modal transportation system.

These impacts are recognized and acknowledged by a growing number of local leaders and community groups, including:

Adam Schiff, U.S. Congress Member, 29th District

“I urge Metro to give full and serious consideration as to how funds for a tunnel project could be better spent...I suspect that for less than the actual cost of a tunnel, Metro would have the funds necessary to undertake all of the remaining options under consideration -- combined. These options, transportation system management, bus rapid transit and light-rail would help move people in an environmentally friendly manner without disrupting our long-established neighborhoods.”

Carol Liu, CA State Senator, 21st District

“It is too expensive, it is too disruptive, it does not solve the problem of growing truck traffic, it would open at an already congested and unacceptable operating level, and it would divert money from many more worthy transportation projects that have broad-based public support.”

Anthony Portantino, CA State Assembly Member, 44th District

“When you have a project of this magnitude, with this many unanswered questions, manipulations and false information, one has to wonder why decision makers aren’t immediately putting a halt to this insanity. It’s a fraud being perpetrated upon the taxpayers of California at the expense of taxpayers and the quality of life of those

neighborhoods in Los Angeles and the San Gabriel Valley which will be devastated by a project that is unwelcome and disastrous."

Recommendations

Rather than spend billions on a 4.5 mile toll tunnel and freeway expansion that will benefit few and burden many, Day One encourages Metro to utilize limited resources in a more sustainable manner that will improve public health and safety, air quality, public transportation, greenhouse gas emissions, and promote the development of more pedestrian, bike and transit-friendly communities.

As elected leaders for the third largest City in LA County, the Pasadena City Council should should acknowledge the many pressing community health and safety concerns with a potential freeway expansion, and urge Metro to study and fund 21st century solutions, such as:

- Electrification of the freight rail system in LA County until trains reach distribution centers in the Inland Empire (e.g., other countries such as Switzerland make use of cargo trains that trucks can directly drive on and off, allowing for caravans and greater flexibility).
- Investment in ship-to-rail technologies at the ports (e.g., GRID Project)
- Expansion of existing transit network:
 - Proposed Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) "alternative"
 - Proposed Light Rail "alternative"
 - Metro Gold Line Extension to Ontario airport

Sincerely,

Christy Zamani
Executive Director
Day One, Inc.
175 N. Euclid Ave.
Pasadena 91101

Jomsky, Mark

From: Margie Grossman <amom144man@earthlink.net>
Sent: Tuesday, December 11, 2012 9:29 AM
To: Jomsky, Mark
Subject: NO to 710 Freeway extension through Pasadena

Dear Mr. Jomsky,

I received notice today of last night's City Council Meeting about a 710 Freeway Extension through Pasadena. Please direct this email to City Council members to register my STRONG objection to any tunnel or surface extension of the 710 through Pasadena.

Pasadena's general plan describes our city as residential neighborhoods with light clean industry. The character of our city with its mature trees, neighborhoods, attractive shopping areas, world class museums and Theaters would be seriously degraded by a 710 freeway extension.

Thank you for ensuring that my strong objection is made known to our Pasadena City Council members - if I had known of last night's meeting, I would have been physically present.

I am 70 years old and a lifelong resident of Pasadena.

Rapid transit, light rail systems, and heavy shipments by railroad make sense. More freeways are not the solution to congestion as has been demonstrated time and again up and down the coastal plain Counties of California from San Diego to San Francisco. More freeway = more trucks, more congestion and more pollution.

Thank you for copying this email to our Pasadena City Council members.

Sincerely,

Margie Grossman
Tel 626.793-9014
Fax. 626.793-8418

Jomsky, Mark

From: Douglas Nickel <dnickel@dslextreme.com>
Sent: Tuesday, December 11, 2012 12:21 AM
To: Jomsky, Mark
Subject: Against 710 tunnel

Hello,

Just got an email from ANSC newsletter and wanted to again go on record **AGAINST ANY** extension of the 710.

The 210 is already at gridlock on any given afternoon and particularly on Friday afternoon as well as holiday periods. I've already invited jackasses from Metro to take a little ride with me during those periods.

Spending untold billions to add gridlock begs the question, who is getting paid off down at Metro? This is not a sane option. Therefore, who is benefitting? Not the public. Who is making money off of this proposed deal?

Thanks for submitting my opposition.

Best regards,

Doug Nickel
Mt. Washington

PS I do most of my shopping for all items in Pasadena and surrounding San Gabriel Valley areas.

Jomsky, Mark

From: Ohmworld <ohmworld@me.com>
Sent: Monday, December 10, 2012 6:10 PM
To: Jomsky, Mark
Subject: Special Item #1 Public Comment

As I am unable to attend the Monday, December 10th, 2012, City Council meeting, I am submitting my comments for the record via email.

I strongly urge the Pasadena City Council to adopt an official stance opposing the F-7x route in Metro's SR-710 EIR study. Metro has just recently expanded the number of scenarios they plan to study F-7x tunnel option in the EIR, thereby increasing the statistical odds that the tunnel freeway will be the final recommendation. The F-7x has been scored using a modeling analysis that does not include a tolling system thereby creating artificially high scores. It has been clear from the onset of this EIR process that it is being driven by political will. The technical review is being driven by biased analysis.

It is absolutely critical that Pasadena take a political stand and officially oppose the F-7x, while demanding at the same time robustness, transparency and public participation from Metro. If the F-7x is chosen as the final recommendation (which is very likely given the alternatives analysis outcome) it will have devastating impacts to Pasadena residents, businesses, historical treasures, property values, air quality and health. Pasadena cannot allow one legal opinion prevent it from inserting its voice into this critical political fight.

Respectfully Submitted,
Gretchen Knudsen

Jomsky, Mark

From: Rody Stephenson <rodys@earthlink.net>
Sent: Monday, December 10, 2012 5:31 PM
To: Jomsky, Mark
Subject: 710 tunnel

No tunnel (or any other connection). It will cause too much pollution, noise, and traffic.

You might also consider this in your resolution:

“If a connection for the 710 gap is ever built against our will, we propose that no trucks be allowed North of Interstate 10.”

We have a precedent with the Pasadena Freeway. Use the same weight limit – which I assume is 10,000 pounds gross vehicle weight (GVW).

Rody

R. Rhoads (Rody) Stephenson
4455 Rockland Place, Unit 10
La Canada, CA 91011
rodys@earthlink.net
(818) 248-7472