Jomsky, Mark

From: Diane Buchwalder <dbuchwalder@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, January 13, 2020 10:30 AM
To: Jomsky, Mark
Cc: info@pasadenacsc.org
Subject: January 13 Meeting Item - in support of VMT

Hello,

As a resident of Pasadena I am concerned about the potential rollback of VMT or other metrics to LOS. We have an urgent duty to prioritize metrics that reduce carbon emissions and increase safety for pedestrians, cyclists, and other modes of transportation. In order to achieve the intense shifts needed to fight climate change, we should be challenging ourselves to meet or even surpass these measures, not moving backwards.

Sincerely,
Diane Buchwalder

01/13/2020
Item 11

Jomsky, Mark

From: Jeff C <tongva4802@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, January 13, 2020 10:07 AM
To: Jomsky, Mark
Subject: 1/13/20 Council Agenda item 11

Dear Mark,

I'm not sure if you all are still collecting correspondence for the council agenda tonight, but if you are, please add my e-mail to the list of correspondence for #11 on the agenda. Please reach out if you have any questions.

Thanks very much,
Jeff Cyrulewski

Dear Mayor and Councilmembers,
I'm a Pasadena resident, and I'm in favor of not maintaining VMT as our impact metric for transportation and going back to LOS instead. VMT has already greatly impacted neighborhoods with increased traffic by all the development going on in the city (and that has gone on in the city), resulting in a more frustrating transportation experience and, in tandem, an increasing, bit by bit, lower quality of life. Having more public transportation available is a good idea, and adding bike lanes to streets that don't need to be adjusted to have them is also a good idea, but most people in the city - including residents moving in and out of new apartment buildings - do drive cars.

Further oversight on the City's behalf is needed for a cumulative review of DOT's plans to implement a new vehicular transportation model. The City has a duty to oversee mass changes to the fabric of the community when impact to quality of life and safety of Pasadena residents and neighborhoods are threatened by civic transportation and planning decisions, including excessive development. I think Erika Foy's op-ed in Pasadena Now today had a lot of superb points that support the need to re-examine DOT's plans.

Please do not maintain VMT as our impact metric and retain LOS instead.

Thank you,
Jeff Cyrulewski

01/13/2020
Item 11

Jomsky, Mark

From: Erika Foy <foyfamily@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Monday, January 13, 2020 1:55 PM
To: Jomsky, Mark; Cornejo, Laura
Cc: Reyes, David; Mermell, Steve; Madison, Steve; Gordo, Victor; Wilson, Andy; Masuda, Gene; Hampton, Tyron; Tornek, Terry; Kennedy, John; McAustin, Margaret
Subject: Transportation Performance Measure
Attachments: Talking Headways Podcast. Job 39817. Proofed FInal (1).doc

Good afternoon- I wanted to share with the community and council the transcript of a podcast called "Talking Headways" (see attached). It is an interview of Fred Dock by Jeff Wood just this last August,26, 2019. There are two very important points I want to highlight for this evenings meeting.

The first is on page 6 of the transcript where Fred Dock states. " I had pretty much decided that what we were seeing was a pattern that transportation impact mitigation was basically about widening streets and making it easier to get through intersections and keeping traffic off certain streets. And so it was really running kind of counter, at odds with the city's overall stated goals of being sort of a mixed-use walkable core type of city with the ability to get around with out a car if you wanted to." What is frustrating for the community is projects like 253 South Los Robles didn't even allow for mitigations to improve bikes or walking. The Technical Memorandum prepared fly ESA for 253 South Los Robles http://ww2.cityofpasadena.net/councilagendas/2020%20Agendas/Jan_13_20/AR%209%20-%205.%20TECHNICAL%20MEMORANDUM%20-%20TRAFFIC%20AND%20NOISE.pdf couldn't find any support for Goal 5 and ESA totally glossed over any support for the goal. What is frustrating for the community is the way DOT evaluates the impacts of projects isn't even helping to make our city more walkable. What were 253 South Los Robles and the other three projects (399 Del Mar, 245 Cordova and Kaiser) required to do add to the walkability of Pasadena- NOTHING.

Second, the community at large is feeling traffic increase substantially. The idea of induced demand created by limited traffic mitigation may not be working. What is even more shocking is Fred Dock himself states in the podcast (pg 27) that in a cap and trade study he participated in, "it was possible to have a slight reduction in overall greenhouse gas production with signal timing improvements. But largely, because the signal timing improvements tend to improve travel times, you wind up inducing travel into that situation as well.. you then wind up incrementally small savings in greenhouse gas." What we have virtually done in Pasadena under this policy of VMT and with transportation impact fees is ignore improving road infrastructure, including such things as synchronizing traffic signals, because it can be seen as "traffic inducing." Our goals are now to make it harder to get around so residents will take a bus, walk or bike **but by proof of the Los Robles corridor lack of mitigation, we are not even getting this!!!!**

So the question is, can Fred Dock and our new transportation director prove that we will have a reduced number of drivers if we reduce spending on signal timing for the sake of greenhouse gas emissions? In addition, did any of the projects along the Los Robles corridor contribute in anyway to create a more "walkable" city? Did any of the projects contribute to adding a bike lane on Los Robles to make it more bike friendly?The answer is no, and the result is, we have more drivers trying to get through unmitigated intersections that are operating at an LOS F at peak hours and therefore as Joel Kotkin reported this Sunday, "Similarly forcing people to live in more congested conditions engenders stop-and-go traffic that, according to a recent London School of

Economics report, wastes fuel and produces more greenhouse gas emissions." https://www.pasadenastarnews.com/2020/01/11/californias-inept-central-planners-joel-kotkin-and-wendell-cox/. Hence, City of Pasadena, you have made greenhouse gases increase. More cars sitting at lights creating unsafe intersections for bike and walkers. If you want to improve the idea of induced demand, you must require developers to buy into this as well but the way we model and evaluate intersections/VMT doesn't even trigger this aspect. Absolutely troubling.

Thank you,

Erika Foy

I had pretty much decided that what we were seeing was a pattern that -- that transportation impact mitigation was basically about widening streets and making it easier to get through intersections and keeping traffic off of certain streets And so it was really running kind of counter, at odds with the city's overall stated goals of being sort of a mixed-use walkabl core type of a city with the ability to get around without a car if you wanted to. You could still drive if you wanted, but you needed -- we had pretty much 10 or 15 years of history of having a stated goal in the general plan. One of the eight guiding principles that you had to be able to get around without a car i the city.

MR. DOCK: Well, yes and yes. It did finish. We worked it out. It wound up in a really odd situation, because at a technical level, the project did demonstrate that it's possible to have a slight reduction in overall greenhouse gas production with that type of signal timing improvements. But largely, because the signal timing improvements tend to improve travel times, you wind up inducing travel into that situation as well. So it -- you wind up with a very incrementally small savings and greenhouse gas.

INTERVIEW OF: FRED DOCK

INTERVIEW BY: JEFF WOOD

AUGUST 26, 2019

MR. WOOD: Fred Dock, welcome to the Talking Headways podcast.

MR. DOCK: Well, thanks, Jeff. I'm glad to be here.

MR. WOOD: So I know you've been on episodes before and I think it was episode 72, but for those who aren't familiar with you, can you tell them a little bit about yourself?

MR. DOCK: Well, I'm currently -- recently retired from the City of Pasadena. I'd been the director of transportation there for the last 12 years. I've only been retired about a month now. So it's getting used to doing a -- perusing a different type of work life here -- after work life.

But prior to working for the City of Pasadena, I was in consulting and transportation planning and traffic experience for about 35 years. I was working in different parts of the country mostly on kind of TOD types of projects. I think that's a lot of what we talked about on the earlier podcast.

MR. WOOD: What got you interested in transportation planning? Like, what was the impetus for going into the field?

MR. WOOD: A lot of it was -- when I was living in Cal -- doing my undergraduate work in engineering, I got attracted to the traffic engineering side of the transportation engineering side. More from the standpoint that it was not quite as --

predictable is not the right word, but it was a little bit more on the art -- into the art and science of engineering, because it involves people. A lot of the things that are -- we take as, sort of, tenants of the traffic and engineering side of it are really just empirical measurements. So I liked going into material science where things are very predictable and you can get the same answer, you know, multiple times in a row. Here you're working basically with human behavior and how to address, sort of, how people operate and how you can influence how people operate within the overall movement component.

So that attracted me into it. And then, basically after I finished graduate school, I wound up getting more and more involved in transportation planning as well as the engineering side of it. That's really, then, how I got involved with a lot of working with new urbanists and working in marketable urban centers, those types of development patterns, and how to pull all the pieces together was what I found very intriguing about it. To move everybody around or to get everybody to move in a way that it was best overall for everybody, that's kind of where we're going these days with much more of a triple bottom-line approach to sustainability and pay people and prosperity on the planet types of things.

MR. WOOD: Do you remember your first project after school?

MR. DOCK: Yeah. Believe it or not, I worked on the -- what at the time was the Yerba Buena Center in San Francisco, now the

George Moscone Convention Center area.

I was doing the transportation analysis for large -- very large environmental impact report, and I got picked up as a part-timer, you know, a temporary employee at a company called TJKM in the Bay Area working with a team that had been put together to look at the nine-block area that forms the whole -- what is now that whole George Moscone Yerba Buena Center area. It has now been built for 30, 35, 40 years. It was one of the -- a very interesting introduction then to working with complex issues within a very complicated urban core.

MR. WOOD: I go down there fairly -- not fairly often, but enough, and right next to it is the new Transbay Terminal. So there's been a lot of change, I imagine, since that initial project in the Moscone Center.

MR. DOCK: Well, it's very interesting because a lot of what had been planned for that center has come about. It's a very much mixed-use place, and then of course the new change in the TransBay Terminal and going from simply a, you know, multilevel bus terminal into what is now a huge mixed-use project. It's been interesting. It's -- it's either we're still waiting for an extension of Caltrain, 40 years later. So it's some -- but Muni Metro got built, you know. The breakout was -- at the end of Market Street happened, the whole Embarcadero change, and all the characteristics of how that -- that is all -- worked in that area down there, and it's been fascinating to look at it over time.

I think, in my career in the Bay Area, I must have worked on over 20 or 25 high-rise buildings in terms of doing the analysis for them in downtown San Francisco. It's been interesting to see how they sort of fit it in or not fit it into the overall fabric there and how the city has changed, how it handles its approval process. It just has been very interesting to be able to be part of that.

MR. WOOD: Well, what's some of the differences now between then and especially on environmental impact reports?

MR. DOCK: Well, the big changes right now, of course, are SP743 and the move to go to vehicle miles traveled as a metric for transportation impact as opposed to vehicle level of service. San Francisco's been, you know, along with Pasadena and Oakland and San Jose are kind of the first cities in the state to really develop a VMT based approach.

San Francisco is very interesting in terms of what they been able to do, developing a very -- more quantitative approach to handling mitigation for the VMT which they have a -- I think they've done a very nice job of integrating their -- things that they will wind up giving you credit for as you go through a project approval process to be able to augment it to reduce the amount of overall vehicle trip making that's associated with your project. That, and the fact that there is now so much more streamlining involved, as also as a part of 743 within San Francisco because basically the state law now allows you to work

through a -- a more of a streamlined process if you're already developing in an area that has characteristics that encourages very low VMT per capita types of travel.

In San Francisco, pretty much the entire city is covered by the characteristic. The city has done a very good job of working out a way to make the process work for them, and it seems to -- hopefully, I think it's going well. I haven't looked at it lately, but the last time I looked six or seven months ago it seemed like it was doing well.

MR. WOOD: In Pasadena, you all implemented it pretty Early, 743, and the move from LOS to VMT. What was your experience there?

MR. DOCK: In Pasadena, as we were trying to update our general plan, starting at about 2009 and a little bit after that is when the SP743 process started at the state level when -- and it of course was ultimately signed into law by 2013, which worked well for us because we kind of wound up converging at that point and were able to take advantage of the fact that 743 had been passed.

But we were basically working out a way to try to align -- the city was using the measure transportation impact with what the city's general plan, goals, and objectives are. And early on in the process as we had been working through, we've, at the department level, hadn't looked at what was going on from the use of -- in our traffic impact analysis, looking at

auto level of service and auto volumes increases on streets.

I had pretty much decided that what we were seeing was a pattern that -- that transportation impact mitigation was basically about widening streets and making it easier to get through intersections and keeping traffic off of certain streets. And so it was really running kind of counter, at odds with the city's overall stated goals of being sort of a mixed-use walkable core type of a city with the ability to get around without a car if you wanted to. You could still drive if you wanted, but you needed -- we had pretty much 10 or 15 years of history of having a stated goal in the general plan. One of the eight guiding principles that you had to be able to get around without a car in the city.

So what we were seeing was a lot of mismatch between what we were mitigating things to do, and as that mitigation was basic and making it harder to get around on foot or by bicycle or using transit even, so we set out to -- as part of the overall mixed -- they updated the general plan that started about that time -- the land-use and mobility elements, primarily -- to be able to think through how do we approach the transportation system in a way that allows our overall development approval process and our general plan approval process to be able to come up with a consistent set of outcomes that will meet the guiding principles of the general plan. So we pretty much were working on it from a general plan consistency standpoint in terms of

developing different types of metrics, exploring different areas, talking to the community quite a bit. There were I think over 1000 hours of an overall community outreach as part of the land-use mobility element update that went on there.

Pretty much what we were able to do then was to work around, to understand that we needed to be looking at measuring sustainable transportation outcomes, not necessarily auto delay, which is not necessarily consistent with our ability to get to a sustainable outcome or something that would actually reduce greenhouse gas generation. And that's how we wound up working towards and settling ultimately on VMT per capita.

We also at that same time introduced several other metrics that looked at making sure that we had -- were adequately measuring how our transit and bicycling and walking and pedestrian systems were functioning within the city and how development at the general plan level and at the project level would be affecting that. And that ultimately is what was adopted by the Council in early -- in 2015, which we had been using -- the city is now using currently. So we have about four years' experience with it.

MR. WOOD: What are some of those other metrics?

MR. DOCK: Well, there are -- actually, there are four other metrics that are used in city core besides VMT per capita. There is something we are using called vehicle trips per capita, which is -- is sort of very unique to Pasadena measure at this point.

That was introduced to be able to address sort of the intensity of trip making from any particular land-use which more closely mirrors sort of the traffic impact kind of an outcome where if you think when you're measuring a traffic impact analysis, that if you're really looking at how traffic is concentrating at intersections or near the project, the vehicle trips per capita is more of a measure that gets at that, but it doesn't get down to looking at individual intersections or street segments. It really is about the intensity of trip making and it's really triggered, or it tends to work against the land-use that has -- I shouldn't say against -- it's really looking at the -- if you're looking at a single land-use generated, like a very high density retail development, that would have a very high vehicle trips per capita number. And so it's reflective of the intensity of a particular use of land.

And the more you get into a mixed-use environment the more that vehicle trips per capita begins to get dim -- goes to smaller and smaller numbers, become more efficient trip making. It isn't exactly like VMT, but it's a similar characteristic to it. VMT, of course, adds the mileage systems so that has to get into the -- where trips are coming from and going to to get to the land-use.

So between the two of them we felt that we had a pretty good handle on being able to deal with the overall vehicle trip generation for a project in a way that would allow us to continue

to deal with the transportation impacts at a more global scale without having to get into using the vehicle level of service at the local street segments or intersection level.

The other three measures that are used in the CEQA analysis in Pasadena are proximity to transit facilities that have, say, 15-minute headway or better, the proximity to level 1 or 2 bicycle facilities which are essentially on street and dedicated bicycle facilities, and then the proximity to a number of different land-uses within a walk shed of an area. So within a quarter-mile of a project, for example, it has really the -- how many different types of land-use are available within that walking distance. And it's really kind of a surrogate for a walk score type of a scenario. But it doesn't get right down to the detail of walk score kind of characteristics because were using a forecasting model to work with it and working off the land-use database within the forecasting model. But it really measures the proximity to the number of destinations.

And all three of those metrics are based on research that's been done at the national level that is about what are the attributes that areas have that would encourage people to walk, bike, or use transit. And again, the proximity to those things, those types of higher level of service, protected bicycle facilities, and number of walkable destinations is what has been shown to give us the most correlation between the idea that people will possibly walk more in this area.

So that's really what we were measuring then with those metrics. And that's between all of those then it -- it gives us a pretty broad basis for a multimodal environment looking to try and have a very efficient trip generation at a particular site, limited number of vehicle trips, and more higher propensity to walk, bike, or take transit.

MR. WOOD: Pasadena is such an interesting case because it's a pretty urban place inside of a pretty urban region, and it doesn't really necessarily have much sprawl or space to grow. Is that some of the reasons why the City is so progressive on transportation policy?

MR. DOCK: I think so. There's -- there's -- it kind of harks back to the late 1990s when the city was undergoing a growth spurt and had that growth spurt and -- a lot of -- scrape everything down and build new -- attitude that was going around at the time -- it was raising a lot of issues. And a couple of those were -- sort of how transportation was being handled.

The other one, of course, was the loss of historic properties. And so out of that sort of early 1990 period there when they were putting up office towers and a lot of parking lots and scraping down all of the old mixed-use buildings that had been there, that's really what Pasadena Heritage was born out of and the historic preservation movement that is so strong in Pasadena.

Coupled with that then was a very strong anti-growth

movement that developed.

And what came out of that, given the need that the city still had some desire to continue to intensify, they were also expecting light rail transit to come their way, which is now the Gold Line.

They did wind up reaching a compromise through the 1994 general plan that essentially created some zones within which there would be a density -- would be allowed to intensify, but only within certain limits. And then other areas which were mostly and largely single-family neighborhoods, would be held from very, very limited development. There wouldn't be any incursion of commercial or nonresidential, even multifamily residential into some of those areas. And so out of that plan you wind up with a situation where the central corridor of the city is just more of an L-shaped central district and some fingers that go off into major streets.

We wound up forming the basis of a series of ten different specific plans, each of which had a gross limit on it in terms of the number of units the residential and the number of square feet of commercial or business or industrial that could go into it. From that, then a fairly progressive zoning code, with a lot of information about massing and almost something -- form-based code, like, that we would expect today. But it's really more written into the zoning code because of the age of it, created an outcome within which you wind up being able to limit

the height of buildings to, you know, something below 8 or 12 stories. Being able to handle the different setbacks in different areas perpetuated the "city of gardens" approach to residential multifamily development. And then set up this framework within which it really slowed down the amount of growth that was going on, but it also channeled it into areas where it could be served by walking or biking or transit as well as driving.

That kind of perpetuated to the 2004 period when the City updated that plan, and that really just revalidated the desire to continue in that direction and modify the development caps a little bit, brought in a lot more innovation in terms of reducing parking requirements within the TOD areas. The Gold Line was well on its way into Pasadena by 2004. And so that really helped the city focus on developing a very good set of overlays for the transfer to development areas around each of the stations that were in town.

So that's really been pretty much where we stepped in with the latest update. It was working now, but that's really where I think the City gets its -- its desire to do that. Because of the way it created this compromise by protecting the single-family areas around the core, it set up a situation where the only kind of development that was going to occur in Pasadena was either going to be sort of redevelopment or infill. And that then created a very specific type of approach to how you want to

do those types of projects. And that really then tends to align very well with where we are today statewide in terms of wanting to have more density around transit, more of a walkable urban core in the city so that we're able to cut down on overall greenhouse gas generation as well as to begin to create more inclusive and multi-income mixed-use areas. And that's really what Pasadena has been able to do given where this trajectory they started in the late 90's as a result of their no-growth movement.

MR. WOOD: And you mentioned protecting single-family neighborhoods, and now we have this discussion about SB50, and you hinted at it. I'm wondering if -- what your opinion is of SB50 and -- and what the process is going forward for allowing more density near transit, in your opinion.

MR. DOCK: I just -- I'm -- fine -- I'm a little bit torn. I'm -- I understand the rationale about why SB50 is important, because even as progressive as Pasadena is, it still has its own limitations on what people in those areas are willing to work with. I mean, technically, Pasadena doesn't have single-family zoning. There is actually a -- most all of the areas that are -- that are protected within the overall concept of a protected area are largely single-family, but they're zoned, at like our -- like three break or something like that.

So it's possible that -- and many of the houses have ADUs on them. They've traditionally had a -- there's a

relatively good history in Pasadena over the years of things like bungalow courts and other versions of things that bring density into single -- what are traditionally single-family areas that people get all upset about, but in the end, Pasadena is full of them. If you actually go out and look at an aerial of the city and try to find an area that is strictly single-family, you're probably in San Marino, or Arcadia next-door.

So I think that because of that history in those areas where we've -- in the cities that really have protected single-family don't allow other than, like, one unit per lot. We are in a situation here as we bring more transit into the areas and more density, or the need for more density, that we're running into a lot of resistance with them. So I can understand why the State might want to move in that direction. I just think it's -- it's an optional push given the fact that it's a real pushing against the local control issues.

So cities have sort of done a very good job of either sidestepping their regional housing needs assessments over the years or applying, you know, or since they -- meeting them or trying to meet them. And so I think that SB50 is a pretty big hammer to bring that down, but hopefully, it started the conversation in a way -- or a dialogue in a way that we can iterate around to something that will allow a way to do it.

I think that a blanket density at a certain level, the way SB50 was going, is gonna be problematic. I'll be interested

to see if cities will come around again with some sort of a compromise to that. I think that recent adjustments to SB50 this year, that we're dealing with displacement and some of those issues of retaining existable affording housing stock in those areas I think is a step in the right direction. I think it -- that what we're seeing here is sort of an iterative last year's whatever the number was that became this year's SB50. You know, it matured as it went into SB50. We've got a lot of late-season adjustments to SB50 before it was sort of tabled.

And if it comes back again, which I'm sure it will, hopefully we'll have a better starting point and can begin to -- to iterate to something that at least a larger number of communities can -- can begin to address, because, I think, as more -- as the State moves along these lines where we're changing, like, SP743 is going to be requiring cities by 2020 to use VMT per capita in their transportation analysis, that's gonna change quite a few things for cities that are currently out on the -- that are not in the -- that are using level of service. And it's going to make them start rethinking about how -- how are they gonna be dealing with development of those patterns, and they may very well quickly -- one would hope quickly -- begin to understand that the more mixed-use development that you're able to bring near transit, the easier it's going to be to keep that development moving at a rational fashion given the new metrics that are going to have to be used.

It may take a few iterations and it may take a couple of years to get it figured out, but I think as we go downstream that change alone is going to help bolster the desire, or the need, on cities' parts to start thinking more reasonably about density in areas that they probably have previously not thought about it.

On the other hand, I think it's going to be a tough sell to people who are residents in those largely single-family areas. I think there's a lot of resistance in some of those, although I know we do have a good GMV groups starting up now; so it should be interesting to watch as it goes forward.

MR. WOOD: Are you glad that you're watching it instead of in the middle of it?

MR. DOCK: Yes and no. It's just -- it's a -- I'm still trying to stay involved a little bit. As I've moved to Washington DC, I've been able to kind of get reconnected with more the policy-level people I used to work with before I went to Pasadena -- Smartbooth America.

I just recently spoke at the Locust conference there. It was interesting to be completely surrounded by nothing but infill and smart-growth developers.

So it's sort of a -- you know, there is a light at the end of the tunnel in some of these things. I think we've reached a point where we have a lot of variety within the housing market we have now, and what cities need to be doing is understanding

how to be able to facilitate that and encourage it and not get so hung up on trying to continue to replicate a particular category, you know, one type of thing that they know how to do very well. I know that is sort of where we're going with it, but I do feel that we have got an opportunity to watch a change as we go forward here.

So I'm happy to be watching from a distance or more at a policy level now as opposed to at the front lines of it. But I also think that watching what's been happening in California with the cities that have been changing over to VMT, I think that it is going to be interesting as we go forward.

MR. WOOD: And you mentioned reconnecting with folks that you were pretty involved with before, and I imagine that means seeing you -- not that you are disconnected but, you know, probably, maybe being more involved in that movement and with those folks. And I'm curious how you got involved in the first place with the movement towards more compact communities and the new urbanists.

MR. DOCK: Actually, it's -- it was a consequence of working on the Playa Vista project out on the west side of Los Angeles. The company that I was working for was out of Chicago, no less, at the time was doing the traffic engineering for Hughes Properties and who owned the Playa Vista site by Marina del Rey and by Playa Del Rey there when this was back in, like, 1987. Well, ancient history at this point.

That was when we were essentially -- I had the

opportunity to basically work through the project at a time when there was a change in ownership or a majority ownership on the project, McGuire Thomas partners, who were Southern California developers, as well as I guess there also they're in the Sacramento area, and probably statewide at this point between the McGuire part and the Thomas part.

We were able to take on a majority interest in the project and wound up bringing in, at the time, what later became sort of the core of new urbanism -- Andres Duany and Gloose, Plater-Zybert, Stefanos Polyzoides and Ms. Moule, Buzz Yudell -- and I can't think of the sixth person at this point. But essentially, they were doing what at the time was called traditional neighborhood design. It's what DPZ had started out working with there, and we got to spend an entire year doing charrettes, watching them apply that concept to the Playa Vista site. And that's ultimately what, you know, wound up developing and then being approved on the site in terms of entitlements is all of those, sort of, dense urban neighborhoods that are now built there 30 years later.

But as a consequence of that I -- it meant that just shortly after the Playa Vista work had been moving through that years with the charrettes and while we were trying to do all the traffic engineering to figure out what the impact of that was going to be on City of LA streets, that's when they wound up forming the Congress of New Urbanism with Peter Calthorpe and Dan

Solomon.

So I thought that was really an interesting time to get involved and begin to understand more of the collaborative way that CNU operates on all of these areas across the different technical disciplines that are really intrinsic to how you build mixed-use communities and mixed-income communities.

And part of it was I've -- in the working and trying to sort through the difficulties of using sort of conventional tools to look at what were essentially these very progressive mixed-use areas. That's really how I really got involved in understanding the nuances that's needed to do the transportation planning, the traffic engineering around how do you best integrate the transportation needs into those communities and then integrate those communities into the region. And that's really what, 30 years later, I'm basically still doing. So it's really been a very fascinating thing to be involved in and to continue.

It branches off into street design and different things like that. So over the years working, seeing you, have meant I've been able to be very influential in developing different design techniques and design manuals for streets. It goes from form-based coding as well as from what are now going to be called complete street design manuals. So it's been very interesting to be able to be involved.

I moved back a little bit from it when I was in the City because most of my job was working on the transportation

side as opposed to the land-use and the transportation side. Now that I'm sort of back here, I've been able to reconnect with a -- at least in the district here -- some old friends, from seeing you, and kinda get caught up and where things are going. So it's been fun.

MR. WOOD: What was something that you -- you learned from working at a transportation department that will help you in your future thoughts about land-use decisions and land use overall?

MR. DOCK: I guess I would just sort of say it just sort of cemented kind of why I got involved in government in the first place. Because I -- as I had mentioned, I was a consultant for 35 years. Mainly working for government, because that's where you do transportation, whether you're working for a private developer or for the municipality or the government agency itself, you -- it is all basically in the public realm because that's what you end up doing. You're working with the public street system and the public transportation system.

What I had sort of evolved by the time I got into thinking about going to work for the government was the fact that it was -- yes, you know, we could get a couple years and we can get plans done and we could do very progressive planning, but unless there's somebody on the ground to hang onto the plan and to move it forward, sort of inch by inch to get to implementation, things just never happened. They just Basically -- we wound up with plans put in crates, set on the

shelves, got awards, and then never got implemented.

And so that was what helped me kind of move into government and help to try to figure out how to take all that I've been doing over the years, in terms of analytics and a technical approach, more of a subject matter expert, if you will, and work to try and figure out how to continue to implement them at a place on the ground. And Pasadena turned out to be a really very good place for me because of the -- it had a lot of the attributes already in place that I felt were needed to be successful.

So it was a -- I went in knowing it was going to take time to do things. The idea was to try and find ways to -- to take advantage of the different ways cities are organized to be able to try to arrange things in a way that would be more effective. I think in the end I learned a lot about how to do that.

Now, if you want to talk to me about how to organize a transportation or, you know, land-use and transportation department, I'd be glad to do that. But it's just that the thing that kind of tended to reinforce in me is that it's just really hard to break down silos, even in places that you think are really progressive, because there is -- for a variety of reasons.

Personalities -- sort of we've always done it this way kind of approaches to life, that there's an inertia that just takes time to work on. And so you just need to be resilient and

keep going and I think the key that I -- like I said, I just sort of tended to reinforce the fact that you need to be there and you need to be present to be able to continue to put your ideas forward. And if you're running into roadblocks, you just need to figure out -- how do you work your way either out of them, in a different direction, or you work your way around them, find different allies, find different ways to approach things, and to do that you have to be there.

So it's very hard to come in from the outside as a consultant, sort of falling from 10,000 feet and leave in three weeks. You don't really -- you're not really on the ground long enough to influence things well enough. But if you're inside of government -- that's going -- I guess it's kinda convoluted the way I said it, but it really is more along those lines.

MR. WOOD: Makes sense to me. It always helps to have people on the inside and the outside working towards the same goal.

Well, you know the first time that we worked together was on the idea of a streetcar in Pasadena which never came to fruition.

But one of the really cool things that we had talked about is kind of the innovations that you could do if you have some of these departments that exist in places like Pasadena, such as its own power department and its own --

MR DOCK: Right.

MR WOOD: -- public utility. And we were talking about

maybe thinking about electrification of the wires and how possibly the ability of the utility to help with lowering the cost because the City ran the utility itself.

I'm wondering what the future of cities are from the electrification standpoint if you have a public utility and if you can be innovative like that, like we tried to be before the streetcar died a slow death.

MR. DOCK: You're right, and there are still proponents of the streetcar in Pasadena. So --

MR WOOD: I imagine.

MR. DOCK: -- just doesn't ever quite reach over that incremental hurdle where it has to get to.

But interestingly, what we're seeing now, particularly in the electrification side, is with the advent and the uptake of all the electric vehicles now. Pasadena Water and Power has become a major player in the city in terms of how to continue to integrate the electrical vehicle charging infrastructure. And with the sort of cap and trade programs and the access to the different credit programs that are available in the state now, many of which flow through the electric utilities, PWP is becoming a bigger and bigger player in the city in terms of the overall development of both the public and a private charging network where, what, five years ago it was really just the Department of Transportation doing it at our public facilities, like parking garages.

So we've really been able to see an uptake on that, and that's, I think, one of those interesting parallels. I had forgotten that we had talked about doing it on the streetcar, but yeah. It's really something that I can see happening with the EV charging infrastructure now.

I think the other part where -- not so much on the power side but in terms of innovation, it's really what we're seeing, I think, these days is with autonomous connected vehicles made by transportation network companies like Uber and Lyft. A lot of the uptake in terms of Door Dash and Uber Eats, the front two, kind of the on-demand delivery services, as well as just what's happening within package delivery from -- from a UPS and FedEx type of standpoint. There's more and more pressure on the curb front going on in terms of managing those. And the tools that cities have to do that with are pretty antiquated. But yet, we're in a position now, I think, in terms of where the cities are coming from, to being able to do more and more, to be able to sort of digitally manage the curb front. And I think you'll start seeing more of that coming out of cities.

I think DC here is starting to do some of it. Pasadena is working with the consortium; then Metro has put together out in -- in Southern California there to try to further those elements.

And those also play into the overall traffic management that is now available, given that we're able to talk back and

forth to vehicles and we now have a lot of big data and analytics to find out things that we couldn't previously find out very easily. So I think that's an area where there's a continued amount of growth that we'll see going forward and where a lot of big change will be taking place.

MR. WOOD: There is a lot of hype around the AVs and electric scooters and electric bikes and all those things. What's the reality, though? I mean, how long does it take for these things to get implemented, especially in cities that might be smaller and not have as much say as a large Los Angeles or a large San Francisco or a large New York City?

MR. WOOD: I think in principle the tendency is just to say no. It's easy to do that still. So there's sort of no in between, it's kinda what I see happening. Just the amount of time it takes to set up a set of regulations and modify your current municipal code and put the right kind of tools in place, it's easily a year or more for a small city to really take that on. And during that time, there is a tremendous amount of trepidation on the part of the Council members to get involved in it because of the fear of having scooters all over the place, or people will be complaining, and it's a very fraught with anxiety kind of a system right now.

And I think that some of the bigger cities are making big inroads into it. We have a lot of available information about how to do it. There's more and more of a network out there

now, particularly from MACTO, that's making a lot of this information available. But I still see a lot of sort of trepidation on the part of some cities to even go down that pathway, just give them the anxiety that is generated with their electeds.

So it'll be interesting to see how it shakes out. I know the market space is continuing to consolidate. We're starting to see more E bikes now then we are otherwise. Probably in the past we didn't have those at all. Scooters are continuing, but they're continuing to evolve, and a lot of the scooter companies are beginning to be more and more -- they're getting more consolidation as well. So I -- it's going to be -- again, it's going to take a while to shake out. And I think it's going to continue. I think, also, it's going to be here for a while. That seems to be the next major move, in particular, in personal mobility, particularly in larger urban areas.

MR. WOOD: I'm also interested -- so we talked briefly also on the last episode about cap and trade and greenhouse gas emissions and the like, and you all were doing a study looking at intelligent transportation systems and whether you could reduce greenhouse gases through light timing, I believe. And you were kind of at the start of applying for that grant, or at least looking at doing that. I'm wondering, you know, five years on, what happened to that project and did it come out positively for you all?

MR. DOCK: Well, yes and yes. It did finish. We worked it out. It wound up in a really odd situation, because at a technical level, the project did demonstrate that it's possible to have a slight reduction in overall greenhouse gas production with that type of signal timing improvements. But largely, because the signal timing improvements tend to improve travel times, you wind up inducing travel into that situation as well. So it -- you wind up with a very incrementally small savings and greenhouse gas.

From a cap and trade standpoint, the interesting part of it was is that cap and trade is broken up into silos. And so the silo that deals with the automotive fuel, which is really where the credits would come from for the cap and trade, if there were any offsetting dollars to be made from the signal timing changes, comes out of the automotive fuel side. And that's all assessed against the refiners the same way that the gas tax is. And so there's really, like, no differential connection to a local municipality to be able to essentially have a nexus for the cap and trade to get applied back to your signal timing improvements.

We had originally started the project on the basis that we would be able to offset it with our local electric utility and help work through from there. It'd be a much more, sort of, direct linkage there that we could work with because of the framework and because of that siloing of the credits where the

fuel credits don't go anywhere near the municipal power utility credits system, it really tended to put up a barrier to be able to effectively use the funds to do anything with it.

So the limited amount of improvement in the -- did not really do much to offset the complexity of dealing with the actual mechanics of the financing that would come out of it. So the results are out there. They're available. But it's really largely moot at this point because there is not enough of -- it didn't generate enough offsetting value to be able to be visible within the way the cap and trade credits are calculated.

MR. WOOD: That's interesting about the silos. I'm wondering, do you think that it would be beneficial if the silos weren't there? Or is it a good thing to have silos for specific cap and trade monies to be distributed?

MR. DOCK: Well, I don't really have enough information about it. I -- I think that a -- quite a bit of thought has gone into it at the legislature to be able to work it out, to be understanding where the different scenarios go and I -- what they anticipated the funding would be used for. And I think we're seeing a lot of that play out through the smart growth app -- what is it, the Strategic Growth Council. That's it, excuse me, yeah. And they're really pretty much the group that's -- that's handling a lot of those -- those elements that are, you know, dealing with how the monies are being distributed. And I think they're approaching it in a way that is much -- that is very

straightforward. We were trying to come up with another way to take advantage of that, but in the end, I think it's something that a -- I'd like to see it continue to play out and see if we can get some longer term improvements out of the housing-based approaches the FTC is working on.

MR. WOOD: Well, I have two more questions for you. The first one is, the Rose Parade is one of the biggest in the country. How do you plan transportation-wise for such a big event?

MR. DOCK: Very carefully is the short answer. But part of the other thing is that the City's been doing it for a long time; so it's not quite by rote, but we do have a pretty good playbook for it. Interestingly enough, we were the subject of a federal highway study a few years ago -- I don't know, three or four now -- that was looking at what we were calling "capacity maturity" for special event management. And so we -- our overall Rose Parade process was looked at in quite a bit of detail by several elements of the Federal Highway Administration as well as Homeland Security. And so we were a model -- one of the ones across the country, I mean, there are several others that, you know, are of similar scale, like Macy's in New York, Thanksgiving, you know, things like that.

So -- so it's definitely the Rose Parade is right up there, but I think that the key is that it's a very integrated process. There's a lot of planning that starts early and often,

and it really follows through a very detailed scenario and a debt-based type of planning and preparation for what goes on.

So there's a lot of cooperation between the Tournament of Roses, who handles all of the parade entries and the marshaling of all of the activities related to those entries. What goes on with the police department and the fact that the Pasadena Police Department is essentially managing a multi-agency task force that includes everybody across federal and state that comes in to -- there is a huge communications infrastructure. And then all of the public works and transportation components that basically go into making sure that all of the movement and the physical space is put together. I mean, even the planning department has a huge role in it because they have to certify all of the grandstand seating that goes in, in terms of its structural integrity.

So all of this is basically, you know, goes on. And much of it starts months and months beforehand for each one of the parade cycles so that we're -- we now have all of these different sort of milestone processes. It basically works through gets written up in manuals that get rewritten every year. And then, it adjusts. There's always an after action.

So every year we learn what we might have done differently if something was -- what was happening, and then it just continues to evolve from that standpoint, as well as to deal with sort of the changing character of what's going on around the

parade at times. And it rarely rains at New Year's in Pasadena so that's also been a big improvement. So you know, I've only got rained on once the entire time I was there. But that has a big effect on how people get in and out and how soon they come and when they go so --

MR. WOOD: Right.

MR. DOCK: But I think it's really one of those things. It's a -- it's a ballet, if nothing else, in terms of the way it all gets choreographed.

MR. WOOD: And my last question is, what was your favorite or maybe most innovative project that you've ever worked on?

MR. DOCK: It's hard, there were --

MR. WOOD: You can throw in a couple if you want.

MR. DOCK: The use of the EMT in Pasadena has been a fairly innovative project for a variety of reasons. It really helped develop a different way of looking at things. I do think one of the projects that we worked on before that was really the development of a walkable street design manual that took about a ten-year period to pull off between seeing you and the Institute of Transportation Engineers and Federal Highways.

But those are the kind of projects that, to me, have had a -- yes, they were innovative, they'd been working forward, but what's interesting about them is that they're slowly changing the way we do business completely. I mean, where -- the work that we

were doing in 2000 to 2010 on the walkable-street concepts in terms of context-based street design are now basically moving over into the green book at ASHTEL. It took another ten years to do it, but -- but they're there so -- and then that's, you know, that's -- so what had been something that was innovative and out on the edge and we're dealing with one particular characteristic of design characters has now basically been picked up and has essentially spread across the conventional way of doing highway design.

Those are the kind of things, to me, that I'm very proud of having been involved in those and being able to work on them. I think that they wouldn't have happened if we hadn't -- or I hadn't gotten involved, with a lot of other people, and thinking about transportation differently. And through things like seeing you and through projects like Playa Vista, where those were where those ideas sort of germinated into cold and when you had a sort of use those concepts to build as we went along, I think we've seen that, even in the development industry is the whole concept of smart growth and transportation development has gone from being on the fringe to something that is now mainstream, and it's right here. It's not even just a regular topic, but there are complete councils of infill builders now.

So -- so I think it's just something that -- it's been interesting from my standpoint to -- to be involved in those

types of activities. It's what's kept me interested in this profession for so long. Not that I've been involved in everything, but I have -- I did -- it's hard to pick one that's more important than the other one. They really all -- you know, they form a continuum, I think is what it is. And I am just pleased to have been able to be part of it and continue to work in that area.

MR. WOOD: Awesome. Well, I hope that you enjoy a little bit more time off. I know you're going to keep working so, you know, you're not retired-retired from all the transportation work. But I hope it's fun in the future going forward.

MR. DOCK: That's why I have the benefit of to be able to pick the ones that are fun here. So, yeah.

MR. WOOD: Yeah.

MR. DOCK: In the meantime, yeah, I'm sitting on a lake in Minnesota right now.

MR. WOOD: That's a good place to be in the summertime, I think.

MR. WOOD: Yes. So it's nice to have the time to do that and I've been looking forward to getting recalibrated to how to be retired and still -- or maybe semi-retired. I haven't actually -- continue to go to conferences and kind of keep my finger on things, but I do look forward to being able to be a little bit more selective about what we're doing and having a little bit more time to enjoy life.

MR. WOOD: Definitely. Well, Fred, thanks so much for joining us. We really appreciate it.

MR. WOOD: Oh, thank you, Jeff. I really appreciate the opportunity to talk over things with you.

(Conclusion of Recorded Material.)

-o0o-

Jomsky, Mark

From: Geraci, Greg @ LA North <Greg.Geraci@cbre.com>
Sent: Monday, January 13, 2020 10:25 AM
To: cityclerk
Cc: Jomsky, Mark
Subject: Stop VMT and stop your plan to overdevelop Pasadena

To all Councilmembers,

The plan to used recalculated DOT metrics would negatively impact our Pasadena neighborhoods with major increases in traffic caused by over-development. Stop this agenda because the residents of Pasadena will suffer in the long run. Over development, VMT, and the plans for having a "city without cars" is wrong for Pasadena.

Please stop using VMT as your impact metric and retain Level of Service as the metric.

Sincerely,

Greg Geraci
818-481-1680

01/13/2020
Item 11

Jomsky, Mark

From: Pasadena CSC <info@pasadenacsc.org>
Sent: Monday, January 13, 2020 11:01 AM
To: Jomsky, Mark
Subject: Fwd: Keep Pasadena Liveable - I Support VMT

Dear Mr. Jomsky,

As there was a typo in your email address in the below email, we are forwarding this to you.

/css
Pasadena CSC

---------- Forwarded message ---------
From: **Kelly Markham** <markham.kelly@yahoo.com>
Date: Mon, Jan 13, 2020 at 10:49 AM
Subject: Keep Pasadena Liveable - I Support VMT
To: mjomsky@cityofpsadena.net <mjomsky@cityofpsadena.net>
Cc: Pasadenacsc Info <info@pasadenacsc.org>

Dear Mayor and Honorable Councilmembers -

I am a homeowner, cyclist, pedestrian, transit user, and driver in the City of Pasadena. Pasadena once again demonstrated that it is a progressive and forward-thinking city when it adopted VMT in 2014. To revert to LOS would be a stunning and shameful reversal that will decrease livability and put us on the wrong side of history. Given the climate emergency we now face, we cannot continue to privilege automobiles to the detriment of other road users.

The decisions we make now will have a tremendous impact on the livability of the planet our children and grandchildren will inherit and the safety of our neighborhoods today. Please keep VMT as our impact metric.

Regards,

Kelly Markham

--
Pasadena Complete Streets Coalition
https://www.pasadenacsc.org
FB, Instagram, Twitter: @PasadenaCSC

01/13/2020
Item 11

Jomsky, Mark

From:	Ken Perry <kenpasadena@yahoo.com>
Sent:	Monday, January 13, 2020 2:21 PM
To:	cityclerk; Jomsky, Mark
Cc:	ContactKeepPasadenaMoving@gmail.com; Masuda, Gene; Gordo, Victor; Tornek, Terry; McAustin, Margaret
Subject:	Stop VMT - Give Everyone in Pasadena A Voice on Transportation Strategy - Not Just Complete Streets Extremists

Dear Honorable Mayor and Councilmembers,

The questionable and convenient recalculation of DOT metrics would greatly impact neighborhoods with increased traffic by over-development, resulting in unfavorable quality of life for residents. Over development, VMT, and the plans for having a "city without cars" is wrong for Pasadena.

If anything VMT and overdevelopment have created a situation where there are too many cars, too much pollution and too much traffic on our streets.

Unfortunately, the current Pasadena Transportation Department is in bed with extremists from the Complete Streets Coalition. We need to listen to the other 150,000 people who live in Pasadena and not continue to hand our transportation strategy over to this small group of people who hate cars and the people who drive them.

We need a City Council that stands up for all Pasadenans and makes decisions based everyone's views – not continue to hand our city and our car keys over to Blair Miller and her extremist followers.

Sincerely,

Ken Perry

775 N. Martelo Ave.

Pasadena, CA 91104

213-308-5319

01/13/2020
Item 11

Jomsky, Mark

From: Blair Smith <bs08113@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, January 13, 2020 11:42 AM
To: Jomsky, Mark
Subject: Transportation Performance Metrics - I support VMT!

Dear Honorable Mayor and Councilmembers,

I am unable to attend the meeting tonight but I am emailing to express my support for the City's continued use of VMT metrics and mitigation measures. In 2014, Pasadena set the standard for California by being the first to adopt VMT. Pasadena has historically lead the Los Angeles region with it's transportation innovation, first with Dobbins California Cycleway, next with the Pacific Red Car, and most recently with the Gold Line Metro Rail.

Reverting back to LOS would be a step back in the future of Pasadena's transportation. Pasadena needs to support it's legacy as a pedestrian friendly multi-modal community. That means protected bike lanes, wider sidewalks, and bus only lanes. Pasadena needs to prioritize reducing Green House Gases (GHGs) and improving mobility access for people of all ages and incomes.

Please maintain VMT as our impact metric.

Respectfully,
Blair Smith

01/13/2020
Item 11

Jomsky, Mark

From: Jeff Smith <kwaj61@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, January 13, 2020 2:07 PM
To: cityclerk
Cc: Jomsky, Mark
Subject: Stop VMT and Keep LOS

Dear Honorable Mayor and Councilmembers,

The questionable and convenient recalculation of DOT metrics would greatly impact neighborhoods with increased traffic by over-development, resulting in unfavorable quality of life for residents. Over development, VMT, and the plans for having a "city without cars" is wrong for Pasadena.
Further oversight on the City's behalf is needed for a cumulative review of DOTs plans to implement a new vehicular transportation model. The City has a duty to oversee mass changes to the fabric of the community when impact to quality of life and safety of Pasadena residents and neighborhoods are threatened by civic transportation and planning decisions, including excessive development.
Please do not maintain VMT as our impact metric and retain LOS.
Sincerely,

Jeffrey Smith

Jomsky, Mark

From: G Wester <gwester@ieee.org>
Sent: Monday, January 13, 2020 11:23 AM
To: Jomsky, Mark
Cc: info@pasadenacsc.org
Subject: January 13 Meeting Item 11 - I support VMT!

Dear Honorable Mayor and Councilmembers,

Our City deserves to have streets that are safe and livable for all users. In 2014, Pasadena set the standard for California by being the first to adopt VMT. Before this change, the most important thing about a street was how fast the cars on it could move. Now we can consider how close new housing is to jobs and retail. This allows us to design our infrastructure for a safe, livable community, not just for the convenience of car drivers.

Please maintain VMT as our impact metric.

Sincerely,

Dr. Gene Wester

Jomsky, Mark

From: jseadream@aol.com
Sent: Monday, January 13, 2020 11:29 AM
To: cityclerk; Jomsky, Mark
Subject: Stop VMT and keep LOS

Subject: Stop VMT and keep LOS

Dear Honorable Mayor and Councilmembers,
The questionable and convenient recalculation of DOT metrics would greatly impact neighborhoods with increased traffic by over-development, resulting in unfavorable quality of life for residents. Over development, VMT, and the plans for having a "city without cars" is wrong for Pasadena.

Further oversight on the City's behalf is needed for a cumulative review of DOTs plans to implement a new vehicular transportation model. The City has a duty to oversee mass changes to the fabric of the community when impact to quality of life and safety of Pasadena residents and neighborhoods are threatened by civic transportation and planning decisions, including excessive development.
Please do not maintain VMT as our impact metric and retain LOS.

Sincerely,
Janet Waldron and Dale Stanhope