

Martinez, Ruben

From: City Web
Sent: Monday, November 16, 2020 7:10 AM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse
Subject: Public Comment for Meeting on November 16, 2020 about Agenda Item 11

Public Comment for Meeting on November 16, 2020 about Agenda Item 11

Name: Ken Perry **Email:** **Phone:** **Address:** Pasadena,
CA 91104

Comments:

The current VMT proposal before the city council continues the pro-development status quo the voters recently rejected in the municipal elections.

The city has not shown that bicycle trips or walkers are replacing any automobile trips. After their bicycle ride or walk, they are still getting in their cars. Train and bus ridership continue to plummet. Meanwhile, our local traffic gets worse with every new multifamily project.

The new VMT proposal does not force developers to go through CEQA. We are left with a city that continues to produce too many luxury condos and not enough affordable housing.

More disturbing is an independent expert analysis of the city's proposal that finds the VMT report was at best shoddy and at worst purposely deceitful. How can we ever trust another report signed by Director Laura Comejo again? The city needs to do its own independent investigation.

Stop the VMT charade and redirect the Pasadena DOT so that it starts serving the residents and not developers and special interests.

Consent given to read my comments out loud: Yes

11/16/2020
Item 11

Martinez, Ruben

From: City Web
Sent: Monday, November 16, 2020 8:15 AM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse
Subject: Public Comment for Meeting on November 16, 2020 about Agenda Item 11

Public Comment for Meeting on November 16, 2020 about Agenda Item 11

Name:	Email:	Phone:	Address:
Jeanette Mann			, Pasadena, California 91104-4902

Comments:

The current VMT proposal does not stop overdevelopment and adds to our overcrowded streets. I urge you to reject it.

Consent given to read my comments out loud: Yes

Martinez, Ruben

From: City Web
Sent: Monday, November 16, 2020 10:20 AM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse
Subject: Public Comment for Meeting on November 16, 2020 about Agenda Item 11

Public Comment for Meeting on November 16, 2020 about Agenda Item 11

Name: Frank Duerr **Email:** **Phone:** **Address:** Pasadena, CA
91104

Comments:

Mayor Tornek, and Council members,

My name is Frank Duerr, leader of KeepPasadenaMoving (KPM), leader of Paloma Neighborhood association, and speaking today as an individual on the VMT/CEQA topic.

I ask the Mayor and Council for a continuance for further review and analysis due to the complex nature of the proposed VMT CEQA policy change. If the City agrees to proceed, may unwittingly impact the City, the environment and neighborhoods for the future. Analysis by a third-party traffic engineering firm, Prism Engineering, (public record) identifies examples that compels the City for a thorough understanding of VMT/CEQA.

It is my view that traffic safety needs to be prioritized, as important as the environment argument. The "outside CEQA" analysis methods are currently allowing development projects to proceed without mitigation as compared to historic ways of reviewing development impacts under CEQA. This topic needs more explanation and sample calculations to be reviewed and studied, verify methodology and soundness of how development triggers CEQA VMT thresholds. Right now, it appears to lean to obfuscate CEQA and render over development unchecked.

Thank you for your consideration.

Consent given to read my comments out loud: Yes

11/16/2020
Item 11

Martinez, Ruben

From: City Web
Sent: Monday, November 16, 2020 10:41 AM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse
Subject: Public Comment for Meeting on November 16, 2020 about Agenda Item 11.UPDATE TO CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT (CEQA) TRANSPORTATION PERFORMANCE THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Public Comment for Meeting on November 16, 2020 about Agenda Item 11.UPDATE TO CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT (CEQA) TRANSPORTATION PERFORMANCE THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Name: Lee Allen (Keep Pasadena Moving) **Address:** Pasadena, CA 91104

Comments:

Concerning the misguided and confusing VMT metric, I am requesting the City Council take the reins from DOT and demand a continuance or outright reject it. VMT is too complex for most people to understand. CEQA is California's broadest environmental law protecting our environment, but raising VMT thresholds gives developers an easy way to avoid an environmental review that prompts mitigation. As a result, we're seeing runaway overdevelopment, increased traffic and noise, but, even before the pandemic, no increase ridership on buses and certainly no increase in commuter bicycling. VMT measures 100% car trips into and out of the city but I wonder why we've never seen percentage of bicycle trips?

DOT has several times attempted to explain VMT in simple language but, with all due respect, even some commissioners don't understand it. Either VMT is complex or DOT is attempting to wear us down in hopes we'll give up and go away.

It's time for the City Council and the new Mayor to step up and take the reins.

Consent given to read my comments out loud: Yes

Martinez, Ruben

From: City Web
Sent: Monday, November 16, 2020 1:22 PM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse
Subject: Public Comment for Meeting on November 16, 2020 about Agenda Item 11

Public Comment for Meeting on November 16, 2020 about Agenda Item 11

Name: Janet **Email:** **Phone:** **Address:**
Waldron Ave., Pasadena, CA 91104

Comments:

“The current VMT proposal does not stop overdevelopment and adds to our overcrowded streets. I urge you to reject it.”

Consent given to read my comments out loud: No

Martinez, Ruben

From: City Web
Sent: Monday, November 16, 2020 1:58 PM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse
Subject: Public Comment for Meeting on November 16, 2020 about Agenda Item 11. CEQA Transportation Thresholds

Public Comment for Meeting on November 16, 2020 about Agenda Item 11. CEQA Transportation Thresholds

Name: Nina Chomsky **Email:** **Phone:** **Address:** Pasadena, CA 91103

Comments:

I am writing in my individual capacity about the recommended update to CEQA Thresholds, as follows:

1. The 15% recommendation is NOT based on current information. There is no analysis of recent and “pipeline” projects to determine a legitimate percentage.
2. Applying the recommendation city-wide is not valid. There are differences among areas such as the Central District, commercial areas adjacent to sensitive neighborhoods, traffic corridors. The recommendation should be differentiated and applied by area impacts.
3. The alleged implications of stricter thresholds are irrelevant. Why should state development and housing pressures overcome this Council’s duty to put the livability of Pasadena and quality of life over state pressures?
4. Full “inside” CEQA review protects neighborhoods and residential areas, including multi-family areas, from permanent significant physical impacts, including traffic impacts, through detailed and enforceable mitigations in response to all significant impacts. The obvious “no CEQA” bias of this recommendation should be rejected.
5. Do NOT find that the recommended thresholds are supported by “substantial evidence”. This is a

serious legal conclusion that should only be reached through a written legal Opinion, and not a City department recommendation.

This whole process is incomplete and should be continued for further detailed analysis.

Consent given to read my comments out loud: Yes

Martinez, Ruben

From: City Web
Sent: Monday, November 16, 2020 3:32 PM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse
Subject: Public Comment for Meeting on November 16, 2020 about Agenda Item 10 & 11

Public Comment for Meeting on November 16, 2020 about Agenda Item 10 & 11

Name: j **Address:** Pasadena, CA 91107

Comments:

I'm a long time resident of Pasadena. I have found that the recent last minute packing of important items such as PROPOSED CHANGE TO THE CITY COUNCIL ADOPTED SPEED HUMP POLICIES AND PROCEDURES & UPDATE TO CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT (CEQA) TRANSPORTATION PERFORMANCE THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE without informing city residents of their outsize importance relative other agenda items to be an egregious lack of transparency on the part of Pasadena City Hall. Until more time is allowed to allow fellow residents to respond, you should be ashamed of yourselves for trying to ram through further development at our expense.

Consent given to read my comments out loud: Yes

11/16/2020
Item 10 & 11

Martinez, Ruben

From: City Web
Sent: Monday, November 16, 2020 6:19 PM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse
Subject: Public Comment for Meeting on November 16, 2020 about Agenda Item 11

Public Comment for Meeting on November 16, 2020 about Agenda Item 11

Name: Kristin Harrison **Email:** **Phone:** **Address:** Pasadena, CA 91106

Comments:

After listening to a traffic commission meeting a few weeks ago, it was clear to me that there needs to be a deeper understanding about how traffic is analyzed in Pasadena, what raising the CEQA thresholds will do to change it, as well as understand other ways that traffic can be analyzed. With a better understanding, and a mindset of wanting to protect our citizens, streets and neighborhoods, I believe you will find that the city does not do enough already to protect us from these issues, and the newly proposed CEQA thresholds will make it worse.

Development is necessary in our city and they should be able to work within the existing guidelines that are focused on keeping Pasadena the town we all enjoy. New developments should add to the city, not make it worse. Allowing denser housing, without putting limits on it due to environmental impacts, like traffic, will make Pasadena feel like Brentwood.

Please allow more time for the CEQA analysis to be understood as it stands today. When the city is ready to move forward, a deeper knowledge can be had by everyone deciding on this issue. It's a big one that cannot be taken lightly.

Consent given to read my comments out loud: Yes

11/16/2020
Item 11

Martinez, Ruben

From: City Web
Sent: Monday, November 16, 2020 6:05 PM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse
Subject: Public Comment for Meeting on November 16, 2020 about Agenda Item 11

Public Comment for Meeting on November 16, 2020 about Agenda Item 11

Name:	Email:	Phone:	Address:
Erika Foy			Pasadena, CA 91106

Comments:

There already has been much discussion about VMT but the information needed to make substantial decisions is not there. Raising the VMT without understanding the mathematics behind the increase could potentially remove the ability of City Council to accurately assess the impact future projects could have on our city and our infrastructure. The city still has not shared the math behind the numbers. To ignore how these thresholds could change our city streets would be a travesty. DOT, can you please share with the council what kinds of conditions have been imposed for outside CEQA other than bike racks and which street segments they were on? The larger street segments do not trigger outside CEQA like 253 South Los Robles. The caps were too high. The more cars on a street, the less likely it gets tripped. You also cannot compare VMT against other jurisdictions because it is not apples to apples. Every city uses different methods as the OPR allows. Your charts make no sense because 253 South Los Robles had a VMT of 12.6 in 2013. How can the 2013 example project have a VMT of 16 being of lesser size?

Consent given to read my comments out loud: Yes

11/16/2020
Item 11