

Martinez, Ruben

From: City Web
Sent: Sunday, January 31, 2021 7:58 PM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse
Subject: Public Comment for Meeting on February 1, 2021 about Agenda Item 6

Public Comment for Meeting on February 1, 2021 about Agenda Item 6

Name: Keep Pasadena Moving **Email:** contactkeeppasadenamoving@gmail.com **Address:** PASADENA, CA - California 91105

Comments:

Mayor Gordo and City Council,

Pasadena DOT asked to meet with KPM on December 22, 2020, for a “listening session for DOT staff to get feedback from KPM” on CEQA and Outside CEQA. KPM also attended the TAC special meeting 1/28/21. KPM responded to both meetings with a presentation on background, analysis, and recommendations. This presentation was developed in unison with various Pasadena neighborhood associations and provided to you under separate letter. A thank you goes to Madison Heights association for the independent traffic analysis.

Ask of the city. Please review the KPM presentation and take special attention that new development does increase traffic, and the VMT process was created to obfuscate what LOS proved – as defined by DOT’s consulting firm, Fehr/Peers: LOS is an “operational analysis”, whereas VMT is “behavioral analysis”. Why is that important: LOS measures traffic flow by new development, VMT does not. VMT and CEQA mitigation by state legislation supports developers and housing lobbyists while avoiding the responsibility to address traffic increase which impacts safety for all of us- driver, cyclist, pedestrian, young, old, visitors, and the list goes on.

If the real concerns are safety, the city should prioritize and enact measures that improve safety. Thank you.

02/01/2021
Item 6

Martinez, Ruben

From: City Web
Sent: Sunday, January 31, 2021 8:39 AM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse
Subject: Public Comment for Meeting on February 1, 2021 about Agenda Item 6

Public Comment for Meeting on February 1, 2021 about Agenda Item 6

Name: Ken Perry **Email:** kenpasadena@yahoo.com **Address:** East Pasadena Resident,
Pasadena, CA 91104

Comments:

Pre-covid, streets that are major corridors – like California, Colorado, Fair Oaks, Lake, Rosemead and Foothill – were jammed much of the day. With each development, the situation keeps getting worse.

I applaud the efforts of the city to try to ensure more large developments are required to go through the CEQA process.

Mitigations for local mobility have gotten less attention but are also critical.

Since their projects impact traffic flow, developers should be responsible for helping to make traffic better – not worse. We need to consider common sense ideas like traffic lights and turn lanes that actually work to mitigate traffic flow.

Some of the ideas mentioned in today's presentation will actually make traffic flow worse – or cause traffic to migrate onto neighboring residential streets.

A good idea would be a task force made up of a broad cross section of residents in our city to work directly with the Department of Transportation on common sense ideas that make developers accountable for their impacts on traffic flow.

02/01/2021
Item 6

Traffic congestion negatively impacts our way of life in Pasadena and makes Pasadena a less desirable place to live. We need to consider better ways to stop traffic gridlock from becoming too common.

Consent given to read my comments out loud: Yes

Entry Submitted: January 31, 2021 at 8:38 am

Martinez, Ruben

From: City Web
Sent: Monday, February 01, 2021 3:40 PM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse
Subject: Public Comment for Meeting on February 1, 2021 about Agenda Item 6

Public Comment for Meeting on February 1, 2021 about Agenda Item 6

Name: Erika Foy **Email:** [REDACTED] **Phone:** 626-[REDACTED] **Address:** [REDACTED]
Pasadena, CA 91106

Comments:

Good afternoon- Thank you very much for taking the time to dig deeply into this issue. We are seeing more and more high-density, multi-family apartments and condos, and as you saw tonight, more medical offices being built in mass adjacent to single family neighborhoods. While I support development and the improvement of neighborhoods, we have to be certain we thoroughly investigate how we can add more development while keeping our streets functioning and safe for all modes of transportation, from pedestrians to folks in their cars. Our current CEQA thresholds are already too high and our mobility mitigations are minimal at best. What's interesting is in our street segment analysis of our mobility element, the higher the volume on a street like Fair Oaks, the less chance mitigations will be triggered because it is done on percentage basis of street volume. Only streets with low volume get triggered. This is backwards in my mind. The two new medical offices being proposed on the same block on South Fair Oaks are going to cause incredible delay and intersection failure. How can we prevent this from happening? We need to fix our local mobility measures to be more impactful.

Consent given to read my comments out loud: Yes

Entry Submitted: February 1, 2021 at 3:40 pm

02/01/2021
Item 6

Martinez, Ruben

From: City Web
Sent: Monday, February 01, 2021 2:12 PM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse
Subject: Public Comment for Meeting on February 1, 2021 about Agenda Item 6

Public Comment for Meeting on February 1, 2021 about Agenda Item 6

Name: Topher Mathers **Address:** Pasadena, CA 91106

Comments:

Pasadena took a prgressice step when it adopted VMT. The housing crisis, like the climate crisis will not go away unless we address it and make smart decisions.

LOS was an outdated metric, it only prioritized speeding cars. VMT takes into account many factors that relate to people's mobility.

People's mobility needs exist on a spectrum; we move through our city for different reasons and utilize different forms of transposition for different trips. Using LOS when analyzing mobility was akin to looking at a rainbow while being colorblind. VMT allows you to see the full spectrum of people's mobility needs.

An example of this is Pasadena the Pilgrim Towers on Villa St. When it was built Villa was widened to accommodate the "flow of traffic", this did not take into consideration many of the elder residents might not have a car or no longer drive. Widening the street made it harder for elderly residents and people with mobility issues to cross and reach the bus stop.

Adopting VMT was the right decision, it puts us in compliance with state law, creates a liveable Pasadena, and will ensure we have an inhabitable world for future generations.

Consent given to read my comments out loud: Yes

02/01/2021
Item 6