

April 12, 2021

Design Commission and Department of Transportation

% Michi Takeda
Pasadena City Hall
100 N. Garfield Ave
Pasadena, CA 91101

RE: 3452 East Foothill Boulevard

There has been intense frustration in the community because of the do-nothing approach to the problem of ever-increasing traffic caused by the addition of incredible density throughout our city. The damage of adding mass density with unmitigated projects is becoming more and more concerning. I was pleasantly surprised to read the March 8th, 2021 Transportation Memorandum prepared for 3452 East Foothill Boulevard. Frankly, this is the first analysis I have come across from the department which actually provides conditions for approval which address LOS and ADT caps. While the conditions are a great start to improving the quality of life for current residents, I would like to suggest adding the following-

- 1) Residents are still concerned about Foothill Boulevard and the impacts this project will have on their main thoroughfare. What is particularly strange is the higher the street volume on streets like Foothill Boulevard, the less chance mitigations are triggered. We need to fix this issue. The residents of East Pasadena are feeling overwhelmed by the increasing traffic in and around the area especially considering the updated Specific Plan has more dense housing planned for the future. There have been suggestions a signal is needed at Hastings Ranch Shopping Center and an additional signal on Rosemead. There has also been the idea a pedestrian bridge would be a positive addition for both walkers and drivers. *The traffic impact fees from this project should be reserved for this area as a proper nexus to mitigate future needs that may arise.*
- 2) In another recently approved project for 590 South Fair Oaks, there was a condition for approval where DOT would monitor a street segment for 12 months following the issuance of the projects Certificate of Occupancy to track and document very specific issues of concern. In the case of 3452 East Foothill Boulevard, the Auto Level of Service cap was exceeded at the Sierra Madre Villa Avenue at Foothill Blvd intersection and conditions have been placed on the project to help improve the intersection, but because the intersection is shown to fail with the addition of this project, it would only make sense to monitor if the improvements have helped to mitigate the situation. This is also true for the street segment of Halstead Avenue where the ADT cap was exceeded.
- 3) *The City's Department of Transportation should commission a complete traffic study two years following the issuance of this project's Certificate of Occupancy.* This was a condition of approval for 590 South Fair Oaks and this seems appropriate for this project as well. The project should be required to deposit funds for a technical analysis of the area of impact.

- 4) To reduce the vehicular trips on Halstead, one condition of approval is to offer discounted Metro passes for five years. The project's overall success is based on the fact many residents will be using Metro because it is so transit oriented. There should be a way to monitor this activity. If the passes are not utilized after 5 years, the developer should be required to continue to offer the incentive past the expired time period.

If Pasadena is really interested in reducing the neighborhood traffic that stems from all of these projects, ADT caps, and LOS measurements must be continually monitored especially if projects of this size are found to be infill exempt. Residents are losing faith in city planners and traffic engineers as the VMT and VT ideal cannot possibly address traffic concerns especially in a localized manner. The City has made a promise to protect single-family neighborhoods and part of that promise is to ensure these neighborhoods are not jammed with speeding cars or surrounded by inoperable streets.

The traffic discussion needs perfect transparency, public engagement, and engineering discipline so that we may grow our city without creating a hopeless mess of congestion. I hope this decision body will consider taking a closer look at the additional mitigation and impact needs of the community. We must be certain the city doesn't miss the opportunity to support Goal Five of the General Plan when projects are exempt from CEQA.

Thank you,

Erika Foy