

To Whom It May Concern:

I don't believe that options 2, 3, or 4 would make Rowena or the surrounding neighborhood safer. None of these options should be considered. We've wasted years not fixing safety issues in the surrounding area knowing there are serious problems. A terrible example is the tragic hit and run death just weeks ago at Waverly and Glendale Blvd where a motorbike was rear ended and dragged a block. This is an intersection that is part of the study and known to be dangerous; an intersection that already had a traffic light approved. We're spending years fighting over a 3/4 mile road diet on a stretch with two schools where over 600 children ages 2 to 11 go to school everyday. Injury collisions are down on Rowena. Injury collisions are up citywide.

We want more safety not less!

We want bike lanes that connect to SOMEWHERE, ANYWHERE: to the L.A. River, to Griffith Park, to the Griffith Park Blvd bike lane. We don't want to be on our heels begging to keep a road diet. We want leaders who stand up for people and safe individual mobility, not one more car lane that will induce more demand and choke the end points further.

I support Option 1 regarding Rowena. Frankly, I'm confused why we paid for a report that includes 3 options that are less safe. Why wasn't an option included that made it safer with protected bike lanes?

I support all other safety recommendations in the report except when it comes to St. George and Rowena. The report's recommendation of a right turn lane on St. George is not a safer option. This is a very precarious intersection that is difficult to cross on foot. Eastbound drivers on St. George endlessly run the stop sign. Many children cross here to go to Marshall High and Ivanhoe. Someone is going to get hurt if it doesn't get safer. We need continental striping and bulb outs.

Please prioritize safety and carbon free mobility options.

Sincerely,
Sean Meredith