

From: Charles Miller [mailto:chasmillier@gmail.com]

Sent: Saturday, August 25, 2012 03:03 PM

To: councilmember.huizar@lacity.org <councilmember.huizar@lacity.org>; councilmember.parks@lacity.org <councilmember.parks@lacity.org>; councilmember.labonge@lacity.org <councilmember.labonge@lacity.org>; councilmember.rosendahl@lacity.org <councilmember.rosendahl@lacity.org>; councilmember.koretz@lacity.org <councilmember.koretz@lacity.org>

Cc: Zenay Loera

<Zenay.Loera@lacity.org>; nate.hayward@lacity.org <nate.hayward@lacity.org>; paul.habib@lacity.org <paul.habib@lacity.org>; June.lagmay@lacity.org <June.lagmay@lacity.org>; john.white@lacity.org <john.white@lacity.org>; richard.williams@lacity.org <richard.williams@lacity.org>; Tina Gulotta-Miller <tmgulotta@yahoo.com>; Gretchen Knudsen <ohmworld@me.com>; wsherman@usc.edu <wsherman@usc.edu>; Tom Williams <ctwilliams2012@yahoo.com>; johnandmonica@sbcglobal.net, "tom pinkava" <tpinkava@gmail.com>, "trishagossett@sbcglobal.net" <trishagossett@sbcglobal.net>, waynnakato@sbcglobal.net <waynnakato@sbcglobal.net>

Subject: Submission for the Administrative Record: Community Briefing for 08/27/2012 Technical Advisory Committee Meeting concerning our SUPPORT for City Resolution 12-0002-S82 which OPPOSES the extension of SR-71 0 (North) along alternatives H-2, H-6, F-2, F

Gentlemen of the City of Los Angeles Transportation Committee,

First, we would like to make it clear we are in SUPPORT of City Resolution 12-0002-S82 which was ITEM NO. (30) on the L.A. City Council agenda, Friday, August 24 ITEM NO.(30) that OPPOSES the extension of SR-71 0 (North) along alternatives H-2, H-6, F-2, F-5, and F-6 and any above ground highway or freeway that would cut through the City of Los Angeles as it recognizes and speaks to 710 Freeway Extension alternatives by surface route highway (H-2, H-6), surface freeway (F-6) or tunnels (F-2, F-5) and their negative impacts to our Los Angeles communities.

We can also assume Metro takes the same position on the two tunnel routes (F-2, F-5) as they are no longer viable for further analysis or consideration due to these being the highest cost alternatives and least effective for reducing congestion.

While the negative effects of surface routes are clear and Metro in their own statements have indicated these alternatives no longer warrant further analysis, we do believe it is important to emphasize that Metro is recommending that tunnel option (F-7) be further assessed in the EIR process.

We have the same concerns regarding the (F-7) option as we did for the other tunnel alternatives (F-2, F-5) that were under consideration. Attached is a briefing document on this issue. We hope you take these points into consideration as you conduct your review of City Resolution 12-0002-S82 in Monday's Technical Advisory Committee meeting.

Please review the attached .PDF for our three-page Technical Tunnel Briefing Document that summarizes our concerns for the City of Los Angeles Technical Committee meeting occurring at 9AM on Monday, August 27, 2012 in Los Angeles City Council Chambers.

Respectfully submitted to the administrative record,

-- No 710 Freeway Extension

Contact:Tom Pinkava Phone: [323-351-0463](tel:323-351-0463)

NO TO THE



The NO 710 Freeway Extension coalition comprises Highland Park residents, as well as community members from Eagle Rock, El Sereno, Garvanza, Glassell Park, Pasadena, South Pasadena, San Rafael, Mount Washington and the surrounding areas. Since its inception at the end of July, just three weeks ago, the group has grown to over 1000 supporters. The coalition opposes all 710 freeway extension options being considered for its community, including any underground tunnel option. The coalition supports a "No Build" position and believes a light rail alternative for commuters and rail solution for freight is the best option for the health and well-being of the region.

Gentlemen of the City of Los Angeles Transportation Committee,

First, we want to make it clear we are in SUPPORT of City Resolution 12-0002-S82 which was ITEM NO. (30) on the L.A. City Council agenda, Friday, August 24 ITEM NO.(30) that OPPOSES the extension of SR-710 (North) along alternatives H-2, H-6, F-2, F-5, and F-6 and any above ground highway or freeway that would cut through the City of Los Angeles as it recognizes and speaks to 710 Freeway Extension alternatives by surface route highway (H-2, H-6), surface freeway (F-6) or tunnels (F-2, F-5) and their negative impacts to our Los Angeles communities.

We can also assume Metro takes the same position on the two tunnel routes (F-2, F-5) as they are no longer viable for further analysis or consideration due to these being the highest cost alternatives and least effective for reducing congestion.

While the negative effects of surface routes are clear and Metro in their own statements have indicated these alternatives no longer warrant further analysis, we do believe it is important to emphasize that Metro is recommending that tunnel option (F-7) be further assessed in the EIR process.

We have the same concerns regarding the (F-7) option as we did for the other tunnel alternatives that were under consideration (F-2, F-5). Attached is a briefing document on this issue. We hope you take these points into consideration as you conduct your review of City Resolution 12-0002-S82.

Respectfully submitted to the administrative record,

-- No 710 Freeway Extension

Contact: Tom Pinkava Phone: 323-351-0463

SR 710 EXTENSION OVERVIEW AND ISSUES

TECHNICAL

1. "Tunnel" is defined by Metro as EITHER "cut and cover" or bored through the ground. Current Metro plans do not differentiate between "cut and cover" and bored" tunnels, which Metro treats as being the same thing.

*"Cut and cover" requires removal of all homes, businesses, and other surface structures, digging a trench, building the roadway, and then covering the roadway with a concrete lid and dirt.

*"Bored tunnel" is created by digging large access pits at either end of the tunnel and inserting large boring machines. Dirt is removed through the pits. Even with bored tunnels, "cut and cover" or trench segments may be needed to access the tunnel.