



Adam Lid <adam.lid@lacity.org>

Subject: CF 15-0719 Mobility Plan 2035 Is Based on Flawed Data

1 message

homeowners-encino@sbcglobal.net <homeowners-encino@sbcglobal.net>
To: City Clerk Wolcott <clerk.webfeedback@lacity.org>, Adam.Lid@lacity.org

Thu, Jul 30, 2015 at 7:34 AM



Homeowners of Encino

◆ Serving the Homeowners of Encino ◆

GERALD A. SILVER
President
PO BOX 260205
ENCINO, CA 91428
Phone (818)990-2757

July 30, 2015

Adam R. Lid
Legislative Assistant
200 N. Spring St. Room 340
Los Angeles, CA 90012
Email: Adam.Lid@lacity.org

Joint Hearing: August 4, 2015
Transportation and PLUM Comm.

Subject: CF 15-0719 Mobility Plan 2035 Is Based on Flawed Data
Joint Meeting Mobility Plan 2035 – August 4, 2015

The Los Angeles Planning Dept. is updating its Transportation plan, now re-branded as the Mobility Element of the City's General Plan. This update opens the door to all modes of travel on City streets. Traditionally Los Angeles streets were reserved primarily for vehicle and bus transportation, not for bicycles or outdoor dining. Many residents believe that Los Angeles streets are too dangerous for extensive bicycle use, and creates an incompatibility between bicycles and motor vehicles.

As in the past, the City's outreach efforts are inadequate and fraught with faulty assumptions. There is very little public participation the Mobility Element revision. Inadequate outreach will lead to a revision that will not likely be accepted by the public. Online Town Halls where only a few hundred people participate is not a sound basis for transportation planning.

The major flaw in the Mobility Element is the lack of a strong connection between allowable growth and development and transportation infrastructure. The failure to constrain new development until transportation infrastructure is actually in place dooms the Mobility Element to failure. The faulty reasoning that effective "transit corridors" are actually in place allows more development to take place creating more traffic problems not less.

The Mobility Plan 2035, as well as Mayor Garcetti's Sustainability pLAN, are based on false population projections. When the premise of the size of the population in 2035 is materially wrong, then the conclusions based on that false assumption deprive the entire Plan of legitimacy. The Sustainability pLAN is relevant to the Mobility Plan 2035 because its data for the 2035 population is materially different from the population

projection under the Mobility Plan 2035.

When the City issues two major Planning documents for year 2035 within a couple months of each other, their population projections should be in the same ball park. When there is a huge discrepancy, then no one may rely on either Plan. Sustainability Plan says at least 500,000 more people by 2035, but the Mobility Plan 2035 says 318,500 by 2035. That is a difference of 181,500 ppl. The discrepancy is about 50%, depending on which number one selects as the base number. Both Plans need to address this significant problem, and since Mobility Plan 2035's FEIR issued after Sustainability pLAn, Mobility Plan 2035 had a duty under CEQA to address this matter.

The City should not "repurpose" its City streets, or buy into current fads and buzz-words, such as parklets. While parklets, (amenities jutting out onto boulevards), provide a cheap solution to the need for public open space with amenities like seating, outdoor dining, planters, bike parking and art, they are dangerous and certainly hinder the flow of traffic. For Los Angeles, repurposing City streets into parklets makes about as much sense as repurposing City parks into paved park lots.

City Planners need to discover what the public really needs and wants. Does the public want faster traffic flow or "slower traffic calming", more attractive streetscapes, safer streets, more pedestrian friendly streets or streets open to more modes of travel (skateboards, bicycles, etc.), more parking spaces or less, better police/fire access, better curb alignment, more planted medians or less, more reverse lanes or one-way streets, etc.? Asking whether the public wants more outdoor dining located physically on city streets is meaningless in absence of accident rates and impacts on traffic flow. The right questions that need to be asked, rather than vague questions such as: "Are you concerned about the impact on our natural resources and our physical health?"

The Mobility Element should encourage more investment in streets, better flowing traffic, better street maintenance, more parking spaces and more available parking lots. The free, open market is the most effective tool to enable residents to make transportation choices. Rather than "forcing" residents out of their cars and into public transit, the City should provide better, cleaner, faster, safer transportation options. Then allow the market place to determine the best usage of City streets, not Central Planners.

Conservation of natural resources is important, but so is the comfort and convenience of the traveling public. While the conservation of natural resources is important, it should not be the means to dictate transportation options. Thirty-nine story, high-rise apartments for example may be more efficient than single family dwellings, but fail to address the needs of many families.

Cordially yours,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Gerald A. Silver". The ink is dark and the signature is fluid and legible.

Gerald A. Silver,
President



This email has been checked for viruses by Avast antivirus software.
www.avast.com