



● **McQUISTON ASSOCIATES**

6212 Yucca St, Los Angeles, CA 90028-5223

(323) 464-6792 FAX same

consultants to technical management

July 31, 2015

CF15-0719

ITEM 1 JOINT TRANS-PLUM

8/4/15

A. Lid

**STATEMENT of J.H. McQUISTON on
PROPOSED MOBILITY PLAN 235**

Honorable Chairmen and Members of the Committees:

1. Be careful! State Law and California Supreme Court clearly stated: The General Plan is the "constitution" which this City must obey. City may not ignore or otherwise violate this Plan if enacted.

This Plan **gobbles funds**. This Plan amendment if realized **must abort** City-infrastructure improvements like critically-necessary parks, programs and public safety. Look at its list of required-programs.¹

2. The amendment lacks documentation proving why denizens are mobile in this City. Without such documentation, how can the Plan be said to *satisfy* the *actual* mobility-needs of City's denizens?

3. The maps apparently-ignore major mobile-elements like State and Federal Highways which substantially-affect mobility. State Law requires the Plan to include specifics on **mobility**; which specifics cannot be genuine without including these elements' effect.

4. AN ISSUE: Policy 3.4 Note, on TOC Corridors, raises unsaid a conundrum: How can you build costly, large structures close to public transit yet enable low-income people to live in them unsubsidized?

My observations on the Red Line conclude that the rich and the business-people won't spend time to ride thereon; yet they are the *only* ones who can afford quarters in the dense and costly structures *near* that line.

At the subway's EIR phase, I observed most would-be riders have to ride at least 3 linked-forms of public-transportation to get from origin to destination, besides walking-lengths before and after. Business-people with cases and brochures, having labor and overhead costs at hundreds of dollars per hour, or those with bulky-item pickup, require other rides and at "rush" and "non-rush" times. Their volume constantly-saturates streets.

The Plan must answer issues like the above, or else it's not viable.

5. State Law prohibits amending the General Plan more than 4 times a year. Already this year this City amended its General Plan more than 4 times. This amendment is vulnerable to writ.

6. State Law² purposely-forbids the Council to amend what the Commission approved; If the Council desires amendment, Council must remand to the Commission. The alternatives for Council are *only* to approve or reject Commission's work. I suggest the Council remand this to Commission because it's legally-vague and ignores State Code mandates. And, it harms City's ability for infrastructure-improvement.

Respectfully submitted,

J. H. McQuiston

c:Interested parties

¹The "action" section indicates the programs may not be required. But the State Law cited in this Plan **requires specificity**. Nothing in this Plan may be optional, or else the Plan is legally-vague and non-compliant with State law. **This Plan requires B&F review; it could very-well affect the City's Fitch-rating.**

² The State Laws and Court mandates called-out herein are well-known to the City Attorney but can be supplied on request.