Responses to Comments on the Draft General Plan

Below are responses to comments that the City received regarding the draft General Plan, which was made available for a 60-day period coinciding the with 60-day public review period for the General Plan Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR). Numbered comment letters follow the responses. When a letter includes more than one comment, the comments are numbered (for example, 1.1, 1.2, etc.) and corresponding responses are numbered similarly below. Comments addressing the General Plan EIR or both the General Plan and the General Plan EIR are addressed in the Final EIR.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letter/Comment/Commenter</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Mandi Dillin 1.1 Maintain residential neighborhood integrity; concerned about new structures on Fremont</td>
<td>The draft General Plan includes an overarching goal to maintain the integrity of existing residential neighborhoods and several specific goals &amp; policies to support this concept. Specific new structures are not the focus of the General Plan, which is a policy document aimed at future decision-making.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Citywide interest in preserving historic structures is needed.</td>
<td>The draft General Plan includes a specific goal and several policies and implementation programs aimed at historic resource preservation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Who defines and enforces standards for terms like “character” and “high quality.”</td>
<td>City decision-makers will make all interpretations of adopted policies with guidance from staff and the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 Better use existing buildings on Main Street.</td>
<td>Adaptive reuse of existing buildings is a component of creating a vital “Downtown” along Main Street, as envisioned in the Land Use &amp; Community Design Chapter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 The General Plan should maintain a small town image. The renderings in the draft General Plan do not convey this image.</td>
<td>Maintenance of the community character, particularly existing residential neighborhoods, is a key component of the General Plan vision. The images in the General Plan are conceptual and illustrative. All new construction would comply with current height and massing limitations, which are not proposed change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6 Buildings in the city should be adaptively reused.</td>
<td>Policy R-6A of the Resources chapter encourages the preservation of historic resources. Adaptive reuse of buildings is one way in which this might be achieved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7 Make the community more pedestrian friendly for visitors, embrace the reputation as a foodie city, and keep rents from increasing.</td>
<td>Various components of the draft General Plan are aimed at making the community more pedestrian friendly and attracting tourists, including “foodie” tourists. Rents are governed by market forces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8 Remove the linear park and consider alternatives for providing green space.</td>
<td>Due to concerns raised about the viability of the linear park, that feature has been removed from the General Plan. Other options for enhancing green space in the community remain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9 Bike lanes are needed.</td>
<td>The draft General Plan includes a conceptual bike plan, but due to physical constraints and safety concerns, primarily focuses on Class III bike routes and keeping bicyclists off major thoroughfares. There may be limited opportunities to incorporate bike lanes on redesigned roadways over the life of the General Plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letter/Comment/Commenter</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.10</strong> A luxury hotel is needed, but should be on Main Street or E. Valley Boulevard.</td>
<td>The conceptual “entertainment district”, discussed in the Land Use &amp; Community Design chapter, would be on E. Valley Boulevard and could potentially accommodate boutique hotels that are consistent with height and massing restrictions for that area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.11</strong> Preserve the home at 403 S. Garfield and move it to the golf course.</td>
<td>The General Plan does not involve any alterations to that home. If any modifications are proposed at some point in the future, such modifications may be subject to environmental review and mitigation. The Resources chapter of the General Plan includes Goal R-6 and related policies aimed at historic resource preservation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.12</strong> Include more specifics regarding sustainability, including drought tolerant landscaping and banning of styrofoam and plastic bags.</td>
<td>The Resources and Services &amp; Infrastructure chapters include various policies generally aimed at reducing water and energy use and solid waste generation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2 Melissa Michelson</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where is the data from the surveys and how many residents indicated a desire for a large hotel and linear parkway?</td>
<td>The results of the surveys conducted as part of the General Plan update process can be viewed at <a href="http://www.cityofalhambra.org/resources/general-plan-update">http://www.cityofalhambra.org/resources/general-plan-update</a>. Responses to the community survey conducted in conjunction with the draft General Plan indicated that 43.3 percent of Alhambra residents believe the City has too few hotels and 6.4 percent believe the City has too many hotels. The only land uses for which residents more strongly felt more is needed are entertainment uses (65.7 percent) and retail stores (44.1 percent). It should also be noted that any hotels allowed in the City would be “boutique” hotels that would comply with existing height and massing restrictions. Finally, the linear park has been removed from the General Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3 George Shafer</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include sidewalks and bikeways south of I-10.</td>
<td>The conceptual bikeways map shown on Figure 12 of the draft General Plan includes bikeways south of I-10. Any new or re-designed roads will continue to meet City standards, including sidewalks, as appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4 Amal S. Moore, Library Media Aide, Alhambra USD</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streets need to be re-paved and broken curbs repaired.</td>
<td>This concern is noted, but is not directly relevant to the General Plan. The City has an existing program for re-paving/maintenance of streets and sidewalks that will continue to be implemented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5 Robert Gutierrez</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5.1</strong> More trees are needed on Fremont Avenue.</td>
<td>The Land Use &amp; Community Design chapter includes policies aimed at adding streetscaping throughout the City.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5.2</strong> More bike lanes are needed.</td>
<td>The Mobility chapter includes a conceptual bikeways map (see Figure 12). It is anticipated that the bikeways map will be refined as part of a final bikeways plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5.3</strong> More parks are needed. Is it possible to turn the former Lowe’s into park space?</td>
<td>The Quality of Life chapter includes various ideas/policies for enhancing recreational opportunities. The Lowe’s site is private property that would have to be purchased to convert to park space.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5.4</strong> Light posts need maintenance.</td>
<td>This comment is not directly relevant to the General Plan, but maintenance of all City infrastructure will continue to be a priority for the Public Works Department.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Responses to Comments on the Draft General Plan**

2
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letter/Comment/Commenter</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>Signs informing dog owners that pets are not allowed in playgrounds are needed. This comment is not directly relevant to the General Plan, but the concern is noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>The Ratkovich development on Fremont should not be allowed. This opinion is not directly relevant to the General Plan, but is noted. That development has received no approval from the City.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>More landscaping projects like the recent one on Mission are needed. This opinion is noted. The Land Use &amp; Community Design chapter includes various policies aimed at enhancing landscaping throughout the City.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>More places that attract a younger crowd are needed. The draft General Plan acknowledges this desire and includes a conceptual &quot;entertainment district&quot; on E. Valley Boulevard that could attract uses such as those suggested by the commenter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>Indoor playground businesses are needed. This opinion is noted. General Plan Policy QL-6F encourages the development of quality commercial recreational facilities in the City.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>Speed bumps are needed on Montezuma Avenue and Palm Avenue Speed humps may not be the preferred traffic calming device, but the following policy has been added to the General Plan Mobility chapter: Policy 4M-B Where feasible and appropriate, incorporate traffic calming features on neighborhood streets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Franklin Murillo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>Bike locks are needed on Main Street. Policy M-2F of the Mobility chapter has been modified to include the provision of bike parking in the City’s bike network.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>Bus shelters should be added. Policy M-2B of the Mobility addresses this suggestion by improving the utility, safety, and attractiveness of alternative modes of transportation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>An ordinance forcing owners of vacant properties along Main Street to lower rents is needed. The Land Use &amp; Community Design chapter encourages enhancement of the Main Street corridor (Downtown), but the requested ordinance it outside the scope of the General Plan. Such an ordinance may face legal challenges.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Angelica Munoz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Save the Victorian home at 403 S. Garfield Avenue. The General Plan does not involve any alterations to that home. If any modifications are proposed at some point in the future, such modifications may be subject to environmental review and mitigation. The Resources chapter of the General Plan includes Goal R-6 and related policies aimed at historic resource preservation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>James Pilon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Save the Victorian home at 403 S. Garfield Avenue. The General Plan does not involve any alterations to that home. If any modifications are proposed at some point in the future, such modifications may be subject to environmental review and mitigation. The Resources chapter of the General Plan includes Goal R-6 and related policies aimed at historic resource preservation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Lanette Nelson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Save the Victorian home at 403 S. Garfield Avenue. The General Plan does not involve any alterations to that home. If any modifications are proposed at some point in the future, such modifications may be subject to environmental review and mitigation. The Resources chapter of the General Plan includes Goal R-6 and related policies aimed at historic resource preservation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Selina Woo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 10 | Save the Victorian home at 403 S. Garfield Avenue. The General Plan does not involve any alterations to that home. If
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letter/Comment/Commenter</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Avenue.</td>
<td>any modifications are proposed at some point in the future, such modifications may be subject to environmental review and mitigation. The Resources chapter of the General Plan includes Goal R-6 and related policies aimed at historic resource preservation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>11 Paul Bryson</strong></td>
<td>Provide more flexibility to encourage mixed land uses rather than focusing on preserving single family neighborhoods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Many commenters at public workshops and in response to the community survey indicated a strong desire to preserve existing single family neighborhoods. The policies aimed at neighborhood preservation are in direct response to this community consensus. Nevertheless, the General Plan attempts to accommodate a mix of uses and housing types by providing for mixed residential-commercial development along commercial corridors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>12 Gisela Adams</strong></td>
<td>12.1 Remove the linear park from the General Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The linear park feature has been removed from the General Plan. Also, please see Response 1.8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.2 Explore all options for development small neighborhood parks.</td>
<td>The Quality of Life chapter includes various options for providing new park space, including identifying vacant properties where “pocket parks” could be developed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.3 Large hotels and entertainment complexes should not be allowed.</td>
<td>The draft General Plan does not call for “large” hotel and entertainment complexes, nor does it indicate that such development is “needed”. Rather, the General Plan indicates that the City could accommodate small boutique hotels and suggests that one possible location for hotel and entertainment-related development would be along E. Valley Boulevard. Any hotel or entertainment-related development would have to conform to existing height and massing restrictions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>13 Michael Lawrence</strong></td>
<td>13.1 The City needs to seriously address the need for improved bike facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The linear park feature has been removed from the General Plan based on this and other concerns. Unfortunately, because of safety concerns expressed by the City Council and others, options for providing additional Class I bike facilities are limited. To partially offset the loss of the one potential Class I facility, a Class III route along Front Street has been added to the conceptual bikeways map (Figure 12).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.2 Remove the linear park because it is infeasible.</td>
<td>As noted above, the linear park feature has been removed from the General Plan. Also, please see Response 1.8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.3 The park and open space acreages need clarification.</td>
<td>Park/open space acreages have been recalculated to eliminate the linear park and to clarify several items, including redesignating San Gabriel High School “Institutional” (this site is designated “Open Space” in the current General Plan). The current amount of designated “Open Space” in the City under the draft General Plan is 192 acres. This includes City parks (60 acres), Alhambra Golf Course (109 acres), and the community garden and other open lands that are not formally designated parks or recreation areas (23 acres). This has been clarified in the General Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.4 Hotel demand needs to be reconsidered based on current conditions and the community is against hotels.</td>
<td>Although the economic/market study was conducted near the beginning of the General Plan update process, conditions, have not changed so dramatically over the 3-year process that the fundamental conclusions of that study have changed. Moreover, even a new analysis now would only be a snapshot in time that would change to some degree within another three-year timeframe. By allowing hotels in certain zones, the City is simply...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
accommodating such development in case a property owner elects to pursue such development based on his/her own financial feasibility analysis. Any hotel would be a “boutique” hotel of 10 to 100 rooms and would have to comply with existing height and massing restrictions of the zone in which it is located. With respect to the concern about the community’s desire for hotels, responses to the community survey conducted in conjunction with the draft General Plan indicated that 43.3 percent of Alhambra residents believe the City has too few hotel and 6.4 percent believe the City as too many hotels. The only land uses for which residents more strongly felt more is needed are entertainment uses (65.7 percent) and retail stores (44.1 percent).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letter/Comment/Commenter</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13.5 The General Plan is flawed and not ready for presentation to the Planning Commission.</td>
<td>This opinion is noted. Based on this and other comments, various refinements have been made to the plan that will be presented to the Planning Commission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Rachel Farfsing</td>
<td>Save the Victorian home at 403 S. Garfield Avenue. The General Plan does not involve any alterations to that home. If any modifications are proposed at some point in the future, such modifications may be subject to environmental review and mitigation. Also, please see Response 1.11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Riza318</td>
<td>Hotels should not be allowed at Crawford’s Corner. This opinion is noted. The hotel concept is discussed in detail in various responses, including Response 13.4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Aide Zeller</td>
<td>The draft General Plan is difficult to understand and more public meetings are needed. The commenter also has questions about traffic and hotels, does not believe the linear park is feasible, and believes the EIR was done incorrectly. The concern about the readability of the plan is noted, but absent more specific direction regarding this concern, a meaningful response is not possible. Over the course of about three years, the City has held four public workshops as well as telephone and online community surveys. Staff and consultants have also attended various public events and conducted two days of interviews with key community stakeholders. Traffic is a major concern in the City and will continue to be a concern over the life of the General Plan. The Mobility chapter includes policy direction for improving traffic conditions, but the City’s ability to address this issue is somewhat limited since traffic in the City is largely a function of regional traffic growth, the City’s location in the heart of a major metropolitan area, and the decision not to extend the 710 Freeway. The hotel issue is discussed in detail in other responses, including 13.4. The economic/market study that concluded that the local market could accommodate small boutique hotels was conducted during the General Plan update process. However, this does not mean that the City “needs” hotels and allowing hotels in certain zones does not mean that hotels will be built in the City. Whether new hotels are actually built would depend on market forces and other factors. In response to this and other concerns, the linear park concept has been removed from the General Plan. The comment regarding the EIR is noted, but absent more specificity with respect to what the commenter believes is incorrect a meaningful response is not possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter/Comment/Commenter</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Anthony Seto</td>
<td>In addition to Policy M1-E, Policy M-4B has been added under the goal regarding street design (see response 5.10). Specific solutions at specific locations will be developed as needed based on this general policy direction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Barbara Messina</td>
<td>This opinion is noted. The hotel concept is addressed in detail in various responses, including 13.4 and 16. Any hotels would have to comply with existing height and massing restrictions of the zone in which they would be located.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Bruce D. Risher</td>
<td>Goal R-6 and corresponding policies in the Resources chapter address individual historic resources. In addition, Implementation R4 of the accompanying Implementation Actions document calls for the City to investigate adoption of a historic preservation ordinance aimed at the protection of individual buildings, structures, and sites of cultural, historical, and/or architectural significance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Danielle Mobley</td>
<td>The General Plan does not involve any alterations to that home. If any modifications are proposed at some point in the future, such modifications would be subject to environmental review and possibly mitigation. The general historic resource concern is addressed in Response 19. It is anticipated that a historic resources inventory would be conducted as part of the development of a historic preservation ordinance, as envisioned in Implementation Action R4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Lizette Aguilar</td>
<td>The draft General Plan does not allow for any increases in building intensity beyond what could occur under the current General Plan and Municipal Code. Please see responses 20 and 21 regarding historic resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Oscar Amaro</td>
<td>The past issues raised by the commenter are not relevant to the General Plan. The concern about the language regarding historic resources is noted. Please see responses 20 and 21.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Shirley Tatsuno</td>
<td>The opinion regarding tech jobs is noted. Higher wage jobs may increase demand for housing in the area, which could increase housing prices. The residential development to which the commenter refers has not been approved. The area retains industrial/commercial designations, but housing is a conditionally allowed use. A major expansion of Auto Row is not anticipated, but market analysis suggests that some growth for this market sector will occur so the General Plan recognizes that. Any new development along Auto Row would continue to be subject to environmental review to ensure that it would not significantly affect neighboring properties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter/Comment/Commenter</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.3 The City should not force owners to sell aging rental units along Garfield Avenue.</td>
<td>The City does not “force” owners to sell their rental apartment buildings. The “Medical Office” designation merely suggests the type of use that would be appropriate for the Garfield Avenue corridor if a property owner elects to redevelop his/her property.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.4 Alhambra cannot compete with downtown Los Angeles for entertainment and more data supporting tourism is needed. The commenter also states an opinion that the entertainment district drawings are “boring” and suggests that an entertainment complex on Main Street similar to one in Oxnard could be successful.</td>
<td>The opinion regarding the entertainment district is noted. Research conducted as part of the General Plan update, including a market/economic study, suggests that such development could be viable, but it would ultimately be up to developers/property owners to do their own financial analysis to determine what specific type of use could be successful. Hotels and entertainment uses are only one possibility along the E. Valley Boulevard corridor. Such development could also continue to occur along Main Street, which remains the City’s “downtown” and a focal point for activity in the community. The opinion regarding the drawings is noted, but these are only intended to provide a general idea of what hotel/entertainment-oriented development might look like.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.5 Bulbouts and sidewalks widenings at activity nodes will back up traffic. Also, the bicyclist depicted on a graphic should not be there since Valley Boulevard is not a bike route.</td>
<td>It is true that bulbouts and sidewalk widenings may incrementally slow traffic along Valley Boulevard. Although Valley Boulevard is not a designated bike route, bicyclists may legally use that right-of-way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.6 Class 3 bike routes are not a good idea for Alhambra. Also, will bicyclists receive tickets if they use roads that are not marked as bike routes?</td>
<td>This opinion is noted. The conceptual bikeway plan included in the draft General Plan is intended to provide reasonable connectivity for bicyclists while primarily avoiding heavily traveled commercial corridors due to safety concerns. Nevertheless, bicyclists may use any public road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.7 The linear park along the railroad corridor should be eliminated.</td>
<td>In response to this and other comments, the linear park has been removed from the General Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.8 A survey regarding transportation needs should be conducted every five years. Improved transit connections and bus shelters are needed.</td>
<td>Policies M-2A through M-2E are aimed at improving transit connections and enhancing transit stop amenities to improve service. The City and transit providers regularly monitor transportation patterns to determine where system enhancements are needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.9 If a school closes it should be replaced by a vocational school and green space.</td>
<td>Policy QL-9C of the Quality of Life chapter includes these suggestions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Jennifer Pezda, MESM, SoCalGas</td>
<td>SoCalGas encourages coordination with SCAQMD to minimize exposure to air pollution, suggests an addition to the Policy R-3C, and states support for policies aimed at climate adaptation/resilience. The support for climate adaptation/resilience strategies is noted. The draft General Plan includes various policies aimed minimizing exposure to air pollution and a new policy regarding use of SCAQMD-recommended methodologies to analyze air quality impacts for individual development projects has been added. In response to this comment Policy R-3C has been revised to read as follows: “Promote using renewable energy, such as solar panels and biomethane, throughout the City.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Michael Lawrence</td>
<td>The linear park should be removed from the plan. Based on this and other comments, the linear park concept has been removed from the General Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Michael Lawrence</td>
<td>Where are the specific plans referenced in the General Plan available for review? All of the specific plans referenced in the General Plan are existing, already adopted plans that are available for review at the Community Development Department at Alhambra City Hall.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hello,

I’ve attended the General Plan Meeting and organized my comments below. The items represent what I think is most important for our city as well as suggestions based on comments from the meeting on Sept 11th.

I very strongly believe the goals of Alhambra should be both preservation and responsible growth. Preserving our past will ensure our future. If we look like every other city, we are neither authentic or unique.

We have incredible assets in our culinary diversity, architectural history and proximity to Los Angeles. If we develop and grow property, we have the opportunity for a very profitable future.

We should look to cities like South Pasadena, Santa Barbara and even Corning, New York which have not only maintained their charm but used it as a tool for both local and national tourism and commerce. Their ‘charm’ is obtained through maintaining their cultural heritage and using that to their benefit.

1. **Neighborhoods.** Maintaining the integrity of our residential neighborhoods and adhering strict standards for remodeling and new development. An approval board should be established to review any proposed changes to existing homes (including exterior cosmetic upgrades AND placement on the street). As a resident of District 5, I am very concerned about two new structures on Fremont Ave between Poplar and Commonwealth which are in conflict to the existing neighborhood plan. They are off-set by 20’ beyond all of the existing homes and are interrupting the eyeline and setback for the entire block. I’m addressing this in a separate email to the City Council.

2. **Preservation.** Embracing and preserving historic structures in Alhambra and working to qualify them for inclusion on both the State and Federal register of historic places. We need to have interest as a community in general, not as a handful of concerned citizens.

3. **Standards.** Having clearly defined standards of ‘character’ and ‘high quality’ that maintain our cultural heritage and cohesive vision for the city. Those are addressed in the general plan but my question/concern is who from the City is defining these terms and who will be enforcing them? We should look to outsiders as well as people within the community to define and enforce our standards of living.

4. **The importance of Main Street, USA.** We need to breathe new life into our Main Street and focus on the buildings we already have as our main entertainment hub. We have fantastic storefronts which are either vacant, derelict or in major need of upkeep. We don’t even need to build up Main Street, we just need to utilize what we have and make it great. Please reference the articles below regarding Corning, NY. You can do this by encouraging the use of existing vacant storefronts on Main Street instead of new commercial development and construction. Also, there should be a push to embrace and encourage local businesses which make up a large part of our community. Finally, we need to keep rents low so we can attract new tenants for the long term. Their involvement and investment in the community makes us stronger as a whole.


https://www.planning.org/greatplaces/streets/2013/marketstreet.htm
5. **Responsible development** in general with aesthetics that enhance the community while maintaining our image as a 'small town'. New structures should be in compliance with what the community defines as our visual standard and does not disrupt the existing architecture (i.e. no large, modern commercial projects that look like Playa Vista and more projects which have an historic look and curb appeal, much like The Andalusia Apartments in Pasadena which are 3 story Spanish style buildings). We should also have height restrictions in order to maintain a cohesive visual presence. I’m very much opposed to the renderings in the General Plan which show modern glass buildings in our entertainment hub. I believe we need to re-think the design aspects. As I said above, if we look like every other city with single story strip malls and glass and metal structures, we are not authentic or special.

6. **Adaptive reuse.** Repurposing historic buildings for modern use which appeals to a younger generation that will support Alhambra’s future. Historic buildings are a point of interest for young developers and young professionals. Alhambra should learn from LA where they have repurposed the Cal Edison Building and the Pacific Mutual Complex. Those are historic buildings which were slated for demolition. A conservation and environmental-minded developer renovated both buildings, preserving the historic elements and creating useable spaces for modern companies. Both buildings have LEED status and collected a huge profit when sold after renovations were complete. Ideas for the ‘modern companies’ are office sharing businesses like WeWork and CTRL Collective, as well as entertainment offerings such as the Alamo Drafthouse, iPic Cinemas and food halls (Grand Central Market in Los Angeles and the Ferry Building in San Francisco).

7. **Tourism.** Embracing our notoriety as a ‘foodie city’, which is a huge boon for local, national and international tourism. We can achieve this by creating a pedestrian friendly city for people visiting from Asia and other parts for Southern California. Planting the proper variety of trees along our streets and general beautification will aid in making Alhambra a place people want to be. This is a gigantic financial opportunity for the city and (as I said above) we should maximize this by working with property owners to keep the rents from increasing so the existing businesses remain and new businesses move to Alhambra. People already want to come to Alhambra to eat. Let’s make them want to stay.

8. **Elevated park and green space.** I agree with the consensus from the meeting that this should be removed from the general plan, as it is not realistic and illegal. We should consider alternatives to improving Alhambra’s green space deficit. Alhambra Park is an excellent park that I personally enjoy on a daily basis. We are lacking a similar space in District 5 and along Mission Road.

9. **Bike lanes and bike racks.** We do need to establish bike lanes to improve non-vehicle access to and through our city. I echo the comments of people at the meeting that bike lanes should be established on Main Street, Mission and Valley. A concern was voiced about safety of bikes on busy streets but the bike lanes actually make it safer for cyclists due to clear establishment of bicycle friendly areas. Painting bike lanes will also increase driver awareness of cyclists on the road. Los Angeles is in the process of a massive bike lane campaign which has made the lanes more visible and safe for both cyclists and motorists.
10. **Hotel on Commonwealth.** I do agree that Alhambra needs a luxury hotel, both to accommodate visitors who come to the city to experience our cuisine as well as to collect hotel tax revenues that would otherwise go to Pasadena or Monterey Park. However, I DO NOT think that repurposing the Fremont Hotel property on Commonwealth is the ideal place for this due to the proximity of the residents. I think the hotel will be better served on East Main Street or East Valley Boulevard in one of our new ‘entertainment hubs’. I also believe the hotel should be in the style of the Langham in San Marino or the Biltmore in Santa Barbara and NOT anything modern.

11. **Suggestion for the Victorian Home at 403 South Garfield and Alhambra Golf Course:** many Residents want to save the Victorian Home and others want to repurpose the Golf Course. Why not move the Home to the Golf Course and turn it into an “Alhambra Heritage Park”? The LA Arboretum has made a tourist attraction of their Victorian home so why not Alhambra? With landscaping improvements to the existing Golf Course, we can create a bucolic setting for Alhambrans to enjoy and, depending on cost and current status of the House interior, turn that into an event space and/or museum which would result in income to the city.

12. **Environmental awareness and sustainable living.** We not only have the opportunity to do so but we also have the responsibility to be a sustainable city. The current plan does not go far enough to set goals for sustainability beyond enhancing green space and changing transportation options. Supporting cycling as alternative transportation is a start but we should have a very clear plan on water reclamation and storage, provide incentives for people to remove grass and install drought tolerant landscaping, make recycling mandatory for all businesses, outlaw Styrofoam take out containers and packaging and, like many other cities in Southern California, outlaw plastic bags, straws and single use cutlery. We need to reduce our carbon footprint by making daily changes. We can make a huge impact on the environment and it would be a massive oversight to not include this in our 20-year plan.

Thank you.

Mandi Dillin

Resident, District 5
Hello,

The General Plan refers to 400 residents who were called and 360 online written surveys as well as 3 public workshops with around 200 people. The data from all of that is absent both from the DEIR and the 980 pages of appendix. How many residents marked they want to see a large hotel and a linear pathway above the train on Mission? What exactly DID residents’ responses say from those who called, those who filled out a survey and the 3 workshops?

Thank you.

Melissa Michelson
Alhambra Resident
Dear City of Alhambra,

Thank you for providing an opportunity for comments on the general plan.

It appears there is very little (if anything at all) in the general plan for the section of Alhambra South of the 10 freeway especially between Fremont and Atlantic. Many people walk and ride bikes on Siwanoy Drive as it is a curvy and winding hill but vehicle traffic makes pedestrian and bicycle traffic dangerous. I saw many years ago on posters posted at Almansor Park for public comment by City Officials that it said "sidewalks on Siwanoy." I agree that sidewalks on Siwanoy would be optimal at least on one side of the street as best as can possibly be done. Bike lanes should be included South of the 10 throughout the Midwick Track area as well. Please remember that South of the 10 remains part of Alhambra and should not be neglected. Thank you.

Best Regards,

George Shafer
1388 Siwanoy Drive
Alhambra, Ca 91803
Reynoso, Vanessa

From: amal moore <samasm06@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Tuesday, September 18, 2018 7:18 AM
To: Alhambra General Plan
Subject: Follow up to Paving streets near South Marengo Avenue

Dear City Officials,

Thank you for your work to help make the City of Alhambra attractive and a nice place to live. I am writing to follow up on one of my main concerns in the city, which is repaving South Marengo Avenue from Valley Blvd near 1701 W. Valley Blvd, Alhambra, CA 91803 to Main street 1701 W. Main Street Alhambra, CA 91801.

South Marengo Avenue is one of the busiest streets in Alhambra, with many cars passing through daily. Some paving has begun, but I am writing to follow up and ask about the progress.

I am also EXTREMELY concerned about West Shorb Street from 1200 South Sixth Street to South Marengo Avenue. I have spoken to Public works regarding the potholes and broken curbs-- and have taken some pictures, but when I drove on West Shorb street yesterday, the potholes were still there.

Any help you can give regarding the streets and broken curbs on these streets would be greatly appreciated. Good luck with your endeavors and your continued work in the city. Thank you in advance. Have a wonderful day.

Sincerely,
Amal S. Moore
Library Media Aide
Alhambra Unified School District
To whom it may concern:

I'm Robert Gutierrez and I live at 2112 Montezuma Ave, Alhambra CA 91803.

For the sake of organization, I will list what I would like to see in a general plan for Alhambra. The list is not in a particular order:

1. **More trees on Fremont Ave** - Once one enters Alhambra traveling south from South Pasadena, it is very apparent how little trees there are. It makes the most traveled part of Alhambra look barren.
2. **Bike Lanes** - We need better, and safer ways to travel through Alhambra. Bike lanes now only allow for a different, and cleaner mode of transport, but also calm traffic.
3. **More Parks** - Is it possible to turn the former Lowe’s developments into park space?
4. **Painting light posts** - Many in the city are chipped, cracked and need to be taken care of.
5. **Signage in parks informing dog owners that their pets are not allowed in playgrounds** - I don’t think people are aware of the fact that while dogs are allowed in parks, they are not allowed on playgrounds and tennis courts
6. **Not allow the huge development on Fremont by the Ratkovich group** - It seems like an extremely bad choice to allow for such a development in the most trafficked section of the San Gabriel Valley.
7. **More Landscaping Projects** - The city recently improved the landscaping on Mission, I would like to see other projects like this in the city.
8. **Attract hipper businesses such as breweries, "hipster cafes" and cooler, independent restaurants** - I’d like to have more places that attract a younger crowd.
9. **Attract an indoor playground business** - Similar to Amy's playground in South Pasadena
10. **Put speed bumps on Montezuma Ave and Palm Ave adjacent to Granada Park** - Cars speed through these areas all the time, and given the amount of children that frequent the area, it seems inevitable that someone is going to get hit.

Thanks,
Robert

--
Robert Gutierrez
(562) 240-3815
This Victorian house is still standing at 403 S. Garfield, just south of the Alhambra.

Please do the right thing and save this only Victorian talent home. Move it or save it as a historical museum.
To Whom it may concern,

Our family lived in Alhambra from the early 50's to the late 90's. My father had a television repair shop in Alhambra, My brothers and I went to school in Alhambra. Many times I've passed by that old house and marveled at the construction and quality of the build. It's architecture from days gone by MUST be preserved for the future! Too many times deconstruction of our past history has happened with only pictures and regret to remember.

This house is a memory and establishment of Alhambra's past and has stood tall against modernization around it. It is a proud survivor of the past and better times it has seen.

Preserve the heritage and quality of life Alhambra provides for the house and the residents of Alhambra and surrounding cities, please.

James Pilon
11756 Vanport Ave
Lake View Terrace
CA 91342

Former residence:
1715 Cabrillo Ave
Please don't allow the beautiful old Victorian house at 403 S. Garfield to be destroyed. It is a beautiful example of early Alhambra history and should be preserved and restored. Thank you.
I have always stopped a moment and admire these old houses, like the old houses north of Alhambra Road, west of Atlantic. There is a story behind all of them. You will not find these old homes anymore. Save them while you can.
Dear planning committee,

Thank you for your extensive work on the General Plan. It is very thorough and appears to have something for everyone. I moved to Alhambra 6 months ago for the location, and I am optimistic that this city can grow into a premium destination in the SGV. I have one major comment:

I disapprove of the emphasis placed on preserving single family neighborhoods, LU-1 and on page 2. I am concerned that prioritizing low density, siloed neighborhoods will prevent development and economic prosperity, as well as discourage new residents from settling here. The plan should allow more flexibility for neighborhoods to accommodate mixed uses, in keeping with 21st century housing trends. Perhaps LU-1 should be written "balance the historical character of low density residential neighborhoods with modern development and design." Encouraging mixed land use would help achieve many of the other goals in this document, such as attracting jobs, improving alternative transportation, preserving resources, etc.

Thank you for your consideration. Sincerely,

Paul Bryson
401 N El Molino St
Alhambra CA 91801
Dear Ms. Reynoso,

1. In general, I was very disappointed to see that the "Linear Park" was still in the plan, although several Council Members asked that this item be removed at a prior City Council meeting. First of all, the RR is on Federal property, and this project would never be allowed.

2. Alhambra is lacking open space for its residents. I am certain there are empty lots and buildings that could be acquired by the city and turned into small neighborhood parks. All options should be explored.

3. In addition, I, and all of the Alhambra residents who attended the meeting on 9/11 meeting and voiced their objections, do not appreciate the plans for a huge hotel, entertainment, retail, etc. complex at Valley and New. I do not recall that at any of the various community meetings Alhambra residents brought this idea forward. As it turns out, the consultant enlisted the services of various "experts," who thought that Alhambra was in dire needs of this type of development. This type of development is totally unnecessary for Alhambra, as there are plenty of these types of establishments just within a short distance. A complex of the size that was included in the plan, would increase traffic and congestion and encroach on the nearby R1 zones and make life unbearable. So needless to say, I am very disappointed that more value is placed on the opinions of outside consultants and their experts, who try to tell us what we need. They do not live here, so they should keep their opinions to themselves.

I respectfully request the deletion of the Linear Park, mentioned in item 1, as well as the development at Valley and New Avenues in item 3, and ask for consideration of expanding open space in Alhambra as mentioned in item 2.

Regard,

Gisela Adams
October 2, 2018

Dear Sir:

After reviewing the documents for the General Plan Update, I conclude that this plan is incomplete and has not been presented in a way that is professional and up to standards compared with other cities in our area. The data is false and misleading in the Parks, Recreation and Open Space sections. Also, the mobility section relies on implementing a bike network that in reality does nothing to encourage individuals to ride their bikes in Alhambra and feel safe. The use of the Linear Park concept to anchor the document in many categories produced a plan that is not workable.

Bikeway and Mobility

In the M2 section of Implementations Actions the goal is stated to "provide a safe and efficient connectivity for bicyclist throughout the city." There is a reference to the Bikeway Map to show how this will be done. The Bikeway Map has one major connective route showing a class 1 bike lane that crosses the city via the Linear Park over the existing Union Pacific rail line. The remaining plan is largely class 3 lanes which is just signs marking routes. There was much controversy during the presentations to the public on this and it was agreed by the city manager and all but one of the council members that this was not a feasible due to the city having no right of way and the lack of interest by Union Pacific. Despite many requests to remove this from the draft it remained and the backbone of the bike plan relies on the connectivity that will never be built. Without this part of the bikeway plan there is no connectivity and does nothing to encourage individuals to ride bikes in Alhambra. The city needs to seriously address this problem and work with the many bike coalitions that are in the area like Bike SGV. Saying that our streets are too crowded and narrow is a lazy cop out and shows a complete lack of interest to solve this important problem.

The Linear Park Again

Quality of Life Implementations Actions

QL5 page 6 states "Revisit the Linear Park concept with Union Pacific " to see if it is feasible. I made two calls to the offices of Union Pacific Southern California offices and was told they have had no discussions with the City of Alhambra regarding the Linear Park. I also called Rails to Trails and was told there are no examples of a working rail line trench that is being used as a park space anywhere in the world. Although some spaces have been built over rail yards or have been proposed such as the project in Toronto, Canada the cost are in the billions of dollars. Using the Linear Park to address our Quality of Life issues is disingenuous. Keeping this in the draft to solicit favorable comments from the public who are not aware of the impossibility of building this concept is not an example of transparency but of deception. The city manager and the council directed Rincon to remove it from the plan yet here it is as a major component in several sections of the plan. Using "Revisit" suggests that you had discussions with Union Pacific already. Please provide the contact that discussed this concept with the city or Rincon.
The Linear Park Again

Parks, Recreation and Open Space

Under Parks, Recreation and Open Space on page 53 of the Draft General Plan it is stated that the city has over 200 acres of Park space. The County survey of Alhambra Park Space has a figure of 65 acres. The mayor on social media also quoted this figure. How is it that the draft has a total of 200 acres of park space?

It also is stated in the same paragraph that there is 270 acres of open space. What is open space? What is green space and "park lands"? There are no definitions and tables that show a breakdown of areas associated with these findings. Will the final plan have definitions, tables and a real break down on how many acres we have? Will the city use the EPA definition of open space as areas that are accessible to the public? Railway trenches, cloverleafs, drainage ditches and locked school grounds are not accessible to the public and should not be included in open space.

Hotels

There is a case made in the Draft EIR based on a 4-year-old memo from the Natelson Dale Group that there is a potential demand for hotels in Alhambra. The data stops at 2014 and does not include the many hotels that have been built or approved in our neighboring cities. This is sloppy work by Rincon. How can you make a case that we should build more hotels in Alhambra when over 1000 new rooms have been added or being added by our neighbors in Monterey Park and San Gabriel since 2014? Where is the demand documentation by the residents for building new hotels? I attended all of the public meeting and there was a collective NO to the building of hotels here in Alhambra and your own telephone survey indicated that over 50% of those questioned stated the number of hotels was about right as is. The representative for Rincon, Joe Powers, when asked where did the suggestion to build more hotels in Alhambra come from replied it was from an economist. Council-member Barbara Messina at the last community meeting said, “That's not the use we want,” she said. “There are enough hotels in San Gabriel and Monterey Park.” Will another study that includes all of the hotels being built or approved since 2014 be provided including the recent 5 story hotel approved on Commonwealth Ave in Alhambra?

Summary

The current draft is not ready for presentation to the Planning Commission and has been poorly presented to the public. The presentations to the public to gather input showed few of the changes suggested by the general public. Instead of a progression of changes from meeting to meeting the plan remained the same despite our input. There was considerable opposition to the hotels and Linear Park but they remained in the plan throughout disregarding the input from the public. This document does not meet the standard for General Plans. A quick review of our neighboring cities shows their General Plans to be much more exact in their documentation and
implementation strategy. I strongly feel the $700,000 spent so far on this plan was not returned by Rincon with a viable document. I urge you to correct the many flaws and present us with a strong vision for the future with concrete solutions and not "conceptual" non-workable solutions.

Sincerely,

Michael Lawrence

1136 South Monterey St

Alhambra, CA 91801
To Whom it May Concern,
I recently received news that there is a plan to demolish the Victorian style era home at 403 S. Garfield. I wanted to know why the city of Alhambra is intent on erasing the history of this city’s architectural past? I have been a resident in this city for 36 years and it is incredibly disheartening to hear that the city would rather put in more garish office buildings and multi-level housing than preserve the historical buildings of the city. I can’t express enough my disappointment in these decisions. I urge you to rethink your plans and take into consideration the concept of honoring architectural history.
Sincerely,
Rachel Farfsing

Sent from my iPhone
As a resident of Alhambra since 1975 and property owner since 1983 I oppose Rincon's proposal for a hotel at Crawford's Corner. Alhambra is already too crowded. Let the tourists stay at the many hotels in San Gabriel.

Sent via the Samsung Galaxy S8, an AT&T 4G LTE smartphone
Dear City of Alhambra

This letter is in regards to the General Plan Update, Draft General Plans, Draft Environmental Impact Report and Draft Implementation Actions. I would like to first address the way that this is written, it is very hard for the average person to be able to understand what it is saying and much more difficult to comprehend what is means. With that being said here are some of my opinions.

-The public meetings which the city has had for the input of its residents have been a waste of our time and city money. Very little of our opinions have been taken into consideration and that shows in the General Plan Update. When ever I had a question about a particular part of a plan the answer I was given was "I don't have an answer for your question at the moment but I will write it down" or "No one has ever asked that question before". That was very surprising and upsetting since I expected to get some form of answers from people who are getting paid to know General Plans.
-Why didn't we have more public meeting which would actually address the questions and concerns of the residents?
-What are the solutions for the traffic we continue to see? 
-How are the traffic problems going to be addresses when the Hotels are built?
-How was the issue of the Hotels addressed? according the General Plans this survey was done many years ago and by telephone.
-Has the city recently asked residents of their desire for a Hotel?
-How did the city come to the conclusion that Hotel was needed at this time?
-How is the city going to improve our F rating in traffic when the hotels are built?
-Why hasn't the city addressed our F traffic rating?
-How was a park over the active railways ever a possibility?
-How can the city approve plans when an EIR report has failed, or not been done correctly?
I look forward to hearing some answers for the questions that I have.

Thank you
Aide Zeller
To the Alhambra Community Development Department:

I write to submit a public comment on the Draft General Plan. I am resident of Alhambra and have lived here an aggregate of 22 years.

While the city has made laudable efforts at improving pedestrian and road safety, the General Plan should make that an express policy goal because pedestrian and road safety remains a serious concern.

I've observed that with more cars on the road in the San Gabriel Valley, drivers are becoming increasing aggressive and reckless. At major intersections, I've noticed that cars making a right turn at a red light consistently roll through the pedestrian crosswalk rather than making a hard stop, often catching crossing pedestrians off guard. Cars attempting to dodge traffic will speed through residential 25-mph zones and school zones. In my own neighborhood, cars routinely roll through the 4-way stop sign at Raymond and Cedar. On the stretch of Main St. between Atlantic and Marengo are consecutive crosswalks at every intersection. Those crosswalks offer little protection to pedestrians when traffic constantly speeds upwards of 40 mph in a 30 mph zone. Frankly, I dread walking the streets of Alhambra and consequently prefer driving in my metal fortress of a car.

The Draft General Plan doesn't have a policy provision that adequately addresses pedestrian and road safety. At best, Policy M-1E seeks to minimize "negative effects of cut-through traffic" and to "consider measures to calm traffic." But this weak language falls short of a meaningful policy expression. It merely implies that the city might consider implementing tweaks and barely addresses pedestrian safety and road safety as a concern of any importance to the city. What the Draft General Plan needs is a policy that 1) does say pedestrian and road safety is an important concern to the city and 2) shows the city's openness to adopt innovative solutions to address this. The General Plan is an opportunity for the city to dream big and I hope that we can dream big in the area of pedestrian safety as well.

Thank you for your attention to the matter.

Sincerely,

Anthony Seto
As a current Council Member, I am writing this letter because the General Plan I will not be heard by the Council until after the first of the year when I will no longer be a Council Member.

As a resident and a homeowner, I oppose the Valley Blvd Entertainment District. Unfortunately, this would go to an R-1 area on both sides of Valley, the traffic and negative impact would negatively affect the character and integrity of the residential neighborhoods.

I feel this should be removed from the plan.

San Gabriel has 3 Mega Holes on Valley, we do not need one!

Sincerely,

Barbara Mezera
1101 Sd. Fork St.
Alhambra, Ca. 91801

RECEIVED
OCT 0 3 2010
I have concerns with the Draft General Plan, particularly the Land Use and Community Design Implementation Actions related to historic preservation. This section calls only for adoption of design guidelines for distinguished or historic neighborhoods. Language needs to be adopted that includes individual historic resources that may not be located within an historic neighborhood, i.e. a stand alone house, business, etc., an example being the ca.1885 house at Beacon and Garfield. If only certain neighborhoods have been identified as historic, then it leads me to believe that an all-inclusive inventory of all historic resources within the city, has never been completed. I would also like to see a timeline for establishing those design guidelines.

- Bruce D. Risher
Good morning, City of Alhambra, the Community Development Department, and Vanessa Reynoso, Deputy Director of Community Development.

Please preserve 403 S. Garfield Ave. ☣

I am a third generation Alhambrian. My grandparents, parents, and now me and my siblings and their own children and other extended family live in this City. We have seen our wonderful quiet city that is great for families change into a bustling little city with lots of dining and entertainment, which we enjoy. But the CHARM of the city is the true reason why we love Alhambra and I URGE you to consider carefully the decisions that will affect my city for the next 20 years. I’ve lived in 3 old houses in Alhambra - my grandparent’s house, my current home and also the wonderful Victorian beauty at 403 S. Garfield which is a major target for demolition. My time living at 403 S. Garfield Ave. was magical and the home is extremely special and rare in our city. So much of Alhambra’s history has been erased with demolitions of architecturally significant and unique buildings. Our history is being erased and this General Plan is an opportunity to set some wrongs right. I expect our architectural heritage to be protected and retained and to incorporate strong language in the Plan and include this building in the currently listed important structures in the Plan. The City needs to include unequivocal language to conduct a survey of what is currently standing before further demolition occurs. I urge you to do these things in order to keep Alhambra a unique and wonderful city where new and old structures can exist together.

Please preserve 403 S. Garfield Ave. I oppose any demolition or any modification to this property that would take away from its original design. This property should be preserved and Alhambra’s wonderful architectural history should be present for future generations of Alhambrans to see.

Thank you for your consideration. I have attached some pictures of this wonderful home.

Sincerely,
Danielle Mobley, Alhambra resident of 36 years
Lam, Paul

From: Lizette Aguilar <lizette.aguilar@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Wednesday, October 3, 2018 9:39 AM
To: Alhambra General Plan
Subject: Alhambra General Plan

SAVE OUR HISTORIC BUILDINGS!!

I have lived in Alhambra off and on since the early 70's and have now been back nine years and I do not want my city turning into Monterey Park with massive multi-use buildings. I want historic buildings protected and demand the City include unequivocal language to conduct a survey of what is currently standing before any further demolition occurs!

-Lizette Aguilar
Please see attached.

Oscar Amaro
Resident
After careful review of the City of Alhambra’s draft General Plan (dGP), it’s not difficult to come away with a cynical attitude about the city I’ve lived in for over 30 years and its “government.” This response is not so much of the dGP, but more of how a citizen of this city reaches a point of viewing its city government sorely lacking in “responsive politics.”

When I formed the Alhambra Preservation Group (APG) in 2003, it was my blissful ignorance which led me to believe that our city—particularly its leadership—were simply uninformed as to the civic and cultural benefits of recognizing and saving its historic resources. I knew through my 30+-year experience as a City of Los Angeles civil servant and working with a myriad of community groups in 15 economically diverse council districts (and the councilmembers who served them), I learned that oftentimes it was simply a matter of communication and enlightenment. By saving a city’s cultural identity and its unique historic stock—neighborhood by neighborhood, a city’s pride would carry over to how its residents view its government.

However, shortly after forming APG and experiencing resistance from our [then] elected leaders over our group’s goals and mission, I was truly baffled considering there was OVERWHELMING support for some type of historic preservation measure. After lobbying, educating and meeting with Alhambra’s city council over the course of 3 years only to be met with obstruction and resistance, APG decided to hold the city’s first ever Candidates Forum in 2006—an election that had 3 council seats open. APG saw it as an opportunity for residents to not only know about our future councilmembers, but also provide an avenue for Alhambran’s to voice their opinions and vision for our city’s future in a public forum.

The amount of backlash and hostility from the [then] councilmembers was incredulous. Not only that, but former councilmembers from long past seemingly came out of the woodwork expressing their “displeasure” at the idea of having this forum. We simply saw it as public education, public participation and fostering transparent government.

But rather than support or praise our efforts, we (along with the Alhambra Historical Society who was then our “umbrella organization”) were instead threatened with being reported to the State of California to be stripped of our nonprofit status for sponsoring a “political event” (their words). When I began to research archived news articles, public property records, and talking with former City of Alhambra staff—it became very clear that there has been—and continues to be—some type of backroom/closed door deal-making coming from person(s) or entity that knowingly sabotages any efforts toward historic preservation.

I am frankly disgusted although not surprised at the tepid language contained in the draft General Plan in regards to the Cultural Resources element AKA historic preservation especially when compared to the recommendations suggested in the draft EIR. It is plainly obvious that the suspicions of an “unseen force” or behind-
the-scenes deal broker that is subverting the will of the people have been substantiated.

Oscar Amaro
Resident and Founder/former President of Alhambra Preservation Group
Letter 23

To Whom This May Concern,

Here are my thoughts primarily based on Page 3 of the Draft Alhambra General Plan.

This Plan is so important it should have been advertised in Around Alhambra from the very beginning. I asked a couple dozen people who often read it if they had heard of the Draft. Only 1 person said they had. I explained to all 23 people about the main points on Page 3. We should have had many more meetings where the community could learn and give their input. Less than 10% of Alhambra people know about this plan. This is disgraceful.

PAGE 3
ABCD
C. This is deceiving because 1,061 residential units, Villages at the Alhambra, are proposed to be built here. Good tech jobs are a good idea. Encouraging apprenticeships to help residents get good jobs should be a must. My big worry is these high paying jobs would make housing even more expensive.

E. Auto Row
Aren’t we suppose to be discouraging driving cars and going more green? Why are we increasing inventory? I know there already is construction to expand space in the Auto Row. This is creating bad living conditions for the residents next door.

F. Garfield Ave.
Affordable housing is a big issue in all cities. In Alhambra, since 2006 1,000+ units have been built. No affordable housing was included. The city should not force owners to sell their aged rental units so medical buildings can be built. Renters should come first.

G. East Valley Blvd.
- Before we consider such a large area dedicated to entertainment, housing should be considered first, particularly affordable housing. Commercial businesses on the bottom and housing on top like some parts of Main Street.
- A realtor told me 20 years ago, that being so close to DTLA is what makes Alhambra so valuable. There is no way Alhambra can compete with DTLA for entertainment such as Staple Center, Music Center etc.
- Entertainment drawings on p 26 are also boring and unexciting. This area is supposed to include retail, entertainment and hospitality uses. San Gabriel has the Hilton Hotel and Sheraton Hotel and Monterey Park is building a hotel also. Where is the data backing up the claim of the masses of tourists for Alhambra? There should be an excellent analysis of visitors and a hotel. Many residents at the last meeting again as they had said in the beginning, they did not want a hotel because of traffic or because it would change the character of our city.
- I have been looking at various shopping areas like Main Street in Alhambra, Westfield Santa Anita and small shops in Atlantic Times Square. It is very hard to be successful in retail. On Main Street the Nucleus Gallery is very successful. At Santa Anita some of the stores are busy but many are not. At Atlantic Times Square, Daiso I think is the most popular. A lot of the other stores barely have business. The restaurants attract more business at all three places. I also worry about too many similar restaurants in this area. Monterey Park will soon be opening a 626 like night market plus condos to replace the Hong Kong Supermarket on Garfield.
If we had a new entertainment area this could still be on Main Street near Nucleus. I think it would be great to explore something on a smaller scale similar to The Annex in Oxnard. The Annex Food Hall is an updated cool Grand Central Market (DTLA) with various small culinary businesses and some eclectic shops. There are front eating bars and common area seating. This is something we do not have. I would love to see different eateries besides Asian ones. Examples are: an excellent deli like Langer’s or middle eastern Wahib coming back Alhambra. Maybe there can be pop up eateries to see what is popular. The Annex also has cool art displayed and an area for performances. This performance area would be a great area for different ethnic groups and other kinds of performances. At the Annex there are game nights. Residents can bring their favorite games. This could be a great family and community socializing event for people of all ages.

Activity Nodes
I live just off of Valley between Atlantic and Garfield. I went to Valley-Atlantic and what I observed there is probably the same situation as the other activity nodes. I was studying your illustration. To accommodate the bulbs and sidewalk widening there will be no right lane and the existing ones could be even narrower also. These bulbs may look nice but because there is one less lane this will back up traffic even more at rush hour. I noticed a small error. Your Valley-Atlantic also shows a bicyclist who should not be there because Valley or Atlantic is not part of the bike path.

Mobility
Bike Path
I have been closely observing Alhambra bikers. They do not have fast bikes. Many bike between the parked cars and the cars on the road. I still think this is the best way. If they biked in the same path as cars they are just too slow. This would put a lot of pressure on the bicyclists and anger the car drivers.
In Alhambra, we already have many very bad drivers. Just last month, I almost was in 2 potentially serious car accidents. Also a friend was very surprised to see when she moved from Montebello to Alhambra how expensive her car insurance was. Her agent said it was because "she lives in Alhambra." Bicyclists in the same lanes as cars will cause even more accidents.
I was particularly worried about 6th Street, where Ramona Elementary School is. I talked with Peggy the cross guard at Norwood/6th. She said bikers were already coming by. Her main gripe as another guard told me was they do not stop at stop signs. What if they are the cause of a bad accident and they do not have renters or home insurance?
I have a friend who lives on 6th across from Moor Field. He said many cars have crashed into his cars or sideswiped them.
What if bicyclists go on Valley, parts of Main, Atlantic or Mission, which are not part of the bike lane because they are too busy? Will the police give them tickets? There already are not enough police to enforce the ban of bicyclists riding on the sidewalks etc. Many car drivers and bicyclists do not follow DMV rules. Class 3 bike lanes are not a good idea for Alhambra.

Mission Road Rail Corridor Elevated Linear Park
This idea should be eliminated. I know two structural engineers who say this is a bad idea and should not be considered. I also have worked next to a railroad track. The building and workers shook like crazy when a train went by. This would happen to people in the park also and is totally irritating and could be dangerous.
Just today in the LA Times, there is a warning railroad locomotives are powered by a diesel exhaust which can cause cancer and birth defects or other reproductive harm. The emphasis is on major railroad facilities having this problem. However the train companies say they are trying to reduce the diesel exhaust. Still having a park above an area where trains go by is a bad for your health also. This also is bad area for bicyclists for the same reason.

Transportation
I think there should be a citywide survey every 5 years or so to find out what Alhambra mass transportation needs. It will not be easy to get people to stop driving but if we had good options this could change. Mass transportation needs to come more often and be dependable. When the Atlantic Station Metro Gold first opened many people did not use it. Look at it now, the parking lot is full during the weekdays.
• Excellent connections of transportation to DTLA where there are many good jobs and entertainment should be top priority. This could cut down traffic in Alhambra.
• There used to be several more bus lines to Pasadena. If they came back, this also would cut down on traffic.
• ACT needs to be expanded so we will not need to drive short distances like from Valley to Main St, to the Y or any other popular destinations in the city.
• Covered shelters at bus stops for our many hot days is a must. The Y needs one for the elderly close to the senior bus pick up.

Vocation School/Green Space
If a school closes because of low enrollment it should be replaced by a good vocational school that is not for profit. The vocational school should focus on good paying jobs of $25+ an hour. Also part of the school should become a green space, which we also desperately need.

Sincerely,

Shirley Tatsuno
surely994@gmail.com
Vanessa Reynoso  
Deputy Director of Community Development  
City of Alhambra  
100 Civic Center Mall  
Indio, CA 92201

RE: City of Alhambra – 2018 Draft General Plan Update

Dear Ms. Reynoso,

Southern California Gas Company (SoCalGas) is one of California’s investor-owned utilities regulated by the California Public Utilities Commission. We are the nation’s largest natural gas distribution utility, providing energy to 20.9 million consumers throughout 500 communities. SoCalGas’ service territory encompasses approximately 20,000 square miles in diverse terrain throughout Central and Southern California.

SoCalGas appreciates the opportunity to submit comments on the key issues, goals, and policies provided in the Resources and Health & Safety Elements as they pertain to concerns for air quality, greenhouse gases/climate change, waste management, and climate change resilience.

The comments provided regard the following topics:

- Mobile Sustainability/Near-Zero Emission Transportation Technology
- Renewable Natural Gas/Energy Sustainability
- Climate Adaptation/Resilience Strategies

**Mobility Sustainability/Near-Zero Emission Transportation Technology**

The Greenhouse Gases (GHG)/Climate Change section of the Resources Element shows that the majority of GHG emissions generated in Alhambra are from on-road transportation, accounting for approximately 56% of total emissions. However, the Air Quality section states that the City “can contribute to further improving regional air quality...through appropriate land use planning...[that] can minimize exposure of sensitive receptors...to elevated air pollution concentrations.” Populations adjacent to heavily trafficked freight corridors and roadways often incur the greatest air quality impacts caused by diesel exhaust emissions from vehicles, especially heavy-duty trucks. SoCalGas believes that encouraging the use of alternative-fuel vehicles for both mass transit and goods movement through these areas can greatly reduce...
these emissions and, in result, also reduce air quality impacts that can cause adverse health effects. We engaged with SCAG in the development of their 2016 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Community Strategy (RTP/SCS), which encouraged and supported development of both near-zero and zero emission vehicles and technologies to help attain near-term emission reduction goals. For example, the use of compressed natural gas (CNG) buses and heavy-duty trucks surpasses the EPA’s NOx and PM air quality standards, and therefore have great potential to improve air quality in heavily trafficked regions. As policies R-4A and R-4B suggest that the city 1) coordinate with SCAQMD for emission standards compliance, and 2) minimize the generation of air pollution and exposure of sensitive populations to elevated air pollution concentrations, SoCalGas recommends encouraging such coordination to prioritize use of low-emission fuel technology to help address mobile vehicle emissions and the growing public health risk from vehicle air pollution. Here, the use of natural gas proves an economically and environmentally preferable alternative to continuing diesel fuel-use for mobility purposes.

**Renewable Natural Gas/Energy Sustainability**

In the Goals and Policies section of the Resources Element, SoCalGas supports Policies R-3A and R-3C that encourage collaboration with energy providers to ensure reliable energy supplies to support projected demand and promote use of renewable energy resources throughout the city. However, Policy R-3C only includes solar panels as a suggested renewable energy resource that can help reduce air quality and climate change impacts from energy use. SoCalGas believes that there are important pathways utilizing natural gas, including renewable natural gas, that achieve both criteria and greenhouse gas pollution reductions faster and more economically than just “decarbonizing” electric generation. SoCalGas is focused on “decarbonizing the pipeline.”

Renewable natural gas, or biomethane, can be produced from agricultural waste, waste water, and landfills, and then upgraded to delivery quality in our pipelines. It may be used for electric generation and as a transportation fuel. Unlike other sources of renewable energy – such as solar and wind – biomethane doesn’t need the sun to shine or the wind to blow. Waste materials can be converted into deliverable, renewable energy that is available around the clock. The energy produced when biomethane fuels electric generation is considered renewable similar to solar and wind and can be counted towards California’s Renewable Portfolio Standards. In addition, as this energy is produced from existing methane sources, generation of biomethane helps reduce both regional and local methane and GHG emissions. As such, SoCalGas believes biomethane should also be included as an alternative energy resource reflected in Policy R-3C along with solar panels.

Further, use of biomethane can yield additional co-benefits that support other policies in the General Plan Update. AB 1383 requires a statewide increase in organics waste diversion of 50% by 2020. Because biomethane can be produced from existing waste streams, its use as a resource can contribute to city waste diversion and reduction goals in addition to emission reduction goals. For example, waste collector CR&R recently built a waste processing facility that uses an anaerobic digester to collect methane emissions from waste and uses it as
renewable natural gas to fuel their truck fleet. In addition, the Point Loma Wastewater Treatment Plant in San Diego collects methane gas from its wastewater digester and feeds it into the natural gas pipeline system. UC San Diego uses this biomethane to power their campus fuel cell and uses byproduct heat from the fuel cell as a continuous power source for chilling capacity to cool campus buildings. Both examples demonstrate how supporting use of biomethane as a renewable energy resource would help support the City’s other policy priorities, including Policy SI-11B, which emphasizes source reduction and recycling to increase landfill waste diversion, and Policy SI-11C, that encourages the City to identify strategies that reduce waste generation and support environmentally-friendly methods for waste disposal.

**Climate Adaptation/Resilience Strategies**

SoCalGas also supports the policy recommendations provided in the Health & Safety Element, specifically Goal HS-10 and its associated policies. For example, Policy HS-10B advocates for the City to develop adaptation measures in response to potential climate change impacts, Policy HS-10C encourages City support for methods and strategies to include consideration of climate change impacts in planning decisions, and Policy HS-10D supports collaboration with other local and regional entities to increase awareness of climate change vulnerability. In support of these policies, SoCalGas would like to emphasize that energy diversification is necessary as a climate change adaptation strategy. The UN Framework Convention on Climate Change clearly states that expanding the energy portfolio increases system reliability in a cost-effective manner, and over-reliance on a single energy source can create avoidable and unnecessary risks for public safety and the economy. Rather, maintaining diverse energy sources across the economy is a prudent measure to ensure resiliency.

As the natural gas system is mostly underground, it is very resilient to extreme weather events. For example, in 2012, after Superstorm Sandy, the entire natural gas system in the Northeast was essentially intact, allowing residents to support back-up generators, cook, and keep warm. Businesses with natural gas-powered fuel cells were able to operate and compressed natural gas (CNG) buses in New Jersey were used to shuttle residents to safety. Further, when Hurricane Harvey temporarily disabled almost 30% of the nation’s refining capacity, CNG shuttles were able to continue operating, and hospitals that had on-site combined heat and power systems were able to provide urgently needed medical attention, despite flooding. These examples demonstrate the critical role natural gas infrastructure can play in supporting local and regional energy supply resilience in the face of extreme climate events. With these case studies, SoCalGas wants to emphasize the importance of energy supply diversification, and specifically distributed generation resources such as combined heat and power, which offer a clean, flexible, and reliable form of energy.

SoCalGas has been engaging with stakeholders and consultants to conduct case studies and risk assessments of the natural gas system with the intent to demonstrate the security and

---

resilience of our system. SoCalGas intends to use this information to help local and regional cities and counties undertake similar efforts to identify system and infrastructure vulnerability.

**Conclusion**

Looking forward, natural gas and renewable natural gas, will continue to play an important role in electric generation, not just for baseload central power plants, but also for flexible and appropriately scaled natural gas peaking technologies that balance the intermittency of renewables, help integrate them into the grid, grow the state’s renewable generation portfolio over the long term, and help achieve State GHG emission and methane reduction goals as well as climate resiliency goals. Decarbonizing our natural gas delivery systems keeps intact the inherent energy efficiencies of direct uses of natural gas, at lower carbon-content, without creating the dramatic increase in electric demand and cost which makes decarbonizing electric generation a challenge. Further, it capitalizes on the inherent resiliency benefits of a grounded energy supply and avoids the increased risk from having an aboveground, vulnerable all-electric energy supply.

SoCalGas appreciates your consideration of these comments and your willingness to meet with us to further discuss the issues raised in this letter. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me by telephone or email. Thank you!

Sincerely,

Jennifer Pezda, M.ESM  
Environmental Policy Advisor  
Southern California Gas Company

Cc/Deborah McGarrey
Jessica,
Most of the public reviewing the documents online or at the upcoming workshop will believe that such a park is a possibility in the future. You and council certainly have the right to have the consultant remove any material you think is disingenuous and not based on fact. Why is the consultant dictating to council? That you are willing to entertain comments on an impossible option to our lack of open space rather than planning real alternatives is so disappointing. This takes away credibility and also trust that the city is trying to address other issues in the plan with real solutions. I can find little logic in leaving this fantasy in the plan other than you are letting Mayor Maloney’s insistence on the linear park concept overrule your responsibility to the provide the residents with honest plans for the future.
Disappointed,
Michael Lawrence

On Fri, Aug 3, 2018 at 9:03 AM Binnquist, Jessica <jbinnquist@cityofalhambra.org> wrote:

Hi Michael,

While the Council made it clear that they were not all in favor of a park over the Union Pacific right-of-way, the consultant did not remove the park, and will not do so until after the community has a chance to review and comment on the document during the comment period.

Best,
Jessica

Jessica,

I thought the train park was put to rest at the last council meeting and Mayor Maloney agreed there was zero chance it would be possible to build it. The consultant was directed by council to remove it. So can you tell me what changed after the council meeting? I believe the controversy this will cause will distract from more important issues. Also it gives the appearance of a less than serious effort by the city to present real ideas that we can discuss.
Please let me know that you received this email and give me an explanation I can relay to others that are concerned about this being in the plan.

Thank you,

Michael Lawrence
Hello there,

Can we discuss this tomorrow?

Thanks,

Lauren

Lauren Myles, CMC | City Clerk
City of Alhambra
111 S. First St. | Alhambra, CA 91801
T: (626) 570-5090 | F: (626) 576-8568
www.cityofalhambra.org

From: Moritz Lorentz [mailto:moritzlorentz@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, August 02, 2018 4:29 PM
To: Myles, Lauren
Subject: Specific Plans

Ms. Lauren Myles,

The general plan update makes references to several specific plans that play a key part in the changes coming to our city. I have searched the city website and cannot find any links to these plans. Can you help me find where they are located? If they have not been put online, please have someone explain why an electronic copy is not available. When could you have them online if they are not currently posted? These are important documents for evaluating the scope of the general plan and must be made available to the public in a transparent manner.

Thank you,
Michael Lawrence