AGENDA ITEM NO. 3

AGENDA REPORT
January 22, 2019
GPA 19-01

TO: City of Alhambra Planning Commission

FROM Marc Castagnola, AICP, Director of Community Development
Vanessa Reynoso, Deputy Director of Community Development

SUBJECT: Presentation by Rincon Consultant’s, Inc. and a Public Hearing regarding the comprehensive update to the City’s General Plan and related Implementation Actions, Environmental Impact Report, Statement of Overriding Considerations and Mitigation, Monitoring and Reporting Program.

1. APPLICANT: City of Alhambra

2. LOCATION: Citywide

3. CEQA DETERMINATION: An Environmental Impact Report (EIR) was prepared for this project.

4. STAFF RECOMMENDATION: After a presentation by Joe Power of Rincon Consultant’s, Inc., open the public hearing, take comment, and continue the public hearing to the next regularly scheduled meeting of the Planning Commission on February 4, 2019.

MEETING FORMAT
The Planning Commission will consider the Final General Plan and Final EIR over the course of three meetings: January 22, February 4, and February 19, 2019.

January 22, 2019
A presentation and public hearing will be held on January 22, 2019. At this meeting, Rincon Consultant’s, Inc. is prepared to present the Planning Commission with an overview of content within the Final General Plan and Final Environmental Impact Report. This meeting serves to present the finalized documents and open the public hearing to allow members of the public an opportunity to comment. At the end of the meeting, it is recommended that the Planning Commission continue the public hearing to February 4, 2019.

February 4, 2019
This meeting will serve to provide response to comments and requests for information from the Planning Commission and public received at the January 22 public hearing as well as a second chance for members of the public and of the Planning Commission to offer thoughts on the Final General Plan. At the end of the meeting, it will be recommended that the Planning Commission continue the public hearing to February 19, 2019.
February 19, 2019
This meeting will provide any final information requested by the Commission. After receiving such information and providing a final chance for public comment, it is anticipated that the Planning Commission would close the public hearing and possibly take action concerning a recommendation to the City Council concerning approval of the General Plan and Vision Plan (with or without any proposed modifications), as well as the Final Environmental Impact Report, Statement of Overriding Considerations, and associated Mitigation, Monitoring and Reporting Program.

WHAT IS A GENERAL PLAN
The General Plan is a state-mandated planning document that is intended to guide and influence future development and embodies the long term vision for the community. In order to do so, the General Plan contains goals, objectives and policies that provide guidance for future public and private land uses. The General Plan includes goals for desired conditions and policies that provide a framework on how to achieve those goals over a long term. It is sometimes called a “constitution for development” because, like a constitution, it contains broad policies and not specific details for implementation of those policies.

According to the State of California Office of Planning and Research (OPR) a General Plan must be updated “periodically”, although this timeframe is not clearly defined by the State. OPR further states that “While there is no requirement for how often to update the general plan, the planning period has traditionally been 15-20 years.” A General Plan update is a long range planning project that takes a considerable amount of time and financial resources. As such, some jurisdictions opt to update their entire general plan “periodically” while others update in smaller portions over time. In the past, the City has been notified by the state that the City’s plan is overdue for an update.

BACKGROUND
This is the first comprehensive update of the City of Alhambra’s General Plan since its adoption in 1986 (and subsequent amendment in 1987). The City’s existing General Plan was developed in accordance with the provisions of state law in effect at the time. The updated General Plan establishes the vision for development through year 2040 while incorporating updated requirements arising from current relevant state law.

PUBLIC INPUT
The General Plan update process commenced in 2015 with public input being taken at various points throughout the entire 3 year process and incorporated into the documents along the way. A variety of mechanisms were employed to secure broad community input into the new General Plan. Outreach incorporated two community surveys: (1) a randomly selected, statistically valid phone survey that included 400 participants; and (2) an on-line written survey with 360 voluntary participants. Outreach also included social media posts, email blasts, street banners, implementation of a dedicated email address and website linked through the City’s website, and public notices in the Pasadena Star News. Coverage of the General Plan update has also been provided by the Arcund Alhambra community newspaper, Alhambra Source website and an Alhambra Chamber of Commerce email blast. There were also a variety of events associated with the General Plan since 2015, as identified on the following page.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event Date</th>
<th>Event Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Saturday, May 2, 2015</td>
<td>Eco-Fair: Informational Booth (Alhambra Park)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday, May 5, 2015</td>
<td>Community Meeting #1: The Alhambra Civic Center Library (Reese Hall)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, May 21, 2015</td>
<td>Young Rotary Outreach Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, June 10, 2015</td>
<td>710 Day Celebration: Informational Booth (at Valley/Fremont)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday, June 28, 2015</td>
<td>Farmer's Market: Informational Booth (South Second Street)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday, July 19, 2015</td>
<td>Farmer's Market: Informational Booth (South Second Street)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, January 13, 2016</td>
<td>Community Meeting #2: The Alhambra Civic Center Library (Reese Hall)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, June 14, 2017</td>
<td>Community Meeting #3/EIR Scoping Meeting: The Alhambra Civic Center Library (Reese Hall)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday, June 1 to Friday, June 30, 2017</td>
<td>Public review and comment period for comments on the Notice of Preparation for the Draft EIR Comment period for the Notice of Preparation for Draft General Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday, July 24, 2018</td>
<td>City Council Presentation (City Hall Council Chambers)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday, August 3, 2018 to Wednesday, October 3, 2018</td>
<td>Circulation Period for the Draft EIR and availability of the Draft General Plan (Note: This comment period was extended from 45 days to 60 days to allow for additional time for public input).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday, September 11, 2018</td>
<td>Community Meeting #4: The Alhambra Civic Center Library (Reese Hall)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is discussion on comments received from the public at these events and through other outreach avenues further in this report.

**ABOUT THE GENERAL PLAN**

**Organizational Structure:**
State law mandates that a General Plan incorporate seven mandatory “elements”: Land Use, Circulation, Open Space, Conservation, Safety, Noise, and Housing. OPR leaves the organization and formatting of those elements into the General Plan to the discretion of each particular jurisdiction. In Alhambra’s case, the City’s new General Plan has been restructured and modified into a substantially modernized document with respect to format while maintaining the relevant components of the current plan. The updated General Plan is organized into seven chapters, which include an introduction and six topical chapters. The six topical chapters encompass all of the elements required by California General Plan law, and provide comprehensive policies for the entire City relating to the following:

- Land use & Community Design
- Mobility
- Quality of Life
- Resources
- Services and infrastructure
- Health and Safety
The General Plan is intended to foster a vision for the long range planning of the community. Each element includes narrative text followed by goals, policies, and implementation measures. The updated General Plan is organized in a contemporary format that includes the following 7 chapters:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th>Chapter Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>Describes organization of the Plan and provides a summary of goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use &amp; Community Design</td>
<td>The relationship between land use, community character and community design are identified in this chapter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobility</td>
<td>Discusses the City’s transportation network and addresses vehicle, bicycle, and pedestrian circulation, transit, rail and parking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Life</td>
<td>Addresses topics that affect the quality of life such as recreation, open space, environmental justice, jobs, economy and healthy communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>Addresses the conservation and management of natural resources such as water, biological resources, cultural resources, energy, air quality, and climate change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services &amp; Infrastructure</td>
<td>This chapter seeks to maintain and enhance the City’s infrastructure including technological infrastructure, solid waste management, water services library service, police and fire protection, and fiscal management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health &amp; Safety</td>
<td>Identifies and describes potential health safety challenges, as well as the requirements and resources available to respond to such challenges.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regardless of how the document is formatted, all contents of the General Plan bear the same weight in terms of the long range planning of the community. Whether or not the information is incorporated into its own dedicated element or topical chapter does not have any bearing on that information’s importance.

**Goals, Policies, and Implementation Actions**

Each Chapter includes narrative text followed by individual goals and policies. The specific goals and policies are intended to achieve the overarching purpose of the respective chapter they are contained in and provide broad guidance for day-to-day land use decisions. A separate, related “Implementation Actions” document has been prepared to provide specific actions to help achieve the goals and policies identified in the Plan. This is a standalone document that is a working “checklist” of action items for staff to use as a tool to ensure that the vision of the General Plan is realized.

Although the General Plan may be considered by some to be “too general; too broad”, the General Plan should be looked at as that “constitution for development” that provides a long-term perspective affecting both current and future planning considerations. The updated General Plan was drafted in compliance with State law in a manner that takes this long-term perspective into account without being overly stringent or incorporating inflexible language that would make it difficult for the City to implement over the 20 year life of the document.
Comments Received on the Draft General Plan

As detailed above, there have been numerous opportunities to comment on the General Plan throughout the 3 year process and there have been three overarching themes with respect to the comments received. Based on public feedback, the City has addressed the concerns and has made significant changes from original draft documents to the final draft documents being presented to the Planning Commission.

- **Open Space/Railroad Cap Park (“Linear Park” concept)**
  The original draft included an elevated “linear park” concept that involved construction of a park along the Mission Road corridor that would cap the railroad. The intent behind the linear park was to provide a continuous east-west open space that could provide bicycle and walking paths. Although considered a very ambitious and lofty concept that would require approval of Union Pacific Railroad (which they currently are not willing to grant) and extreme financial resources, it was anticipated that if the linear park ever came to fruition over the 20 year life of the General Plan it would provide an important open space amenity. Although there has been a great deal of concern expressed about the need to provide additional open space in the community, the City did not receive a favorable response to the linear park concept from the public and therefore it was removed from the final Plan.

- **Historic Preservation**
  The community, particularly members of the Alhambra Preservation Group, have expressed a deep concern about the need to protect the City’s history by preserving its architectural resources and protecting its established residential neighborhoods. The General Plan provides policies aimed at preservation and neighborhood character. The Implementation Plan goes a step further by committing the City to considering adoption of a historic preservation ordinance and investigation of funding resources that can assist the City in preparation of preservation activities.

- **Hotels**
  The Natelson Dale Group, Inc., under the direction of Rincon Consultants, Inc. looked at feasibility of various development opportunities with the City. As a result of their analysis, they indicated that the West San Gabriel Valley is well positioned for new hotel development. Specifically, Alhambra is substantially underrepresented in the hotel market. Hotels are no longer built on speculation but rather through market analysis to determine the extent of need and demand in a particular locale both as to location and size/type of hotel. New hotel development is being captured in the surrounding cities of San Gabriel and Monterey Park which supports the findings from The Natelson Dale Group, Inc. It appears that the aversion to new hotel development by community members is linked to the scale of some projects in those nearby cities and the amount of potential traffic that such projects would generate. City Staff is of the opinion that the massing and scale of the hotel developments in surrounding cities is not appropriate for Alhambra. However, staff is in support of smaller scale, boutique-type hotels that can provide amenities to the community. As such, many boutique hotels have recognized the need to incorporate restaurants, bars, lounges, and community gathering spaces that are made available not only to guests but to members of the public. There are no hotels being proposed as part of the General Plan, but rather the Plan identifies an opportunity for the City to provide a business and amenity that is currently underrepresented in the City. Hotels as a land use concept are maintained in
the General Plan, although the concept is clarified to reflect the City’s desire for boutique style hotels. In addition, any proposed hotel development would be required to conform to the City’s Zoning Ordinance with respect to development standards (i.e. massing, height, parking, etc.) and public hearing processes.

From August 3, 2018 to October 3, 2018, the City received 26 written comment letters regarding the draft General Plan that coincided with the 60 day public review period for the Draft Environmental Impact Report (to be discussed below). This public comment review period was extended by the City from 45 days to 60 days to allow additional time for community input. Comments and responses to those comments received during this period are attached as Attachment 1.

FUTURE ITEMS
Although the actual recommendation to the City Council for adoption of the General Plan will be considered at the Planning Commission’s meeting on February 19, 2019, it is important to be aware that adoption of a new General Plan is just the first step in a three part process to bring the City’s land use planning up to fully modern standards. After the new General Plan has been adopted the City will embark on Step 2, which is a comprehensive update to Title 23 of the Alhambra Municipal Code (“Zoning Code”), which has not been updated on a comprehensive level since 1986. A new Zoning Code will allow for implementation of the General Plans policies in concert with current planning practices and updated standards and regulations. An update to the Zoning Code is important. If the General Plan is the “constitution for development” then the Zoning Code is the document that contains specific regulations and standards to guide development consistent with the General Plan.

Step three, the final step in this process, would be to amend the City’s General Plan to adopt a new Housing Element. The Housing Element is the only element that is not being considered as part of this comprehensive General Plan update. Unlike the remainder of the General Plan, the Housing Element is the only portion of the General Plan that is on a mandated update schedule. The most current Housing Element was adopted by the City Council on January 13, 2014 and approved and certified by the State Housing and Community Development Department on February 4, 2014. The current Housing Element currently covers an eight year cycle from 2013 to 2021 and remains valid so a revision is not required by the State as part of this General Plan update. The preparer of the City’s current Housing Element is also a member of the General Plan consultant team and has confirmed that no provision of the General Plan update would conflict with the current Housing Element. After the General Plan update is approved, staff is already preparing for the next Housing Element update, which is anticipated to be completed, approved and certified by the State Housing and Community Development Department, and formally adopted by 2022.

An amendment to the General Plan will likely occur in 2022 to incorporate not only the new Housing Element but also guidelines that will address the status of the 710 Freeway stub and a shift from Level of Service (LOS) to Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) as the metric for analyzing transportation impacts in planning. VMT regulations are in the process of being finalized by the State and the upcoming amendment will serve as a good time to formally incorporate them.
ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW
An Environmental Impact Report (EIR) was prepared by Rincon Associates, Inc. under the direction of the City. It has been prepared, noticed to other agencies and the public, and distributed pursuant to requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act. The Draft EIR is intended to provide information regarding: (1) the potential environmental impacts of the proposed project; (2) ways in which any significant impacts of the project may be mitigated or avoided; and (3) alternatives to the project which could reduce or avoid the significant impacts associated with the project while still achieving the objectives of the project.

For purposes of CEQA, the “project” considered is the update to the General Plan and not any particular development activity. The appropriate type of EIR prepared for the General Plan Update is known as Program EIR. This type of EIR allows for consideration of broad policy alternatives and program wide mitigation measures, as opposed to a “Project EIR”, which considers individual projects and their impacts in great detail. It is nearly impossible to predict future privately-funded development projects; therefore all subsequent development activity subject to CEQA will require its own environmental review in compliance with CEQA and the CEQA guidelines.

To determine the scope of environmental issues to be addressed in the EIR, a Notice of Preparation (NOP) was issued and circulated for 30 days beginning June 1, 2017 and ending on June 30, 2017. In the middle of that period, on June 14, 2017, the City also held a Draft EIR Scoping in conjunction with a community meeting that included a presentation of the draft Master Plan. This meeting took place in Reese Hall at the Alhambra Public Library and was geared toward soliciting input from the community. All input, whether from the meeting or received through other channels, is reflected in the Final EIR. Based on the analysis in the Final EIR, the proposed General Plan would result in significant effects related to Transportation/Traffic. All other impacts of the Plan are either less than significant without mitigation, or less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

As previously mentioned, the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) was made available for review and comment from August 3, 2018 to October 3, 2018. The City received 17 written comment letters during the extended 60 day review period. Comments and responses to those comments received during this period are included in the Final EIR beginning on Page 315.

Environmental Effects of the Project
The Environmental Impact Report considered and analyzed the environmental effects of the General Plan update. As noted above, the proposed project would result in significant effects related to Transportation/Traffic. All other impacts of the Plan are less than significant. These effects are summarized on the following page:

Impact T-1 Traffic generated as a result of development facilitated by the Plan would degrade operations at 21 intersections to below identified significance thresholds. Because feasible mitigation is not available at 20 of 21 intersections, impacts would be significant and unavoidable.
Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoids or substantially lessens the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR. Growth forecast under the Plan would incrementally increase traffic levels on the local roadway network, which already experiences high levels of congestion due to local and regional traffic. The Plan’s potential impacts to roadway intersections have been reduced to the degree feasible with the following mitigation measure.

*Mitigation Measure:* Fremont Avenue/Orange Street
Widen the westbound approach of the Fremont Avenue/Orange Street intersection to provide an additional lane for traffic.

This measure would address the significant effect at the Fremont Avenue/Orange Street intersection. However, mitigation is not available for the other intersections that would experience significant effects. Therefore, the Plan’s overall impact to roadway intersections would be significant and unavoidable.

**Impact T-2**

Traffic generated by development facilitated by the Plan would degrade operations on the I-10 freeway corridor and on I-10 freeway off-ramps to below identified significance thresholds. Impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.

Growth forecast under the Plan would incrementally add to traffic levels along the I-10 freeway, which already experiences high levels of traffic congestion due to regional traffic. The Plan’s potential impacts to roadway intersections have been reduced to the degree feasible with the following mitigation measure.

*Mitigation Measure:* I-10 Freeway Corridor and Off-Ramp Operations
Future major projects within the Plan Area should shall be reviewed for both localized impacts that overlap with identified locations of potential I-10 freeway corridor and off-ramp significant impacts. Projects that make a substantial contribution to a significant impact in these locations must make a fair-share contribution to freeway corridor improvements planned by Caltrans.

This measure would address the significant effect to the I-10 freeway. However, improvements to the I-10 freeway are under the jurisdiction of Caltrans and, as such, cannot be assured by the City. Therefore, the Plan’s impact to the I-10 freeway would be significant and unavoidable.

**Impact T-3**

Because the Plan would contribute more than 50 vehicle trips to the CMP arterial monitoring intersection of Fremont Avenue and Valley Boulevard,
implementation of the Plan would conflict with an applicable congestion management program. Because there are no feasible mitigation measures at this intersection, this impact would be significant and unavoidable.

Growth forecast under the Plan would incrementally increase traffic at the Fremont Avenue/Valley Boulevard intersection, which already experiences high levels of congestion due to local and regional traffic. Due to physical constraints, mitigation is not available for impacts to the Fremont Avenue and Valley Boulevard intersection. Therefore, the Plan’s impacts to this CMP intersection would be significant and unavoidable.

**Alternatives**
The EIR considered the following two alternatives to the proposed General Plan:

1. **No Project (Current General Plan)**
The No Project alternative involves continued implementation of the City’s current General Plan. This alternative assumes that existing General Plan policies would continue to facilitate development in accordance with existing land use designations. The overall amount of growth anticipated to occur under the current General Plan is roughly equivalent to what could be facilitated under the proposed Plan.

   While the Plan preserves the existing pattern of uses in most of the City and provides for protection of established neighborhoods, it also identifies focus areas that offer unique characteristics and may provide opportunities to transition over time with adjustments in land use, beautification, and place making. In contrast, the No Project Alternative would continue to facilitate development in the same pattern as is currently seen in the City, as reflected in the City’s current Land Use Policy Map.

   Under the Plan, new development would generally result from re-use of properties, conversion of uses in response to market demand (e.g., select industrial to commercial), and more intense use of land in defined areas. While new development under the No Project alternative would also result from re-use of properties and conversion of uses in response to market demand, this alternative would not include the focus areas included under the Plan. Therefore, rather than potentially creating more intense use of land in the geographically well-defined focus areas, the same amount of new, market-driven development would occur, but would be more likely to be spread out across a wider area of the City, and without the adjustments in land use, beautification, and place making included in the Plan.

2. **Relocated Focus Area**
The Relocated Focus Area alternative involves shifting the location of one of the focus areas identified in the Plan, in an attempt to avoid growth-related impacts in certain areas. In particular, this alternative is designed to avoid or lessen the Plan’s significant and unavoidable traffic impacts, which occur at 20 out of 21 intersections that would be significantly impacted by the Plan (compared to existing conditions), with impacts at the other one of these significantly impacted intersections being mitigatable. The Plan would
also have significant and unavoidable LOS impacts to the operation of the I-10 freeway corridor and on- and off-ramps.

Given the fact that 14 of the 21 significantly impacted intersections would occur in the southern half of Alhambra (on or south of Mission Road), and the I-10 freeway corridor and on- and off-ramps are also located in the southern half of Alhambra, this alternative involves relocating one of the Plan focus areas located in the southern half of Alhambra to the northern half of Alhambra. The East Valley Boulevard Entertainment District focus area was chosen as the focus area to be moved, since it is near several significantly impacted intersections along Garfield Avenue and Valley Boulevard, and because the new hotel and entertainment uses that could be encouraged by this focus area could have relatively high trip generation potential compared to existing uses.

Under this alternative, this focus area would be relocated to West Main Street. West Main Street was chosen because it is located in the northern half of Alhambra and it is a major thoroughfare with commercially-designated land and ample right of way for both vehicles and other modes of travel.

Both of the studied alternatives would involve the same overall level of growth/development as the proposed General Plan and, as such, would have generally similar environmental impacts. Neither of the alternatives considered would eliminate or substantially reduce the proposed General Plan’s significant and unavoidable impacts related to transportation/traffic, nor would either alternative substantially reduce any of the Plan’s already less than significant impacts. The No Project alternative would not bring the General Plan up to current standards in terms of legal requirements or address any of the specific issues identified during the development of the General Plan. The Relocated Focus Area alternative would potentially move more future development to the Main Street corridor in the northern part of the City where residents have previously expressed concerns about development density/intensity. For these reasons, neither of the alternatives is more desirable than the proposed General Plan in terms of meeting the City’s objectives for the Plan. For this reason and because neither alternative would avoid any of the Plan’s significant impacts, neither alternative are considered feasible.

The Draft EIR also had considered the alternative of excluding the Linear Park concept from the General Plan. However, because this concept was ultimately excluded from the General Plan and the Final EIR modified to account for that exclusion, the alternative need not be studied in the Final EIR.

**STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS**

Section 15093 of the CEQA Guidelines requires lead agencies to adopt a Statement of Overriding Considerations if they elect to approve a project that has significant and unavoidable environmental impacts. However, the Planning Commission would need to recommend to the City Council that the benefits of a project outweigh the significant and unavoidable impacts.

As previously noted, the proposed General Plan would have significant and unavoidable impacts related to transportation/traffic. As such, the City has identified the following overriding
considerations that explain why the Plan's benefits outweigh these significant environmental impacts:

- The Plan updates outdated policies in a manner that meets current legal requirements for general plans, including recently adopted state requirements related to complete streets and environmental justice.
- The Plan provides a more user-friendly document that will make use of the General Plan easier for decision makers, staff, and the public.
- The Plan reflects current community goals and preferences as identified during a three-year public outreach process.
- The Plan is designed to achieve the overall community goals of providing:
  o Stable residential neighborhoods
  o Enhanced commercial corridors with a mix of office, retail, entertainment, and lodging that meets the needs of residents while attracting visitors
  o Industrial and commercial districts that meet local demand, create good jobs, and take advantage of the City's location near downtown Los Angeles
  o A beautiful community with improved streetscapes, gateways, and parks

In order to achieve these objectives, the Plan focuses on improving how residents get around, meeting community needs with available services, providing a greater sense of identity, and preserving established residential neighborhoods. For most of the City, the Plan preserves the existing pattern of uses and establishes policies for protection and long-term maintenance of established neighborhoods. Generally, new development in accordance with the Plan would result in re-use of properties, and conversion of properties to different uses in response to market demand (e.g., select industrial to commercial). The Plan emphasizes bicycle connections and pedestrian-oriented focus areas, and proposes focus areas and activity nodes to help shape and distribute new development.

The proposed General Plan does not increase development potential relative to the current General Plan, but rather simply focuses on emphasizing new development in certain areas of the City to achieve goals related to the provision of jobs and services while maintaining the historic and current density and character of existing single-family neighborhoods.

PUBLIC NOTICE
The Notice of Public Hearing was sent to interested parties on January 10, 2019. On January 11, 2019, a Notice of Public Hearing was posted at City Hall, The Police Department, The Alhambra Civic Center Library and the City's website. A Notice of Public Hearing was also placed in the Pasadena Star News on January 11, 2019. The Final EIR and General Plan were made available for public review beginning on January 11, 2019 at the Community Development Department at City Hall, at The Alhambra Civic Center Library, and on the City's website.

CONCLUSION
Although the General Plan may be considered by some to be "too general; too broad", the document is appropriate given the fact that the General Plan should be looked at as a high-level policy document taking long-term perspective that affects both current and future planning considerations. The updated General Plan was successfully drafted in compliance with State law
in a manner that takes this long-term perspective into account without being overly stringent or incorporating inflexible language that would make it difficult for the City to implement over the 20 year life of the document.

The goal of the General Plan is to maintain stable residential neighborhoods, enhance commercial corridors, establish industrial and commercial districts that meet local demand, and continue to beautify the community with improved streetscapes, gateways, and open spaces. Goals, policies, and implementation actions contained in the various General Plan components have been modified to reflect the needs and desires identified by the community throughout the 3 year update process.

STAFF RECOMMENDED ACTION

Staff recommends Planning Commission to:

1. After a presentation by Joe Power of Rincon Consultant’s, Inc., open the public hearing, take comment, and continue the public hearing to the next regularly scheduled meeting of the Planning Commission on February 4, 2019.

ATTACHMENTS:

1. Response to General Plan Comments, January 2019
2. Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program
3. General Plan, January 2019 (under separate cover)
4. Final Environmental Impact Report, January 2019 (under separate cover)
5. Final EIR Errata Sheet, January 14, 2019 (under separate cover)
6. Implementation Measures, January 2019 (under separate cover)
## 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>1.1 Mark Dillих</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain residential neighborhood integrity; concerned about new structures on Fremont</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Citywide interest in preserving historic structures is needed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The draft General Plan includes a specific goal and several policies and implementation programs aimed at historic resource preservation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Who defines and enforces standards for terms like “character” and “high quality.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City decision-makers will make all interpretations of adopted policies with guidance from staff and the community.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 Better use existing buildings on Main Street.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<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>
<td></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></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6 Buildings in the city should be adaptively reused.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<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>
<td></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></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Various components of the draft General Plan are aimed at making the community more pedestrian friendly and attracting tourists, including “foodies” tourists. Rents are governed by market forces.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8 Remove the linear park and consider alternatives for providing green space.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9 Bike lanes are needed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<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>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
City of Alhambra
General Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letter/Comment/Commentator</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.10 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>1.11 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>1.12 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>2. Melissa Mitchell</td>
<td>Where is the data from the surveys and how many residents indicated a desire for a large hotel and linear parkway?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. George Starks</td>
<td>Include sidewalks and bikeways south of I-10.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Anel S. Moore, Library Media Aide, Alhambra USD</td>
<td>Streets need to be re-paved and broken curbs repaired.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Robert Gutierrez</td>
<td>5.1 More trees are needed on Fremont Avenue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.2 More bike lanes are needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.3 More parks are needed. Is it possible to turn the former Lowe’s into park space?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.4 Light posts need maintenance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Responses to Comments on the Draft General Plan
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letter/Comment/Committer</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>This comment is not directly relevant to the General Plan, but the concern is noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>This opinion is not directly relevant to the General Plan, but is noted. That development has received approval from the City.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>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>The draft General Plan acknowledges this desire and includes a conceptual “entertainment district” on E. Valley Boulevard that could attract uses such as those suggested by the commenter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>This opinion is noted. General Plan Policy Q5-6F 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 bumps may not be the preferred traffic calming device, but the following policy has been added to the General Plan Mobility chapter: Policy 4M-8 Where feasible and appropriate, incorporate traffic calming features on neighborhood streets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francisco Mocito</td>
<td>Policy M-25 of the Mobility chapter has been modified to include the provision of bike parking in the City’s bike network.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>Bike locks are needed on Main Street. Policy M-25 of the Mobility chapter addresses this suggestion by improving the utility, safety, and attractiveness of alternative modes of transportation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>Bus shelters should be added. 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 is outside the scope of the General Plan. Such an ordinance may face legal challenges.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3</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>7.1</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>7.2</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>7.3</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>7.4</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>7.5</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>
</tbody>
</table>

Responses to Comments on the Draft General Plan
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<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-5 and related policies aimed at historic resource preservation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Bridges</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>Gina Adams</td>
<td>The linear park feature has been removed from the General Plan. 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>12.1 Remove the linear park from the General Plan.</td>
<td>The draft General Plan does not call for “large” hotel and entertainment complexes or 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>12.2 Explore all options for development small neighborhood parks.</td>
<td>The linear park feature has been removed from the General Plan. 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>Michael Lawrence</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>13.1 The City needs to seriously address the need for improved bike facilities.</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>13.2 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 &quot;Institutional&quot; (this site is designated “Open Space” in the current General Plan). The current amount of designated &quot;Open Space&quot; in the City under the draft General Plan is 192 acres. This includes City parks (60 acres), Alhambra Golf Course (169 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>
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<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>14.4 Rachel Frome</td>
<td>Save the Victorian home at 4635 S. Garfield Avenue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.7 Mike Brown</td>
<td>Hotels should not be allowed at Crawford's Corner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.8 Alfonso Valdez</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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony Doe</td>
<td>The General Plan does not include adequate measures to address pedestrian and road safety.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Messina</td>
<td>The hotel concept should be removed from the General Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trace D. Riker</td>
<td>The General Plan should include a complete inventory of historic resources and protection for individual resources rather than just neighborhoods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damienee Dobby</td>
<td>Save the Victorian home at 403 S. Garfield Avenue. Also, the General Plan should include unequivocal language regarding a historic survey and preservation of historic resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graciela Aguilar</td>
<td>Massive multi-use buildings are not desirable and historic resources should be protected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oscar Amaro</td>
<td>The commenter raises several concerns about past issues with the City and is unhappy about the “topk” language in the draft General Plan regarding historic resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shirley Wallace</td>
<td>Good tech jobs are a good idea, but high paying jobs may make housing more expensive. Also, a portion of the industrial area is already slated for residential development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The City should discourage driving cars and the auto row creates poor living conditions for neighbors.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Responses to Comments on the Draft General Plan
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letter/Comment/Commenter</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>The City does not &quot;force&quot; owners to sell aging rental units along Garfield Avenue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.4</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 &quot;tourist zone&quot; 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</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</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</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</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</td>
<td>Policy QL-9C of the Quality of Life chapter includes these suggestions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>ScCedan encourages coordination with SCAG/MD to minimize exposure to air pollution, suggests an addition to the Policy R-3C, and states support for policies aimed at climate adaptation/resilience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>The linear park should be removed from the plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>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>

---

**Responses to Comments on the Draft General Plan**

---

19
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 feet beyond the existing homes and are interrupting the skyline 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 need of some upkeep. We don’t even need to tear up Main Street; we just need to utilise 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 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/marketsstreet.htm
5. **Responsible development.** In general, we need to do a better job of 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 rethink 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 environmentally-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 'foodies 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 Remont 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 Alhambrians 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 Dilin
Resident, District 5
Letter 2

Reynoso, Vanessa

From: Melissa <melmiichelson@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, September 15, 2018 11:28 PM
To: Alhambra General Plan
Subject: where is the survey data?

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
Letter 3

Reynoso, Vanessa

From: George Shafer <gksafer@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, September 16, 2018 4:12 PM
To: Alhambra General Plan
Subject: Comments on General Plan

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 Tneck 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
Letter 4

Reynoso, Vanessa

From: amal moore <samam06@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
Letter 5

Reynoso, Vanessa

From: Robert Gutierrez <robertgutierrez83@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 18, 2018 1:04 PM
To: Alhambra General Plan
Subject: Public Comment

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 bare.
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 calms traffic.
3. **More Parks** - Is it possible to turn the former Lowe's developments into park space?
4. **Painting light poles** - 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 Radtovich 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 hipster 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
Thank you for your interest in Alhambra. We are excited to have you join our community!

1. We would love to hear from you!
2. Is there anything else I can assist you with?
3. How may I contact you?

We look forward to welcoming you to Alhambra!

City of Alhambra
Development Services Department
111 S. First Street
Alhambra, CA 91801
From: angelicamunoz <gaviota626@yahoo.com>
Sent: Friday, September 21, 2018 11:43 AM
To: Alhambra General Plan
Subject: 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 Plon
11756 Venport Ave
Lake View Terrace
CA 91042

Former residence:
1715 Cabrillo Ave
Lam, Paul

From: Lanette Nelson <lanettamel@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, September 22, 2018 9:38 AM
To: Alhambra General Plan
Subject: Preservation of Victorian house

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, sieve 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 breakdown 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 Napolitan 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 Measner at the last community meeting said, "That's not the case 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 gether 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
1138 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 Farsing

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.
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 it 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 addressed 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,
Alde Zeller
From: Anthony S. <aseto21@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, October 3, 2018 10:30 AM
To: Alhambra General Plan
Subject: Public Comment - Draft General Plan

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 increasingly 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 revised plan 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 concerned opponent of the Valley Park Entertainment District, I feel as though this would affect both areas on both sides of Valley, the traffic and noise impact would negatively affect the character and integrity of the residential neighborhood. I feel this should be removed from the plan.

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

Sincerely,
Bob M.
May 30, 1980

[Signature]
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
From: Danielle Mobley <surshinemobley@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, October 3, 2018 8:59 AM
To: Alhambra General Plan
Subject: 403 S. Garfield Ave. needs to be preserved
Attachments: Image1.png; ATT00001.jpg; Image2.png; ATT00002.jpg; Image3.jpg; ATT00003.jpg

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 3rd 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 Alhambrians to see.

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

Sincerely,
Danielle Mobley, Alhambra resident of 36 years
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
From: Oscar Amaro <oamaro1120@att.net>
Sent: Wednesday, October 3, 2018 5:32 PM
To: Alhambra General Plan
Subject: Response to draft General Plan
Attachments: O_Amaro_USP_response.pdf

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 Alhambrian'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 non-profit 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
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 encouraging 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 26 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 Staples 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, Daise 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 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 bulbouts and sidewalk widening there will be no right lane and the existing ones could be even narrower also. These bulbouts 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 bikers 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 shot 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 that 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 idea 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 shelter 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 biogas to power their campus fuel cell and uses byproduct heat from the fuel cell as a continuous power source for cooling capacity to cool campus buildings. Both examples demonstrate how supporting use of biogas 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
ScCalGas 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 reduce 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. Support in support of these policies, ScCalGas 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 safety2. Further, when Hurricane Harvey temporarily disabled almost 50% 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, ScCalGas 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.

ScCalGas 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,

[Signature]

Jennifer Pezda, MSEM
Environmental Policy Advisor
Southern California Gas Company

Cc/Deborah McGarrey
Letter 25

Reynoso, Vanessa

From: Moritz Lorentz <morioztlorentz@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, August 03, 2018 10:24 AM
To: Binnquist, Jessica
Cc: Castagnola, Marc; Reynoso, Vanessa; Myles, Lauren
Subject: Re: Linear Park Still in General Plan Update

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 override your responsibility to provide the residents with honest plans for the future.

Disappointed,
Michael Lawrence

On Fri, Aug 3, 2018 at 9:03 AM Binnquist, Jessica <jbinquist@cityofpalohicina.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

From: Moritz Lorentz <morioztlorentz@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 02, 2018 8:49 PM
To: Binnquist, Jessica
Subject: Linear Park Still in General Plan Update

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

---

From: Myles, Lauren  
Sent: Thursday, August 02, 2018 4:33 PM  
To: Castagnola, Marc  
Cc: Reynoso, Vanessa  
Subject: FW: Specific Plans

Ms. Lauren Myles,

The general plan update makes reference 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
Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

CEQA requires that a reporting or monitoring program be adopted for the conditions of project approval that are necessary to mitigate or avoid significant effects on the environment (Public Resources Code 21081.6). This mitigation monitoring and reporting program is designed to ensure compliance with adopted mitigation measures during project implementation. For each mitigation measure recommended in the Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR), specifications are made herein that identify the action required and the monitoring that must occur. In addition, a responsible agency is identified for verifying compliance with individual conditions of approval contained in this Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program.
## City of Alhambra
### General Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measure / Condition of Approval</th>
<th>Action Required</th>
<th>Monitoring Timing</th>
<th>Monitoring Frequency</th>
<th>Responsible Agency</th>
<th>Compliance Verification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.2.1. Fremont Avenue/Orange Street</td>
<td>Widen the westbound approach of the Fremont Avenue/Orange Street intersection to provide an additional lane for traffic.</td>
<td>Monitor traffic conditions and widen the westbound approach toward the intersection at such time it is deemed necessary.</td>
<td>When determined necessary based on traffic conditions</td>
<td>Public Works Department</td>
<td>Public Works Department</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1.5 freeway Corridor and Off-Ramp Operations

Future major projects within the Plan Area shall be reviewed for both localized impacts that overlap with identified locations of potential I-10 freeway corridor and off-ramp significant impacts. Projects that make a substantial contribution to a significant impact in these locations must make a fair-share contribution to freeway corridor improvements planned by Caltrans.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Required</th>
<th>Monitoring Timing</th>
<th>Monitoring Frequency</th>
<th>Responsible Agency</th>
<th>Compliance Verification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development of a fee program and collection of fees on an as-needed basis.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fee program development prior to approval of new major projects; fee collection as needed</td>
<td>Public Works Department</td>
<td>Public Works Department</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>