

From: Ellen Biasin <ellenbiasin@ymail.com>  
To: "mayor@longbeach.gov" <mayor@longbeach.gov>, "district1@longbeach.gov" <district1@longbeach.gov>, "district2@longbeach.gov" <district2@longbeach.gov>, "district3@longbeach.gov" <district3@longbeach.gov>, "district4@longbeach.gov" <district4@longbeach.gov>, "district5@longbeach.gov" <district5@longbeach.gov>, "dee.andrews@longbeach.gov" <dee.andrews@longbeach.gov>, "district7@longbeach.gov" <district7@longbeach.gov>, "district8@longbeach.gov" <district8@longbeach.gov>, "district9@longbeach.gov" <district9@longbeach.gov>,  
Cc: "cityclerk@longbeach.gov" <cityclerk@longbeach.gov>, "Patrick.west@longbeach.gov" <Patrick.west@longbeach.gov>  
Date: 10/01/2013 02:29 PM  
Subject: Resolution Supporting the Completion of the 710 Freeway

---

Dear Mayor Foster and members of the City Council

I live in Pasadena about 1.3 miles from the proposed SR-710 tunnel/tollway project. My neighbors and I are deeply concerned about the effect this project would have on our neighborhoods and those along the 134/210 freeway corridors in NW Los Angeles, San Gabriel Valley, and the Verdugo Foothills. I am writing to urge a "NO" vote on the above item for the following reasons:

1. We believe that the benefits of the project do not sufficiently outweigh the negative impacts of additional congestion, pollution, 8-10 year construction, dividing communities and diminished quality of life in our area and in the region.
2. The SR-710 North EIR study is currently in process. Only ONE of the five alternatives being studied will connect the I-710 to the I-210 freeway. The study is expected to be completed in 2014. Until the study is completed we feel that it is premature to take a position.

After reading the R-9 memorandum posted on the Long Beach City Council

website, it appears that the motivation for this resolution is based on concern about the movement of freight from the Ports of LA/Long Beach and addressing the problem of increasing congestion in the I-710 corridor.

3. Freight movement is not a factor in the current SR-710 EIR study. During the past year, at public meetings when the subject was mentioned, Metro representatives repeatedly denied that port traffic was a significant factor in making a case for the tunnel/tollway alternative. Likewise a staff person at SCAG told me that their studies concluded that most of port traffic would go from the I-710 to the I-60 so port traffic will not be a factor in the SR-710 Tunnel/Tollway alternative.

4. Your resolution seems to be based on the belief that additional highways will alleviate congestion in our region. However, this is not based on experience of most people who have lived here for any length of time. Nor is it confirmed by traffic studies. It is more likely that new highways attract more motorists to the roadway eventually resulting in congestion and a demand for more highways. It is a vicious circle. We need to break it by developing a regional transit system that includes more rail to move freight.

5. The SR-710 tunnel/tollway is expected to cost \$5.4 billion but probably will cost much more. Although a private partner will assume most of the expense, in light of the recent failures of the Orange County tollways, we need to examine the risks to the public for such an arrangement. Also does this investment work toward a long term solution to our transportation needs? Because of the complexity and scope of the problems of congestion, pollution and freight movement in our region, discussion on the regional, state and national levels is needed to reach consensus on a comprehensive solution that will address current and long term needs.

I urge you to vote "no" on this resolution or at least hold it over until the SR-710 EIR study is completed.

Your consideration is appreciated.

Ellen Biasin  
110 Malcolm Dr.  
Pasadena CA 91105