

Communication from Public

Name: Brian Girvan

Date Submitted: 01/16/2024 05:56 PM

Council File No: 23-0600-S54

Comments for Public Posting: I'm writing to make public comment related to Item #11 (23-0600-S54): This report suggests that the cost of implementing the Mobility Plan 2035 may include repaving costs, but the City already repaves hundreds of miles of streets per year, and this routine maintenance work is already budgeted for. The estimate of implementing the Mobility Plan 2035 without taking into account repaving costs is approximately \$2B less. Whether it's the City's version of Healthy Streets LA or Healthy Streets LA, both only trigger when repaving is done. Therefore, the cost of repaving should be excluded, since it's budgeted for separately. Thank you.

Communication from Public

Name: Jairo Avalos

Date Submitted: 01/16/2024 09:08 PM

Council File No: 23-0600-S54

Comments for Public Posting: The recent report concerning the implementation of Mobility Plan 2035's Bicycle Enhanced Network, Bicycle Lane Network, and sidewalks within the Pedestrian Enhanced District brings to light significant budget considerations. It's important to highlight that the estimated costs of implementing the Mobility Plan 2035 appear to include repaving expenses. However, given that the City annually budgets for and undertakes the repaving of hundreds of miles of streets, these costs should not be conflated with the expenses of the Mobility Plan. By distinguishing routine maintenance costs from the plan's implementation expenses, we can more accurately estimate the cost of the Mobility Plan 2035 at about \$2 billion less. Both the City's version of Healthy Streets LA and Healthy Streets LA itself are initiated during these regular repaving schedules. Therefore, it's essential to recognize that repaving costs are separate and already accounted for in the City's budget, ensuring a more accurate and realistic financial plan for our city's mobility future.

Communication from Public

Name: Luis R Garcia Chavez

Date Submitted: 01/15/2024 10:48 PM

Council File No: 23-0600-S54

Comments for Public Posting: This report suggests that the cost of implementing the Mobility Plan 2035 may include repaving costs, but the City already repaves hundreds of miles of streets per year, and this routine maintenance work is already budgeted for. The estimate of implementing the Mobility Plan 2035 without taking into account repaving costs is approximately \$2B less. Whether it's the City's version of Healthy Streets LA or Healthy Streets LA, both only trigger when repaving is done. Therefore, the cost of repaving should be excluded, since it's budgeted for separately.

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 01/15/2024 08:49 PM

Council File No: 23-0600-S54

Comments for Public Posting: This report is misleading and must be revised. It contends that the expenses associated with executing the Mobility Plan 2035 might involve repaving costs. However, the City routinely repaves hundreds of miles of streets each year, and this regular maintenance work is already allocated in the budget. The projected cost of implementing the Mobility Plan 2035, excluding repaving costs, is roughly \$2 billion less. Notably, both the City's version of Healthy Streets LA and Healthy Streets LA initiatives only come into play when repaving is carried out. Hence, the cost of repaving should be omitted, given its separate budgetary allocation.

Communication from Public

Name: Julian Kelly

Date Submitted: 01/15/2024 02:06 PM

Council File No: 23-0600-S54

Comments for Public Posting: The report indicates that implementing the Mobility Plan 2035 will include repaving costs, but the city already repaves much of the city streets every year, and this routine work is already budgeted for. The vision of Healthy Streets LA is to only trigger implementation of new mobility infrastructure when repaving is done. If you exclude these repaving costs, the estimate of implementing Mobility Plan 2035 drops significantly (roughly \$2 billion). I strongly support Mobility Plan 2035, and want to make sure the City is weighing the implementation costs accurately, without inflating them. Thank you. -Julian Kelly (city of LA resident in 90066 zip code)

Communication from Public

Name: Karen Canady

Date Submitted: 01/15/2024 03:01 PM

Council File No: 23-0600-S54

Comments for Public Posting: I urge the City to revise the Report from the City Administrative Officer relative to implementation of Mobility Plan 2035's Bicycle Enhanced Network, Bicycle Lane Network, and sidewalks in the Pedestrian Enhanced District. As drafted, this report suggests that the cost of implementing the Mobility Plan 2035 includes repaving costs, while disregarding the fact that the City already repaves hundreds of miles of streets per year, a routine maintenance cost that is already within the city's budget. Excluding the redundant repaving costs would lower the estimate of implementing the Mobility Plan 2035 by approximately \$2 billion. Because Healthy Streets LA only triggers implementation when repaving is done, the cost of repaving should be excluded, since it is a separate budget item.

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted:

01/17/2024 01:13 PM

Council File No:

23-0600-S54

Comments for Public Posting: I am writing to grossly challenge the report that suggests that the cost of implementing the Mobility Plan 2035 will be billions of dollars higher by trying to include the cost of the City's already budgeted repaving program. The cost of repaving should be excluded.

Communication from Public

Name: Connor Webb

Date Submitted: 01/17/2024 01:43 PM

Council File No: 23-0600-S54

Comments for Public Posting: I support implementing the Mobility Plan 2035, but this report suggests that implementation includes paving costs, which the city already does and is already budgeted for. Mobility Plan implementation under Healthy Streets LA is only triggered when already repaving, so that is absurd to include this as a cost of the mobility plan. Without including the repaving costs, it is \$2B less.

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 01/17/2024 07:46 AM

Council File No: 23-0600-S54

Comments for Public Posting: The cost of the mobility plan stated in this report isn't representative of its true cost, which is much lower. The whole point of the plan is to target streets that are already being repaved regardless, so including the cost of the repaving in the plan seems like nothing but bad faith. Please do better, and please implement the mobility plan asap.