

From: [Jennifer Griffin](#)
To: [City of Cupertino Planning Commission](#)
Cc: grenna5000@yahoo.com
Subject: LOS vs VMT for Item 3- Study Session
Date: Tuesday, September 22, 2020 4:55:28 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Planning Commission:

I think it is important to retain the LOS when traffic is being studied. The public understands this designation of LOS and is used to seeing it used for the last 25 years on projects in Cupertino as well as in the County as well as for projects in the city of San Jose, Sunnyvale, Los Altos, Santa Clara, Saratoga and Los Gatos. I have seen LOS used in projects in others states I have read about.

LOS is easy to understand. Intersections are graded as A, B, C D or F. The Level of Service degrades to unacceptable levels such as D or F as the ramifications of the project being studied increases and affects the neighboring roads and streets. It is easy to understand. Your intersection or roadway was at B level and with the project being studied your intersection or roadway will go to a D or F. It is very easy to understand. With or without mitigating circumstances, that is probably the traffic level you will wind up with -- D or F-- with many of the high density housing projects that are being pushed forward by the Big Housing Bills.

Did Governor Brown change LOS to VMT because he knew that there were going to be the plethora of Big Housing Bills introduced in the years following him signing the bill to convert LOS to VMT? I wonder about that. The Big Housing Bills first started showing up in 2017, just three years after this bill that switches LOS to VMT. What was the rationale there? Does the removal of LOS and replacement with VMT do anything to promote the Big Housing Bills? Does VMT make it easier to build high density, multi-story highrises? LOS might have shown more true traffic impacts than VMT does if some of these high rise projects are built. Also, why try to confuse the public with new terminology as these Big Housing Bills are just now being introduced?

It is like changing the language we do CEQA in from Spanish to French. We all speak Spanish and we understand how stuff works with the traffic studies, but now we are being forced to have our LOS Language changed to a new language VMT (like now we have to do this in French and few speak French) and then we also get saddled with the plethora of new Big Housing Bills.

At least the public understands LOS. Don't change the language on us now to something like VMT which no one understands yet and then they also throw in the Big Housing Bills and their impossibility of understanding or interpreting, especially the ones that got signed into law by the previous governor and maybe this one. The public are having to try to figure out/understand/comprehend/question/define the Big Housing Bills (some which make no sense and seem to just try to build fourplexes on every square inch of land in a city, even in the roads and on the sidewalks). Don't take LOS away from us now. That is at least one tool we have to try to fathom these apocalyptic Big Housing Bills.

I do believe that in one of the Study Sessions last year on LOS and VMT that cities were allowed to also retain LOS in their reports if they wished. This was on the Study Session on this 2013 bill Governor Brown signed, SB 743. I do believe that cities can actually pay for studies to evaluate LOS and place them on the reports on projects along with VMT. I think that is a great idea! I speak LOS. Please keep it on the project reports that Cupertino has in the future. I am a firm believer that one should not change all the parameters at one point, especially when the public's understanding is at stake. Keep LOS and then we can compare it side by side with what VMT is saying. The public understands the LOS and gets to see what VMT can or can't do for them. This is a big Win - Win for everyone involved.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Griffin

From: [Jennifer Griffin](#)
To: [City of Cupertino Planning Commission](#)
Cc: grenna5000@yahoo.com
Subject: Comments for Item 3- Study Session on LOS and VMT
Date: Tuesday, September 22, 2020 7:07:00 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Planning Commission:

I think that we should keep LOS in the studies of any upcoming projects. LOS has been used for many years in the studies of new projects that may impact adjacent areas around the project and traffic load on streets and intersections. LOS is understood by much of the public. It has been used in studying the ramifications of large projects on our city and other cities.

I would prefer that LOS be retained in the analysis and study of upcoming projects. VMT is not understood well by the public. It is an unknown entity.

I remember in the city Study Sessions on SB 743 last year that it was determined that a city could have LOS analysis in plans of a project as well as the new VMT. I think that Cupertino should keep LOS in their project analysis on new projects as well as having the new VMT. LOS is extremely valuable in determining traffic load and how intersections are affected by new, especially high density, projects. Much of the public already understands how LOS works. There is no reason to take away a tool that the public already knows and can understand.

Please retain LOS in any studies of projects being proposed for Cupertino. It gives the residents one more trusted tool to understand the implications and ramifications of new, especially high density, projects on streets, traffic load and potential intersection congestion.

I believe LOS to be an excellent tool to judge potential traffic load on streets and it should be retained in project reports.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Griffin

From: [Jennifer Griffin](#)
To: [City of Cupertino Planning Commission](#)
Cc: grenna5000@yahoo.com
Subject: Issues with LOS and VMT
Date: Tuesday, September 22, 2020 8:15:23 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Planning Commission:

LOS has been used successfully in the past to plan projects in Cupertino and Santa Clara and other cities. The LOS was included in the 700 page DRAFT EIR in one project in Santa Clara.

I am very worried that the intent to remove LOS as a tool is another attempt to suppress local control in cities by entities who are promoting the Big Housing Bills.

I am very concerned when tools residents and cities have been using successfully for years are suddenly taken away. This smacks of the issues with elimination of local control by the writers of the Big Housing Bills.

I am wondering why SB 743 was written in the first place and why is it being implemented now when the Big Housing Bills are being rolled out by Sacramento.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Griffin