

From: Michael Duran <agentoso12@yahoo.com>
Sent: Sunday, September 09, 2012 10:25 AM
To: RoseBowlNFLComments
Subject: Comments of Michael Duran

I begin with reference to a 2008 Richards, Watson & Gershon "Tips for Reading an Environmental Impact Report. At page 35 they point out the importance of examining "the 'no Project Alternative"". This seems to be missing from the Draft EIR (DEIR) applicable to the NFL at the Rose Bowl.

1

Given the number of significant and unavoidable results, I reject the view that the drafters come to regarding which Alternative is "environmentally superior". Surely the "no project alternative" is superior. The bias of the drafter seems to have blinded them to this obvious point.

Rather than re state the many fine points already in the record, I incorporate by reference the letter to David Sinclair, by Linda Vista-Anandale Association dated 4/18/12.

2

I wish to add that when my partner and I purchased our home at 721 W. Washington Bl. in May 2009, we knew about the events hosted by the Rose Bowl. We had attended of them before buying our home. Since that purchase attended a number of other events. We have attended professional soccer games, UCLA football games, the Swap Meet, the Pasadena Pops, organized and pick up soccer games. We have used the loop to exercise on a regular basis.

We love living 1/2 mile from the Rose Bowl.

We do not want to have an NFL team displace any of the events now available in the Central Arroyo. We are not willing to live with NFL tailgating and all the harms that will likely stem from this major change.

3

We do not think the poor quality, small numbers and nature of the jobs will outweigh the significant harms the DEIR and the LVAA letter set forth.

Finally, even for a five year period, I oppose any project which violates existing legal standards. These standards, in my view, set a minimal level of protection of the public. I insist that they be maintained.

Michael F. Duran
721 W. Washington Bl.

Letter No. 28: Michael F. Duran

Michael F. Duran
721 Washington Boulevard

Response 28-1

The comment refers to the No Project Alternative. As stated in Section 4.0 Alternative, *State CEQA Guidelines* Section 15126.6(e)(2) requires if the No Project Alternative is identified as environmentally superior, then another environmentally superior alternative shall be identified among the other alternatives. Therefore, although the No Project Alternative would not create any new impacts related to transportation, air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, recreation, and noise, Alternative 2 is selected as the environmentally superior alternative in accordance with CEQA.

Response 28-2

The comment incorporates the letter submitted by the Linda Vista Annandale Association. Refer to the responses to **Letter No. 8**.

Response 28-3

The comment concerns the overall merits of the proposed project. The comment will be included as part of the record and made available to the decision makers prior to a final decision on the proposed project.