

From: [Abajian, Suzie](#)
To: [Golanian, Roubik](#)
Cc: [Garcia, Michael](#); [Calvert, Bradley](#); [Cortes, Karen](#)
Subject: FW: N. Brand and Bike Lanes
Date: Monday, August 12, 2024 11:52:09 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image003.png](#)

Suzie Abajian, Ph.D. | City Clerk | City of Glendale
613 East Broadway, Suite 110 | Glendale, CA | 818-548-2090
sabajian@glendaleca.gov | www.glendaleca.gov | [Follow us!](#)

From: Lisa Yesko <lisayesko@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, August 12, 2024 12:23 AM
To: Asatryan, Elen <EAsatryan@Glendaleca.gov>; Brotman, Daniel <dbrotman@Glendaleca.gov>; Kassakhian, Ardashes <AKassakhian@Glendaleca.gov>; Najarian, Ara <ANajarian@Glendaleca.gov>; Gharpetian, Vartan <VGharpetian@Glendaleca.gov>
Cc: Abajian, Suzie <SAbajian@Glendaleca.gov>
Subject: N. Brand and Bike Lanes

Some people who received this message don't often get email from lisayesko@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email was delivered from the Internet. Do not click links, open attachments, or reply if you are unsure as to the sender.

Dear Mayor and Councilmembers,

I am a bike rider and have been a resident of Glendale for over 45 years.

The lane reduction on N. Brand has introduced an unnecessary traffic problem where none existed and does not benefit anyone, including bike riders, for any significant purpose to justify the cost and the inconvenience that it causes to the majority of Glendale residents.

The three blocks were functional and were considered a luxury to navigate getting my family and myself to doctor appointments and other destinations on Brand Blvd. and throughout the city. Today, navigating N. Brand by car, bike or walking is a chore and an avoidable path if possible, at all costs, for me and my family.

I am appalled at the fact that the concerns over response time and maneuverability expressed by the Battalion Chief at the Glendale Fire Dept. of being hampered by the single lane of traffic has been ignored.

It is an expensive mess, short-sighted and ill-advised on every level. I experienced the before and after of reducing the traffic lanes in Culver City during my time at Sony Studios and dealt with the negative impact of lane reduction in that town. Culver City learned a hard and expensive lesson and

is giving back more traffic lanes due to the fact that the majority of people drive, which is also the case in Glendale.

With the fiasco created on a three block stretch on N. Brand, there is absolutely no way the city-wide bike lane/lane reduction plan should even be considered without much more consideration to the driving population and growing population within Glendale and the fact that not everyone can ride their bikes with their elderly parents on the handlebars to doctor appointments and to grocery stores while also juggling bags of groceries. And a realistic and sensible cost analysis MUST be done first to justify the changes on the city streets.

I am, of course, sympathetic to bike riders and EVERYONE to the fact that we need safer streets. Overall, that solution requires more traffic enforcement, bottom line. Bike lanes are solely never going to guarantee a safe ride on the streets.

Thank you for your consideration.

Best regards,
Lisa

From: [Abajian, Suzie](#)
To: [Golanian, Roubik](#)
Cc: [Garcia, Michael](#); [Calvert, Bradley](#); [Cortes, Karen](#)
Subject: FW: Bicycle Transportation Plan
Date: Monday, August 12, 2024 11:55:26 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image003.png](#)

Suzie Abajian, Ph.D. | City Clerk | City of Glendale
613 East Broadway, Suite 110 | Glendale, CA | 818-548-2090
sabajian@glendaleca.gov | www.glendaleca.gov | [Follow us!](#)

From: Don Anderson <donanderson2001@hotmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, August 10, 2024 5:16 PM
To: Gharpetian, Vartan <VGharpetian@Glendaleca.gov>; Brotman, Daniel <dbrotman@Glendaleca.gov>; Kassakhian, Ardashes <AKassakhian@Glendaleca.gov>; Najarian, Ara <ANajarian@Glendaleca.gov>; Asatryan, Elen <EAsatryan@Glendaleca.gov>
Cc: Abajian, Suzie <SAbajian@Glendaleca.gov>
Subject: Bicycle Transportation Plan

CAUTION: This email was delivered from the Internet. Do not click links, open attachments, or reply if you are unsure as to the sender.

Dear Glendale City Councilmembers:

I understand that the bicycle transportation plan will soon be put to a vote and that there will be no input from the community in the upcoming meeting.

It was clear from the last meeting that there has been no input from the community on bicycle transportation needs during the past year in which this proposal was formulated. The only outreach conducted has been to bicyclist interest groups, partisan politicians, and city workers who are in favor of the project. During the last Council meeting, some Councilmembers also made it clear that Council did not wish to hear public comments on the matter and they sought legal advice in an effort to avoid having to hear comments. This approach does a disservice to the residents of Glendale.

The last Council meeting demonstrated that a substantial majority of Glendale's citizens does not support spending this amount of money on a minority interest that serves a privileged few. The expenditures are clearly exorbitant. So much of the plan was clearly flawed and was not bolstered by any research of support from the community. The proposed barriers and lanes will interfere with traffic, pose a safety hazard to pedestrians and vehicles, and are a blight to our community.

Moreover, the plan does not follow any logic in determining what bicycle pathways to construct, when, where or how.

Clearly, many greater priorities should be addressed by Council. California schools continue to decline and are among the worst in the nation. In the ten years that I have lived in Glendale, I have seen the ranking of Glendale schools decline. Such a decline affects all of us, as it makes our city less desirable. To allocate this outrageous amount of money to the privileged few who might bicycle in Glendale, and who primarily do not live in Glendale, is an affront to those you represent. The proposal will only benefit the bicycle lobby and corrupt politicians who seek their support.

I strongly encourage you to vote against this project. It was not sufficiently publicized to the community, serves very little benefit, and will be undone by future Council. Should you have any legacy to leave Glendale, approving this plan will certainly undo any good you might have advanced. Please use your common sense and vote against this so-called "plan."

Thank you for your attention.

Don Anderson

1811 Niodrara Dr.

From: [Abajian, Suzie](#)
To: [Golanian, Roubik](#)
Cc: [Garcia, Michael](#); [Calvert, Bradley](#); [Cortes, Karen](#)
Subject: FW: Bicycle Plan
Date: Tuesday, August 13, 2024 4:49:05 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image003.png](#)

Suzie Abajian, Ph.D. | City Clerk | City of Glendale
613 East Broadway, Suite 110 | Glendale, CA | 818-548-2090
sabajian@glendaleca.gov | www.glendaleca.gov | [Follow us!](#)

From: Grant Michals <grant@michals.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 13, 2024 3:55 PM
To: Asatryan, Elen <EAsatryan@Glendaleca.gov>; Brotman, Daniel <dbrotman@Glendaleca.gov>; Gharpetian, Vartan <VGharpetian@Glendaleca.gov>; Kassakhian, Ardashes <AKassakhian@Glendaleca.gov>; Najarian, Ara <ANajarian@Glendaleca.gov>
Cc: Abajian, Suzie <SAbajian@Glendaleca.gov>; Adjemian, Aram <AAadjemian@Glendaleca.gov>
Subject: Bicycle Plan

You don't often get email from grant@michals.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email was delivered from the Internet. Do not click links, open attachments, or reply if you are unsure as to the sender.

Mayor and Council Members,

The agenda item for the Bicycle Plan before Council on July 30 was largely unnoticed by the GHCC. Given the discussion, I feel the need to address the issues if only summarily.

I represented the GHCC on that stakeholder group. The last communication I received from the staff and consultant was this spring announcing the last virtual meeting of the group. Neither I or neighborhoods directly received notices as the matter went through the commissions, but we were aware of the process.

The GHCC does not have specific comments as a consensus was not reached on the aspects of the plan. Neighborhoods were encouraged to comment directly. There was disappointment that the nuance of our participation and engagement was not reflected in the final report. Our primary concern was that the plan achieve usable paths of mobility that make useful connections through the city. That has not been achieved in the plan.

The larger issue of outreach is one we have advocated for improvement. Expect us to address specifics in a follow up.

Grant Michals, GHCC president

Sent via the phone