Supplemental Material
Received at the Meetings of
City Council
Redevelopment Agency
Housing Authority
Financing Authority

for

March 20, 2007

Item #13: Animal Care Services Adoption of Ordinance

a. Letter to the City Council from Patricia Wilcox the chair of the Animal Care Services Advisory Committee in support of the ordinance.

Item #18: Central City Two-Way Conversion Study

a. 2/16/07 letter to the City Council from George Chambers describing specific street sections of the project.

b. 8/22/06 letter to the City Council from George Chambers describing specific street sections of the project.

Patricia Wilcox, Chair
City of Sacramento
Animal Services Advisory Committee

March 20, 2007

Mayor Heather Fargo
Members, City Council
City of Sacramento
915 I Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

Re: Ordinances Amending City Code for Animal Care Services - February 27, 2007

Dear Mayor Fargo and City Council Members,

This is to advise that your Animal Services Advisory Committee voted to approve the ordinances amending the city code for animal services at their regularly scheduled meeting of Tuesday, February 27, 2007. The committee voted to approve revisions, additions and fee resolutions.

Thank you for working effectively to decrease animal overpopulation and improve the welfare of animals in the Sacramento area.

Sincerely,

Pat Wilcox

Patricia Wilcox, Chair
Animal Services Advisory Committee

Item #18 - 3/20/07

George Chambers
P.O. Box 162711
Sacramento, Ca. 95816-2711
phone (916) 454-5524

2-16-07

To: [illegible] (council members)

I was pleased to hear that Department of Transportation (DOT) has had the good sense to not [illegible] converting our smooth, gas saving one-way streets on L, P & Q to less efficient two-ways. Now if poor little N street can be saved from this [illegible] two-way conversion fate, all would be well. Plus I have noticed something regarding 19th and 21st streets that needs to be looked at a little more clearly as well:

N Street

The logic remains the same for not converting a street as well as the lettered streets L, P & Q. (See my 8-22-06 correspondence to DOT and delivered to you in October.)

At the 12-14-06 DOT public meeting, the rationale for converting N street was mentioned that it would allow west bound travel directly when exiting the northbound I-80 freeway at N. The flaw there is that few people will elect to plod along your two-way N street to reach downtown. Most would make a right turn somewhere in the high 20's to pick up wonderful one-way L street and make a left on it (two turns). They can already achieve this by simply going straight down 30th street from the freeway offramp and make the left on L directly (one less turn). For the greater good, let's not waste scarce precious funds changing

the signal lights and other things all around on good efficient N street. It's fine the way it is. Save the money on this very controversial street conversion and flawed idea. Save the money.

19th and 21st streets

Very early on, I tended to lend my support to this particular conversion in order to implement bike lanes on the removed third one-way lane, erroneously believing that there weren't north/south bike lanes in that area.

One of the eloquent speakers at the 12-14 DOT meeting made an excellent point; if it went to two lanes, all cars would have to wait for the left or right turning vehicles in front of them who are waiting for the pedestrian traffic to clear before they can turn and the vehicles behind those turning vehicles can proceed onwards. With the three one-way lanes, as we now have, a motorist going some distance on those streets can get in the middle lane, as I usually do, and proceed smoothly until time to get over for the eventual turn.

That got me thinking. After that 12-14 DOT meeting, I went home and looked up the bike lane information in the 1-12-06 conversion study. Lo and behold, we already have north/south bike lanes in the area. On 20th street no less. Right in between 19th and 21st. Table 6-9 on page 6-16 and figure 6-8 on page 6-17 indicate the lanes go from T to E streets on 20th. This table and figure appears to be outdated or inaccurate however, as

an actual inspection recently by me showed the bike lanes now actually going from T to Capitol. But the table and figure also shows there are connecting east/west bike lanes on Capitol and K on which the cyclists can proceed to downtown.

While the bike lanes are wonderful on my lesser traveled P street, we don't want the whole city covered with bike lanes do we? Plus the cyclists will be safer and probably perfer the existing lanes on lightly traveled 20th street.

That leaves the short conversion segments on 3rd, 9th, 10th and J streets which you may have noticed I have been silent on. This is, dare I say, really alternative B, but now with a really long hard look at 19th and 21st streets as well. You would have a better idea of the objections, if any, to these short street conversions. It seems to me that these should actually be the top priority as they are the least controversial and least expensive.

Lastly, I understand some of the proponents of this conversion initiative will request a meeting with some of the council members in a last ditch attempt to gather enough votes to still get portions of the lettered streets converted despite DOT's recommendation of non-conversion. Should you grant these proponents an audience, it is only fair that I and other opponents be granted equal time to rebut that activist/advocate contingency.

Regardless, barring a postponement, I'll be looking forward to speaking before the entire city council on 2-27 and answer any questions you may have of me after my three minute time allotment that night.

Sincerely,

George Chambers

(2)

Item #18 - 3/20/07

George Chambers
P.O. Box 162711
Sacramento, Ca. 95816-2711
phone (916) 454-5524

8-22-06

To:
Department of Transportation
915 I street Room 2000
Sacramento, Ca.
95814-2604

attn: Linda Tucker

Dear Linda,

Thank you so much for providing the Central City Two-Way Conversion Study of 1-12-06. Planning Dynamics Group and associates are to be commended for preparing what appears to be a fair, balanced and unbiased report. Please include me on your "stakeholder/citizenry" notification list on this issue as further open meetings come up, especially when this goes before City Council.

I vehemently oppose the proposed changes to P, Q, L and N streets, especially to P and Q where I live and whose streets I use the most. It is wrong, wrong, wrong!

While the lane reduction and installation of bike lanes on 19th and 21st streets may appear acceptable I'll put a nickle on the table right now that says, down the road, you'll be coming back trying to get those thoroughfares also converted to two way streets using the same flawed logic and reasoning now used for converting P and Q street.

I live at 2711 P street #5. The way P and Q are now is tailor made for me. When going downtown I use P, then turn right on 21st or 16th, then left on L or some similar one way street. It's efficient. Returning, I come back on Q, although recently I have been using poor N street. I then turn from 28th on to one way P and can park on either side of the street, swinging my car door open wide without too much caution thanks to the buffering bike lanes preventing me from opening the door in front of an oncoming vehicle. It is so good the way it is presently set up, a smooth gas saving corridor in both directions from I-80 to I-5.

In fact, the good engineers who made it this way are to be highly commended. They got it just right, a nice smooth efficient passage straight through.

And I'm not noticing speeders in the five months I have lived on P since returning last January after spending seven months in Europe. Plus we have stop signs every few blocks. I've noticed the most noise comes from regular non-speeding motorcycles and the loud mufflers that many seem to have.

Before I begin quoting some items from your very own conversion study, I'd like to ask a question: These stakeholders/citizens who favor this conversion, did they all reside in the central city prior to all these streets being the way they are now? I don't know when our current good one-way thoroughfares were created but your study implies this may go back to the 1950's and '60's (3.2.1) at these.

"supporters" moved in subsequent to the one-way streets, I don't think they have a right to complain since they apparently didn't do their homework very well before buying or renting and moving in. and if they did take note beforehand and came in with the idea of changing things later, you can imagine my sympathy. I knew full well what I was getting into with the one-way traffic before I moved into my current place on P street. I just didn't realize it would be as good as it is.

I'd also like to point out I lived on the corner of P and 21st streets for a couple of months after returning from 4½ months in Asia (Japan on down to New Zealand with all the continental Southeast Asian countries in between). With a loud night bar across the street and the window open, it didn't get much noisier than that. But I knew what I was getting into, and loved it there as well before taking off last May for seven months in Europe and Eastern Europe. Then, upon my return, I see a blurb in the newspaper about this ridiculous proposal. While the public input period passed while I was busy securing and moving into my current apartment, before I go before city council when this does come up for the vote, I would like to recount a number of sections that support my position that I ran across in your ~~very our~~ conversion study as I perused this one inch thick and who knows how many pages and pounds monstrosity:

2.6. The third paragraph reads in part "the additional changes would result in significant

changes to levels of service and congestion at a number of intersections. To avoid unacceptable traffic congestion levels, bike lanes would need to be removed along sections of L, N, P and Q in order to allow turning lanes at impacted intersections." and by that, it means a right turn only lane from this new lane created from the removal of the bike lane and a few parking spaces. The citizens of Sacramento will just love being stuck behind all the left turning vehicles waiting for a gap in traffic before they can now make their left turn. Through traffic can't even swerve around these left turning vehicles on the right because it will be a right turn only lane, not what the through traffic can use.

Page 2-7. Here are the three alternatives available. I will let the higher minds involved select their preference here from A1, AB and AC. I personally would hate to see poor little N street get converted, spending/wasting all that money for a street that works just fine.

3.2.1. History and background — "In the 1950's and 60's, one way streets were implemented in cities across the U.S., including Sacramento, in an attempt to rid downtown of traffic congestion. The relative efficiency of one-way streets in moving traffic served to reduce congestion..." Note this last sentence.

Page 5-13. Second dot (bullet) says it better than I could. One of the sub goals of the central

city Community Plan is to "improve vehicular circulation and reduce traffic congestion..." makes sense to me. Your conversion proposals seem diametrically opposed to this good goal we have now achieved.

6.6 (Page 6-27). The last paragraph eloquently states "Converting one-way traffic to two-way operations would increase the number of conflicting traffic movements at each intersection." Let me repeat the key words in this phrase "... would increase the number of conflicting traffic movements at each intersection."

Page 6-46. The second paragraph states in part "... most of streets that would be converted to two-way operations would have single lane approaches and <u>no separate left turn lanes</u>..." "Left turning vehicles would need to wait for gaps in the opposing traffic stream, and they would often block through and right turning traffic while they wait to turn."

also on page 6-46, last paragraph, second to last sentence reads "at intersections of two-way streets, additional time is required for left turns that conflict with opposing through traffic."

Page 6-47. See chart where left turns block traffic (L, N P + Q) et al.

Page 6-48. First paragraph, second sentence reads "Due to

fewer conflicting traffic movements, one-way streets generally move traffic more efficiently than two-way streets.

Page 6-89. The third paragraph, second sentence again reads "Due to fewer conflicting traffic movements, one-way streets generally move traffic more efficiently than two-way street."

Pages 6-94 to 6-98. Just look at all the humongous LOS (Level of Service) significant reduction on these proposed changes.

Appendices. The good Charles E. Zell letter of 9-16-04 says on page 4, first paragraph "Timing of traffic progression is simple for one-way streets. Timing for progression on two-way streets is more complex and generally results in lower speeds and increased vehicle delay."

The equally well thought out response of 9-17-04 from Cheri Davis states on the last paragraph of page 1 "What does everyone have against one-way streets? as a bicyclist I think that one-way streets are fabulous so long as there is a bike lane and speeds are kept at a reasonable level. Since the two-way conversions of the other downtown streets, I have experienced more near-accidents than I can count, although many of those near-accidents can, I believe, be attributed to the road closures, others are simply because cars are going in multiple directions instead of one direction. (The street closures mean that cars must turn every few blocks, and cars that are turning pose the greatest threat to pedestrians and bicyclists)."

amen. I still do a slow been having to navigate a simple trip to what use to be albertsons down there with all the obstacles put up in that section. and you know how contentious that implementation was.

The powerful 5-21-02 letter by Michael T ault Executive Director of Downtown Sacramento Partnership eloquently states in the second sentence of the second paragraph, refering to J, L, P + Q and North/South 19th and 20th streets "These streets are critical for downtown to function and should not be considered. In any case, council should make no decision for actual conversion without a full traffic study that includes a "do nothing" option."

That would be alternative AA.

Lastly, the earliest letter in file, also in opposition to this proposal is from Mike Courtney, Deputy Director of Real Estate Services Division on 8-7-01. This letter is completly clear and well typed, with the sole exception of the one sentence I wish to quote. Howdel. The reproduction got garbled there and only there. But I was able to decipher what was left and what I wish to quote which reads "as currently comprised, there appears to be an inadequate level of representation for the areas largest employers, business and property owners." Then, back to clarity, it adds "It would also seem important to have the Sacramento Air Quality Management District, the County of Sacramento, and the

+ local government represented. Again, amen.
Somebody has to put a stop to this ridiculous proposal. It should never have gotten this far if it had been thought through a little better right from the start.

And now there is this proposal to spend all that money changing the traffic lights and signs to, let me use the word "impede" traffic flow along these corridors. So don't be getting too carried away with this so called "trend" for, and I use this word loosely, "traffic calming". Most everyone knows how contentious this proposal is. Once these conversions get approved and implemented, the city is going to have some very unhappy citizens and commuters on its hands.

Before closing in my attempt to combat this mind set that seems hell bent on eliminating our beautifully efficient one-way streets under the guise of "traffic calming" (read congestion), I'd like to relate my impression when traveling to all 30 major league baseball parks then in existance in 2004 after selling my residence in Oak Park: after catching a couple games down in Houston, I took in the San Jacinto Battlefield where that wonderful battle cry of "Remember Goliad! Remember the Alamo!" originated. Before that, I had spent a couple days fully touring the grounds of that moving memorial in San Antonio. It was my second pilgrimage there. Upon departing, I was left with a thought: Those days, back in 1836, made their position perfectly clear.

Sincerely,

George Chambers