PUBLIC COMMENTS LETTERS RECEIVED ON
THE KINGS BEACH COMMERCIAL CORE
IMPROVEMENT PROJECT
(JANUARY 2010 GB AGENDA ITEM VII.B)
AS OF JANUARY 19, 2010
Hi Joanne,

I am a homeowner in Kings Beach and I unequivocally support the 3-lane option.

I compiled a paper after doing extensive research on the subject (attached) and actually USED TO support the 4-lane option until I started researching the subject on my own time. I travel a great deal for business and had to research this subject when I could find the time. I am previously on record as supporting the 4-lane option and had numerous emails into Placer County starting back in 2002 stating so. However by educating myself I realize how very wrong I was.

By educating myself I NOW REALIZE that only the 3-lane option can solve the profound economic and social problems that plague Kings Beach. Please see the paper I put together that summarizes my reasoning and research.

Thank you and regards,

Rick Marshall
www.fico.com
Revitalizing Kings Beach

Creating a World-Class Destination Right Here, Right Now.

PREPARED FOR:
Federal, State & County Agencies with Oversight Responsibility for Kings Beach - as well as the Citizens and other Stakeholders of the Region.

PREPARED BY:
Rick Marshall and the residents for a revitalized Kings Beach
1 Roundabouts, Large Sidewalks & Lane Reduction - Why?

1. **Increased Property Values:** Studies have shown that towns that have narrowed dangerous roads through their downtown corridors have dramatically increased their property values. Please see Section 2, 'Revitalizing a Blighted Downtown' as well as the final section of this document titled, 'Case Studies – Seeing is Believing'

2. **Roundabouts Move More Traffic, Save Gas & Increase Safety:** These assertions were not pulled out of thin air; they come directly from the Insurance Institute for Highway Safety (IIHS). The IIHS is wholly supported by member organizations such as Allstate, Farmers, GEIKO, State Farm, etc. so it is fair to stipulate the IIHS is an unbiased source dedicated to the interests of motorists. Please refer to Section 3, 'Roundabouts – Reducing Traffic, Saving Gas & Increasing Safety' for more details.

3. **Quicker Construction Schedule:** Only one construction season will be required in contrast to two seasons for the 4-lane plan. This will minimize environmental and traffic impacts as well as minimize the headaches associated with construction.

4. **Safety:** The current 4-lane configuration has resulted in deaths inside Highway 28 crosswalks. This is because motorists think that the car in front of them is stopping for no reason. When they swerve to go around the 'idiot in front of them' they end up hitting the pedestrian in the cross walk. The Iowa Department of Transportation Office of Traffic Safety funded before and after evaluations of 15 sites that were converted from 4-lanes to 3-lanes, and compared these to 15 control sites. The results of the study proved that crashes involving injuries were reduced by 34%

5. **More Tax Revenues from Higher Sales and Hotel Taxes** - Studies have shown that towns that have narrowed dangerous roads through their downtown corridors have dramatically increased their Tax Revenues. Please see Section 2, 'Revitalizing a Blighted Downtown' as well as the final section of this document titled, 'Case Studies – Seeing is Believing' for evidence of this.

6. **More Stable, Year-Round Jobs:** With the creation of a unique town that supports sidewalk cafes & unique shopping outlets, Kings Beach will become a destination - not a 'freeway through a ghetto' - that tourists want to drive through as quickly as possible. Studies have shown that when downtown corridors offer something unique - motorists park their cars, get out and go to enjoy the community. They tend to spend multiple hours shopping, going to restaurants and visiting local attractions.

7. **Water Quality:** Scientific research has established that roads are one of the primary culprits in fine sediment loading to the Lake which results in clarity loss. The smaller surface area of the three lane design, establishment of roundabouts, and expansion of landscaped areas will reduce the amounts of fine sediments and nutrients entering the lake by decreasing the area needed for sanding, reducing vehicle speeds, and increasing infiltration capacity. Although the EIR states there is no difference between 3 and 4 lanes, pure logic will lead to a different conclusion. With more areas that are permeable, such as the center of the roundabout, it should be obvious to an objective person that water quality will benefit with the 3-lane configuration.

8. **Air Quality:** Roundabouts, bike lanes, and increased side walk areas will improve air quality by reducing dependence on the automobile, as well as produce a walkable and bikeable community safe for families and children. The Insurance Institute for Highway Safety (IIHS) estimated that if just 10 intersections in Northern Virginia were converted to roundabouts 200,000 gallons of gasoline would have been saved. That nets out to 4 million pounds of carbon dioxide that unnecessarily went into the atmosphere. Please refer to Section 3, 'Roundabouts – Reducing Traffic, Saving Gas & Increasing Safety' for more details.

9. **Scenic Beauty:** The 3-lane design will result in a more attractive and unique downtown corridor. A place that tourists will want to come visit, take pictures and send their friends to see.

10. **Cultural & Social Benefits:** Studies show that when towns practice road reduction the residents leave their cars behind to walk through the downtown corridor. Neighbours get to know each other as they pass on the street, rather than from the anonymous confines of their automobiles.
2. Revitalizing a Blighted Town – A Case Study Demonstrating the Value of Lane Reduction and Widening Sidewalks

El Cajon, California

Problem
Suburban development and increased traffic diminished Main Street’s appeal to pedestrians, leading to empty storefronts and a failing historic downtown.

Background
Downtown El Cajon is the historic heart of east San Diego County. It blends unique architecture and character, yet it struggles with a problem affecting the urban core of many American cities: competition from suburban shopping areas. By the 1980s Main Street was lackluster and quiet. When shoppers came, they found many empty storefronts and few reasons to return. El Cajon also lacked a pedestrian-oriented district where people could stroll, shop, and dine. Traffic had increased on the four-lane main street, making the area more of a pass-through place than a destination. (Remarkably similar to Kings Beach – isn’t it?) Main Street’s decline meant lost sales tax revenue for the city.

Solution
In 1971 the Redevelopment Agency was formed. In 1999 El Cajon passed a new implementation plan for a downtown revitalization effort, and has been actively pursuing new projects since. The city approached revitalization with a variety of strategies. One of these has been a "road diet" of East Main Street for a four-block area. This section previously had four travel lanes and on-street parking. The city reduced the street to two travel lanes and added angled parking. This reconfiguration slowed traffic and widened sidewalks to make walking safe and inviting and create public space for outdoor dining, landscaping, street furniture, and bulb-outs at intersections.

Results
Times are better in downtown El Cajon.

- Since 1996,
  - property values have increased by 181 percent compared to 75 percent in the city at large
  - taxable sales in downtown have increased by 66 percent compared to 45 percent in the city at large
  - revenue from the Transient Occupancy Tax (hotel tax) has increased by 36 percent
  - lease rates have increased by 56 percent
  - crime has decreased by 16 percent.
- Since 1998, the private sector has invested $43,175,000 in downtown.
- Since 2001, 179 new businesses have opened and 746 new jobs have been created.
- Today, 91 percent more customers shop and dine in downtown than did in 2002.

As the downtown revitalization effort continues, El Cajon looks forward to a cycle of more investment, more business openings, and more tax revenue. All this will continue to transform downtown El Cajon into a lively pedestrian environment where people work, shop, dine, entertain, and attend cultural events.

Web sites and resources
A fact sheet on "The Economic Benefits of Walkable Communities" is available here:
http://www.lgc.org/freepub/land_use/factsheets/walk_to_money.html
El Cajon Redevelopment Agency's Web site:
http://www.ci.el-cajon.ca.us/dept/redev

Contact
David D. Cooksy
3. Roundabouts - Reducing Traffic, Saving Gas & Increasing Safety

Roundabouts reduce traffic congestion, save gasoline and increase safety for BOTH pedestrians and motorists alike. This conclusion is from the Insurance Institute for Highway Safety which is wholly funded by member organizations such as: Allstate, Auto Club, Chubb, Farmers Insurance, GEICO, GMAC Insurance, Liberty Mutual, Mercury Insurance, Nationwide Insurance, Safeco, State Farm, The Travelers & Zurich Insurance. With this roster of members it is obvious this organization is NOT a group of car haters dedicated to creating gridlock. So when they release a report unequivocally citing the benefits of roundabouts it is worth noting. Their findings for ten (10) signalized intersections in Northern Virginia were:

1. Roundabouts would have reduced vehicle delays by 62 - 74%
2. Annual fuel consumption would have been reduced by more than 200,000 gallons (this equates to 4 million pounds of carbon dioxide)
3. Roundabouts in place of traffic signals could have prevented 62 crashes, 41 with injuries


The September 2005 Study Concluded: “The present study examined ten signalized intersections in Northern Virginia that were newly constructed or recently modified. It was estimated that roundabouts would have reduced vehicle delays by 62-74 percent, depending on intersection, thus eliminating more than 300,000 hours of vehicle delay on an annual basis. Annual fuel consumption would have been reduced by more than 200,000 gallons, with commensurate reductions in vehicle emissions. Based on previous research on crash risk, it is estimated that construction of roundabouts in place of traffic signals could have prevented 62 crashes, 41 with injuries, between 1999 and 2003.” for roundabouts.

A May, 2000 study also by the Insurance Institute for Highway Safety concluded that the study of, “crashes and injuries at 24 intersections before and after construction of roundabouts. The study found a 39 percent overall decrease in crashes and a 76 percent decrease in injury-producing crashes. Collisions involving fatal or incapacitating injuries fell as much as 90 percent.” This study is available for further reference & fact checking at: http://www.iihs.org/sr/pdfs/sr3505.pdf
4. Case Studies – The Best Way to Prove Something Can Be Done, Is to Show – It Has Been Done

Kirkland, WA - Downtown with a Waterfront

Problem
The City of Kirkland recognized that the economic climate of its downtown was fragile and faced many challenges.

Background
Kirkland is the only city east side of Lake Washington with a waterfront downtown. It was an industrial city, called “Pittsburgh of the West.”

Solution
Kirkland created a downtown action team to research the potential for the city’s downtown. The team found several guiding principles for the downtown’s revitalization, including creating a pedestrian-oriented downtown, balancing efficient vehicular circulation with pedestrian access through traffic-calming, and celebrating the waterfront as an asset for the city.

As part of the revitalization project, the city reduced lanes from four traffic lanes to two lanes, one left-turn lane, and bike paths in both directions on its lakefront artery.

Results
Kirkland’s redevelopment helped the local economy more than local officials anticipated. Kirkland budgeted to get about $2.5 million in building permits for both 2005 and 2006; the city took in more than $3.1 million by the end of 2006. The downtown has also enjoyed an extremely low vacancy rate.
Hendersonville, NC -Main Street in a Mountain Town

Problem
Pedestrians in the downtown shopping district had a difficult time crossing a wide street with heavy traffic. The vitality of the downtown shopping district was threatened because of this uncomfortable environment for pedestrians and the addition of new shopping opportunities on the outside of town.

Background
In the mid-1970's, the mountain town of Hendersonville faced a dilemma common to many rural American communities. Strip shopping centers were beginning to locate on the outskirts of town, and there was a concern that a large regional shopping mall would be developed in the future that might lure more shoppers away from downtown businesses. On Main Street, the traditional commercial and social center of the community, 17 businesses had closed their doors and Main Street was declining. At night Main Street became a racetrack, where teenagers would drag race their cars down the wide and straight roadway. During the day the roar of traffic on Main Street endangered pedestrians trying to cross four lanes of traffic and parked cars.

Solution
Lateral shifts in the roadway slowed vehicles traveling on Main Street, making the street safer for pedestrians and giving drivers a chance to see the local businesses. Curb extensions, or "bulb-outs" reduced the crossing distance and the amount of time that pedestrians were exposed to traffic while crossing Main Street. The Main Street Pedestrian environment has been enhanced by street furniture and landscaping.

City Council members, community leaders, and downtown merchants traveled to Grand Junction, Colorado which had successfully revived its downtown using traffic calming and pedestrian-oriented design. Inspired by Grand Junction, the town leaders returned to North Carolina ready to implement some of their own ideas for the rebirth of downtown. In order to provide a competitive shopping environment, the leaders determined that certain improvements and amenities needed to be provided, including slower traffic, easier pedestrian crossings, parking, and beautification.

Located at the junction of several major mountain roads, Hendersonville had plenty of automobile traffic from traveling vacationers. The community wanted to develop Main Street into an environment where travelers would be enticed out of their cars to stroll around comfortably and shop. Main Street was originally designed with a right-of-way in excess of 32 m (100 ft), wide enough for a team of oxen to turn around without backing up. Prior to its redesign, Main Street had two lanes of travel in both directions and parallel parking on both sides of the street. The conversion to a one-way pair of two streets on either side of Main Street reduced the traffic-load on Main Street, gave through travelers a convenient alternative route, and allowed the town leaders to pursue their new vision for downtown.

The improvements to the downtown area were financed by a special tax district requested by the merchants themselves. Main Street was narrowed from four lanes to two. In the middle of each block a quick bend in the street creates a lateral shift of the entire street. The street winds back and forth through a six-block area, with transition blocks at each end. The mid-block curves are formed by curb bulb-outs that open onto marked crosswalks at the peak of each curve. At these points traffic moves slowly and the pedestrian crossing distance is reduced to two lanes.

Each intersection is also marked with crosswalks on all four legs, with curb bulb-outs on the two Main Street legs. The bulb-outs shorten pedestrian crossing distance at intersections, improve pedestrian visibility, force tighter and slower right turns onto Main Street, and reinforce the notion that the driver has entered a traffic calmed area. The entire area has been enhanced with landscaping maintained by contract. Brick planters were installed along the length of street and are filled with spectacular flower displays that change throughout the year. Street trees planted 25 years ago have grown tall and provide a sidewalk canopy and shade for pedestrians.
Results
According to the Executive Director of Downtown Hendersonville, Inc.; the serpentine layout of Main Street offers many aesthetic and safety advantages. The layout slows traffic, making the street safer for pedestrians, and gives drivers a chance to see the local businesses. Vehicles now tend to travel at or near the 32 km/h (20 mi/h) speed limit on Main Street. In addition, the mid-block crosswalks on Main Street are shorter than regular street crossings, making crossing the street safer and more comfortable for pedestrians. The improvements to the six-block section of Main Street were achieved at an initial cost of about $235,000 in 1975 and approximately $72,000 per year for maintenance.

In addition, the pedestrian improvements in downtown Hendersonville have helped Main Street achieve economic success. While the mall has arrived—and has gone through two bankruptcies—downtown Hendersonville has experienced a renaissance. It was named a “Main Street City” by the National Trust for Historic Preservation in 1985, and was entered in the National Register of Historic Places in 1989. Property values increased after the roadway was improved, and many downtown buildings were renovated and restored. There are currently 100 retail businesses downtown, including 14 restaurants, specialty shops, and regionally-oriented anchor stores, and a waiting list exists for Main Street locations. Offices and apartments occupy many of the second floors in two-story buildings, and most buildings have been renovated. New buildings have been built as well. Today, over 25 years later, the stores are all occupied and downtown Hendersonville is alive and bustling with pedestrians and shoppers. Once virtually empty, Main Street now averages 1,750 pedestrians per day.

Contact
Jim Castetter, Executive Director
Downtown Hendersonville, Inc.
401 N. Main Street
P.O. Box 536
Hendersonville, NC 28793
Phone: (828) 697-2022
Fax: (828) 697-2124
E-mail: dhinc99@aol.com
Santa Monica, CA - Third Street Promenade

Problem
A pedestrian mall in downtown Santa Monica had become unsafe and lacked economic activity.

Background
The Third Street Promenade was a commercial district made into a pedestrian mall in the 1960s. Over the years it had become neglected and had fallen into disrepair. By the early 1980s, competition emerged from a new regional shopping center nearby. Twenty years after it was created, the Third Street Mall, or "The Old Mall," as it was known, was unsafe, blighted, and considered an economic disaster. Efforts to restore economic health to the district and the greater "Bayside District" community surrounding it were badly needed.

Solution
The Third Street Promenade was developed in the late 1980s by the City of Santa Monica to revitalize the deteriorated downtown area and create a vibrant center for community life and retail activity. Financed through a citywide bond measure, the Third Street Development Corporation hired architectural firm Roma Design Group to plan the redesign the 25-year-old outdoor Santa Monica Mall. The renamed Third Street Promenade opened on September 16, 1989.

A three-block segment of Third Street was closed to vehicle traffic to enhance the pedestrian experience on the Promenade. Shop owners said that they initially felt that preventing cars from accessing their front doors was destroying their business. As a result, when the project was built, the City constructed a road through the Promenade, but placed removable bollards at the ends of each block. The bollards were put in place the first weekend to test it as a pedestrian mall, and the experiment was so successful that it was eventually closed for good. Now, Third Street competes with local shopping centers by providing a festive pedestrian space protected from auto traffic in the heart of downtown Santa Monica, which is a frequent destination for tourists visiting the Los Angeles area.

The Bayside District Corporation, established by the City to manage the Promenade, is a private/public partnership paid through an assessment on the properties in the Promenade. The District has become an award-winning downtown revitalization project.

The District has more than surpassed the City's original objectives and has become one of the most successful award-winning downtown revitalization projects in the country. Not only has the Third Street Promenade been an economic boost to downtown businesses, its outstanding success has made Santa Monica a major Southern California destination. The Bayside District includes more than 70 restaurants, 17 movie screens in 4 cinemas, and more than 160 specialty shops, services, and entertainment venues open year round.

Local residents and tourists from around the country come to Santa Monica to enjoy the pedestrian experience on the Promenade. Weekend crowds are often very dense with a swarm of pedestrian activity radiating from the Promenade to other downtown establishments, Palisades Park, and the Santa Monica Pier. Parking in various City lots surrounding the Third Street Promenade is plentiful but can be difficult to find during peak hours.
Winter Park, Florida

They stroll leisurely up and down one of Florida's great "Main Streets." They window-shop at The Gap, the Banana Republic or one of the avenue's other high-end retail stores. They lunch at the sidewalk cafes, or cross the street for a walk in the park; perhaps to watch a train pull into the Amtrak station.

On the street itself, a steady stream of traffic creeps along. Motorist patiently search for a gap in the wall of parked automobiles that separate pedestrians from motorists, or they duck into side streets looking for an available space. They want to get out of their SUVs and sedans and join the procession of strollers up and down the avenue; to see or to be seen in fashionable Winter Park.

Winter Park, home of Rollins College, is a green oasis of studied elegance in the middle of the unrelenting concrete and asphalt wasteland of suburban northeast Orlando. Hailed as one of Florida's most "liveable cities," the town long ago discovered that ambiance is a bankable commodity. Winter Park has some of the highest property values in Central Florida, and Park Avenue is surrounded by expensive homes, condos, townhouses and above-store apartments.

Florida's best known and most successful Main Streets - Park Avenue, Miami's Coconut Grove and South Beach, Palm Beach's Worth Avenue and Key West's Duval Street, to name a few - long ago learned the secret to survival in a state that has for half a century blindly embraced suburbanization as the dominant lifestyle: Invest in public infrastructure, pay careful attention to street-scaping and urban trees, adopt design standards that support the village-like character of downtown, and make sure the sidewalks are adequate for people to walk, dine, window shop and congregate.

And above all, get control of the traffic. Traffic is a Main Street killer.

Slow it down by design - with narrow streets, fewer travel lanes, roundabouts, landscaped traffic medians, on-street parking, raised intersections, speed bumps and other "traffic calming" techniques.

In fact, cities all over Florida have begun to "take back" their downtowns in recent years, following successful Main Street models like Winter Park, Coconut Grove and South Beach: From Sarasota to St. Petersburg to New Smyrna Beach to Clearwater to Hollywood, virtually all have adopted a variety of traffic calming policies designed to put automobiles in their place and bring people and investment back to long-neglected city cores.

Here are a few examples of cities that have taken back their downtowns:
Ft. Pierce, Florida

"I grew up here . . . we belong here," says Jim Gately, from behind the counter of his popular sidewalk eatery Gately's Grille at the corner of Orange Avenue and 2nd Street. "People had abandoned downtown for years, and now they're coming back. And they're not blowing by at 35 or 40 mph, either. They're getting out of their cars and spending money."

For three years, Gately has been doing a brisk business in Fort Pierce's newly restored downtown, an area that has taken on the feel and flavor of the Mediterranean village that town fathers had begun to build in the good times of the 1920s - before the Florida land boom went bust.

Fort Pierce is a city of 20 square miles and 37,516 people. Located where Florida's Turnpike meets I-95, it sits at the northern tip of the burgeoning Gold Coast megalopolis. A rather nondescript city of sprawling, unconnected subdivisions, Fort Pierce is also one of South Florida's less affluent coastal communities.

But in 1995, city officials set out to rebuild an urban core that had long ago been dissected by U.S. 1, which funnels 40,000 autos a day through the heart of Fort Pierce. Over the course of dozens of community charrettes and workshops, traffic calming emerged as an important component of revitalization.

To the east of U.S. 1, Orange Avenue, a three-lane, one-way high-speed road running into the heart of downtown, was converted to a two-lane, two-way street. To the west, Delaware Avenue, a once elegant street lined with stately oaks, was reduced from four-lanes to two lanes. Several other downtown corridors were also put on a "road diet." Indian River Drive, a well-traveled road along the lagoon that connects to the beach, was fitted with a traffic circle at the intersection with Avenue A.

The roundabout - with its carved pink stone base and lushly landscaped center - is both an efficient way to move traffic through downtown and a popular "photo opportunity" spot for tourists. This in marked contrast to the ugly metal barrier that once blocked the view of the waterfront at that intersection as motorists backed up in all directions while waiting for the light to change.

"Multiple lanes don't move traffic," says Ramon Trias, Fort Pierce city planner. "All it does it stack traffic. The problem with the old traffic pattern was that it was dysfunctional."

In addition to reconfiguring the roadways, Fort Pierce invested something like $20 million over six years - building a new downtown library and police substation, restoring the 1925 City Hall, and renovating the 1923 Sunrise Theater into a 1,200-seat cultural arts center. An abandoned high school on Delaware Avenue was turned into a magnet school for the arts. Such expenditures in turn generated more than $31 million in additional investments, and the downtown tax base has doubled.

With its red-brick sidewalks and stately palm tree-lined streets, downtown Fort Pierce has a low vacancy rate. And the street narrowings notwithstanding, some 1,500 workers and commuters move through downtown each day, not to mention 150,000 visitors a year.

West Palm Beach, Florida

Just a decade ago, West Palm Beach was an urban jungle at night. Drug dealing and prostitution was the main commerce on historic Clematis Street. Not far away, several blocks of one-time crack houses had been razed, and the property abandoned. In 1993, Clematis Street had a 90 percent vacancy rate and property values running as low as $10 per square foot.

If you visit Clematis Street today, you can ride a free trolly up and down its 4,500-foot length past more than 80 restaurants and retail establishments. Property values have skyrocketed and expensive new residential developments have sprung up around it.
A colorful downtown plaza at its eastern terminus sports an amphitheater and a "dancing" fountain, where delighted children drench themselves under the watchful eyes of a city "fountain guard." On Friday nights, thousands of people gather on the plaza for city-sponsored block parties.

And at the site of the former crack houses has risen City Place, an impressive $550 million mixed-used development of stores and restaurants, a multiplex movie theater and performing arts center, townhouses and rental apartments. City Place has attracted several major chain stores, including a Publix Super Market that, thanks to local design standards, looks like anything but a Publix.

A decade ago, West Palm Beach's ability to finance public improvements was practically nonexistent. So the city went into traffic calming as a reclamation and economic development tool in a big way - aggressively narrowing lanes and redesigning streets to slow down traffic all over the city.

"The city was broke, and its physical environment was dilapidated," senior city planners Tim Stillings and Ian Lockwood have written of West Palm's experience. "West Palm Beach had much larger issues that required immediate attention beyond simply speeding, collisions and cut-through motor vehicle traffic. At the heart of many of its challenges were the negative effects of those vehicles in the city and past treatment of street environments.

"The evolution of traffic calming combined with the use of New Urbanist principles and a host of other initiatives allowed the city to begin its metamorphosis into a 'masterpiece city.'"

Clematis Street, one-way with three travel lanes and two parking lanes, was converted back into a two-lane, two-way street with angle-parking on both sides of the street. City Place was likewise designed and constructed along New Urbanist principles, serviced by two-lane streets and on-street parallel parking. Soon, two other major downtown streets, Dixie Highway and Olive, will also be narrowed in an ongoing traffic-calming effort.

"Once Clematis Street was done, businesses started coming back downtown," says Stillings. "It's not only a better business climate but also a much nicer environment for people."

As a result of the city's revitalization efforts, people are moving back into downtown West Palm Beach. As much as any city in Florida, revitalized West Palm Beach is benefiting from the "empty-nest syndrome" as baby boomers whose children have left home are electing to leave the suburbs to spend their golden years in a more stimulating urban environment.

"The public realm is the connective tissue of our everyday world." Nancy Graham, the former West Palm Beach mayor who led the downtown revitalization effort, once told a reporter: "Human scale must prevail over the needs of motor vehicles."

**Stuart, Florida**

For residents of Stuart, a former railroad town nestled in a tight peninsula on the St. Lucie River, the crises point occurred in 1988. That's when the state Department of Transportation made hurricane evacuation plans that included construction of a new multi-lane bridge across the river, widening U.S. 1 and running it through the heart of this small but viable downtown.

"The DOT is an enormous, rich, self-righteous bureaucracy experienced in getting its way," a little-known architect named Andres Duany told the city in a report that year. "You will have a battle, but it is one that must be fought.

"Remember, DOT in its single-minded pursuit of traffic flow has destroyed more American towns than General Sherman."

Duany went on to become a founder of the New Urbanist movement, and Stuart went on to win its war against DOT. The new bridge was built and U.S. 1 improved, but in a way that bypassed, not gutted,
downtown. Downtown Stuart today is a picturesque village of narrow, interesting, sometimes confusing streets lined with prosperous restaurants, gift shops, art galleries, a restored theater and night spots. It's attraction as a destination is such that it is difficult to find a parking space downtown even on a weekday. And some of the most expensive housing in Martin County is located on the edges of downtown.

"When you think about it, lack of parking is a great problem to have," says Cty Planner Kim DeLaneay. "It means people want to come here."

Stuart's renovations have all been designed to maintain downtown as a "walkable community." Some 21,000 employees work within a two-mile radius of downtown. As many as eight freight trains a day come through the town center, and 8,000 vehicles move through downtown during the evening rush hour.

Traffic is heavy at such times, but not gridlocked at the much celebrated roundabout located where no fewer than six streets and a railroad crossing come together. It somehow manages to keep traffic flowing more or less smoothly. Indeed, watching traffic move around the circle, one has difficulty imagining how the flow of traffic from that many converging streets could even be regulated by traffic signals.

Only one street leading into downtown, Colorado Avenue, is wider than two lanes. It is visibly the least attractive and economically stagnant street in downtown, and the city is making plans to slow down traffic on Colorado in order to stimulate investment and attract people. The anticipation is that revitalizing Colorado will, in turn, help spark reinvestment in some of the less affluent residential streets that intersect it.

**Hollywood, Florida**

The Hollywood of my youth was pretty much a ghost town after dark. During the daytime, too, for that matter. By the time I reached high school pretty much all the commercial action had moved west, out beyond I-95, where an impressive new edifice called the Hollywood Mall had risen.

Downtown Hollywood had begun to dry up and blow away - just as Main Street commercial centers all over America were crumbling in the face of the inexorable march of commerce and people toward the ever-expanding suburbs in the Interstate Age.

Recently, I had the opportunity to go back to Hollywood for the first time in many years. I was astounded to see that downtown Hollywood was booming - almost as though urban evolution had begun to march backward.

It has cafes, restaurants and jazz clubs. It has art galleries and dance studics. It has retail, offices and pricey over-the-store townhouses. An eight-story apartment complex with parking garage is rising just two streets away - the first new downtown housing in decades. A new downtown hotel recently opened its doors on Harrison Street, and the value of apartments in an aging high-rise on the other side of Hollywood Circle have shot up tremendously.

And downtown Hollywood is funky - with buildings painted in a variety of bright colors, and people wandering around in the wee hours of the night. At a sidewalk cafe, a woman in a red dress sang Italian love songs to the accompaniment of a keyboard and base guitar. People sitting on benches in a pocket park that wasn't there before. All very cool.

So how did downtown Hollywood seemingly reverse the course of urban evolution and make that giant leap back into the future?

It put Hollywood Boulevard on a "road diet."

It narrowed the downtown portion of the boulevard to two lanes of traffic, one going each way. It slowed, not stopped, the movement of traffic through the heart of downtown. It made downtown Hollywood safe
once again for pedestrians, shoppers, entertainment-seekers and other living things. And this on a major east-west corridor that handles nearly 21,000 vehicles a day.

Downtown Hollywood, is back - So is "Main Street" Fort Pierce, Stuart, Delray Beach, Fort Lauderdale, West Palm Beach, DeLand, New Smyrna Beach and a few other once-mortlumb central city districts that I recently had occasion to pass through during a five-day, 1,000-mile tour of Florida cities that are on the mend.

Helena, Montana

One example provided was an urban primary highway (US-12) in Helena, Montana. It is a 48-foot-wide, 35-mpg roadway with an ADT of 18,000. The roadway did not have a high collision rate but it did have a high percentage of rear-end and sideswipe accidents. It is located in a commercial area with numerous commercial access points.

Montana State Traffic Engineer Don Dusek proposed restriping the roadway to a three lane facility. Both the city staff and other state staff engineers were apprehensive at first, but after observing the improvement in traffic operations and reduction in accidents they support the conversion. They also have received numerous complimentary remarks from city residents about the conversion.

Don Dusek stated that the "number of accidents decreased, good traffic flow was maintained, and community residents prefer the three lane facility over the former four-lane roadway." The roadway cross section was marked with 5-12-14-12-5 foot lanes which meets AASHTO standards to accommodate bikes along a roadway. However, they do not designate the five-foot lanes as a bike path.

Duluth, Minnesota

In a study conducted for the Minnesota DOT, Howard Preston, BRW Inc., found that the highest urban corridor accident rates were found on four-lane undivided roadways. In fact, the collision rate on four-lane undivided roadways was 35% higher than on urban three-lane roadways (4). The study found three-lane roadways in Minnesota with ADTs as high as 20,000 vpd. Mr. Preston stated he would convert most four-lane undivided urban roadways with ADTs less than 20,000 vpd to three lane facilities "in a heart beat."

A good example of a change in community attitude toward the four- to three-lane conversion is the conversion of 21st Ave. East in Duluth, Minnesota. (ADT is 17,000 vpd.) Prior to the conversion many in the community opposed decreasing the number of traffic lanes. A Duluth News-Tribune article pleaded "Don't limit 21st Ave. East" and "It's not too late to keep it a four-lane street." However, after the conversion, a Duluth News-Tribune staff editorial (5) stated the following:

"Admit it, 21st East Works"

When Duluth officials announced they would convert busy 21st Avenue East between London Road and Woodland Avenue from four lanes to two, with a turn lane in the middle, some armchair analysts predicted it wouldn't work. The News-Tribune Opinion page was among them. Well, it works. About everyone agrees—from city traffic officials to neighbors—that the change has eased congestion and reduced drivers' speed making it safer for pedestrians, and it hasn't caused problems in winter. Traffic moves steadily up and down the hill even though the volume is up. Cutting available traffic lanes by 50 percent on the already heavily used stretch carrying vehicles between the I-35 exit at 21st Avenue East at London Road and the Hunders Park and Woodland neighborhoods did not seem like a good prospect when it was done last May. Initiated at the end of the academic year, many believed that, when the University of Minnesota–Duluth and St. Scholastica resumed classes in the fall, the thoroughfare wouldn't be able to handle the traffic. And winter . . . well, it would be a disaster, we doomsayers predicted. None of it happened. Now the city is planning to repaint the lanes and keep the pattern on 21st indefinitely—as well it should.
Bridgeport Way, University Place, Washington

Ben Yazici, P.E. took on the redevelopment of Bridgeport Way, a former five-lane suburban style roadway, as a central spine for a new downtown for his community of University Place. The roadway had a poor safety record, and it was experiencing significant delays in traffic. Walking and bicycling were treacherous. The highway offered no sense of place. Orchestrating a successful downtown along and adjacent to this roadway would not be easy. Using a highly interactive set of public visioning activities, known as a charrette, Ben, the city manager and newly elected officials were able to gain consensus to rebuild this street as a four-lane, median divided road with bike lanes, sidewalks, planter strips and tree canopy.

Resistance. Within weeks of the announced vision, a small, talented resistance group formed, bringing out 200-400 people at a time to oppose the project. At stake was whether this new group could force the city council out of office over the Bridgeport Way issue. Ben and the town leaders worked extended hours, days and nights for the next six months to design and ready a parallel street (Grandview Avenue) for construction. Their mission was to prove that sidewalks, bike lanes, medians, and even roundabouts would prove popular in the new corridor. The Grandview Avenue project was completed under budget, under deadline, and opened four weeks before the election. The result: residents loved the new treatments and overwhelmingly voted the incumbents back into office. In just two years Ben and his staff orchestrated the funding, design, construction and completion of this first model portion, plus two additional segments of Bridgeport Way, three added projects on Grandview Avenue, including five more roundabouts, 17 and two road diets in other areas of town. This is an amazing feat considering that the town of 30,000 had just been incorporated two years earlier and had no reliable external source for transportation funding. They had to prove their expertise to many. From a town that had a meager yearly budget of $450,000, they anchored over $30 million in committed state and regional funds.

Ben Yazici, P.E. and other University Place, Washington officials endured public fear and ridicule to build the converted section of Bridgeport Way. The median divided road, complete with bike lanes and sidewalks has reduced crashes 50%, increased roadway efficiency and achieved an aesthetic, people focused place for a new downtown. Today the town is celebrated in the local and statewide press After conditions, improved traffic flow, crashes cut by 50%.

Hillsborough Street, Raleigh, North Carolina

Nina Szlosberg, citizen activist, served as the leader of rebuilding this town and gown connection street. Hillsborough Street, one of the state’s oldest, most historic roads, had become highly unsafe (second most dangerous pedestrian street in the state), ugly and dysfunctional. The intersections and corridor struggled to move peak hour traffic in four lanes. A small group of neighborhood and street stakeholders banded together under Nina’s leadership in 1999 to rebuild Hillsborough Street into an attractive public space. They teamed and partnered with North Carolina State University, City of Raleigh, North Carolina DOT, area neighborhoods and other stakeholders. A five-day public process (charrette) was held, and a strong working vision for a 2-lane corridor, medians, turning pockets, bike lanes and roundabouts emerged. The vision resulted in a highly energized team of both local and state implementers. The activities sparked fresh enthusiasm in the city engineer, as well as key planning and community development people. Further action brought more advanced leadership in the North Carolina DOT, and in the state legislature. Today there is an active Smart Growth committee in the state legislature working to improve towns throughout the state. The group found funds from the state legislature, city council and through a number of other sources. A contract has been let for the design and construction of the new corridor. Once built, their corridor will have numerous crossing points for pedestrians and manage intersection traffic at roundabouts with speeds of 18-20 mph. The street modifications have returned civil behavior, attractiveness and new public and private investment to the North Carolina town.
Lewistown, Pennsylvania

In the 1980s Pennsylvania DOT engineers used FHWA safety monies to fully fund a study and to convert a one-mile section of Electric Avenue in Lewistown, Pennsylvania, from four lanes to three.

The roadway was carrying 13,000 ADT. After reviewing hours of time-lapse video and analyzing crash statistics and other data, the team concluded that more uniform flow, reduced conflicts and great reduction in crashes would result from four to three-lane conversion. The change was made facing 95% opposition from local residents, who felt that their trip times would increase. Once the new roadway section was completed, new time-lapse photography and data collection began. Dangerous maneuvers and crashes dropped to nearly zero. Overall trip times were unaffected. Today nearly 95% of those fearing the change are openly thankful to PennDOT for making the roadway better for safety, mobility and access.

Orlando, Florida – Edgewater Drive

4-lane to 3 lane conversion with 20,500 vehicles per day. There was 68% reduction in injuries. 41 per year to 12 per year. 34% reduction in crash rates. From 146 accidents per year to 87 accidents per year.

Number of Pedestrians using Edgewater Drive per day rose 23%. From a daily total of 2,136 to 2,632. The number of cyclists using Edgewater drive rose 30% from 375 per day to 486 per day. The economic benefits of this conversion were attributable to the fact that people got out of their cars and spent more on shopping and dining. More information on this case study will be provided soon.

Anchorage, Alaska & Seattle, Washington

Definition

A lane reduction (also known as a “road diet” or “4-lane to 3-lane conversion”) changes the configuration of an existing 4-lane road by reallocating the available street right of way. The final configuration is a through-lane in each direction with a center turn lane. The area the fourth lane occupied becomes a sidewalk, bike lane, on-street parking or provides space for area beautification.

Discussion

Three-lane roads function similarly to 4-lane roads, carry the same amount of traffic, and are safer. Take a minute and think about your driving experience along a 4-lane road. The inside lanes of 4-lane roads in business districts are frequently blocked with cars or trucks waiting to turn left. Motorists weave from lane to lane to avoid them, creating a dangerous situation that causes people to get sideswiped and rear-ended. Folks entering a 4-lane road from a side street are often t-boned because some nice person leaves them a gap with visibility blocked by the stopped traffic. If you are a pedestrian, you have a similar problem. Motorists often can’t see you because a vehicle in the other lane might block their vision. Crash statistics reveal these to be real problems that have caused property damage and injury on Spenard Road for a long time in Anchorage, Alaska.

From experience in other cities, the change to a 3-lane road can reduce the speed limit on the road, which in turn may reduce the number and severity of vehicle-to-vehicle crashes. Pedestrians benefit because they have fewer traffic lanes to cross and because vehicle speeds are lower.


Seattle has a lot to show us about business impacts—businesses are requesting lane reductions.
According to a fall 2006 conversation with Pete Lagerwey in the Seattle Department of Transportation, Seattle has completed 18 lane reduction projects and has three more in the works. Seattle businesses go to the City and say they want a safer, more pedestrian friendly street. Experience has shown them that customers want the slower traffic, easier left and right turning and pedestrian access the lane reductions create. They find that slower, safer traffic means people have time to notice businesses and their window displays. Anchorage 2020 Comprehensive Plan goals envision a walkable community. To reach the Anchorage 2020 goals, we need more streets that are safe for pedestrians, people with disabilities, bicyclists, and cars to navigate.

Cambridge, Massachusetts

A portion of Massachusetts Avenue, the main drag of Cambridge, MA (also a state numbered route) was redesigned, going from 4 lanes to 3, allowing not only bicycle lanes but also wider sidewalks and maintaining parking. ADT is approx. 21,000. There are a couple of turning lanes. The project has been considered to be extremely successful.

Contact: Cara Seideman
City of Cambridge, MA

Boulder, Colorado

After significant public process, the City of Boulder removed a traffic lane to add a bike lane on Table Mesa Drive. This is working great and has been viewed as a resounding success despite initial public opposition.

Contact: Randall Rutsch
Transportation Planner
City of Boulder, CO

Salem, Oregon

The city of Salem, Oregon reconfigured 4 lanes to two lanes plus center turn lane and bike lanes on 17th Street.

Contact: Michael Moule
Oregon Department of Transportation
Bend, Oregon
(541) 388-6216
michael.m.moule@state.or.us
http://www.odot.state.or.us/techserv/bikewalk/index.htm

Portland & Corvallis

The cities of Corvallis and Portland removed a travel lane from one-way couplets that had 4 lanes in each direction (they now have 3). On top of bike lanes, motorists benefit from the reduced need to weave (getting from one side to the other in anticipation of having to turn left or right), and pedestrians benefit from easier crossing (Portland reduced pavement width and widened sidewalks and built curb extensions at sidewalks). ODOT bicycle and pedestrian program was instrumental in preventing a couplet project from going to four lanes in one direction, and keeping at 3 (Albany).
Greater Vancouver, British Columbia

In the Greater Vancouver Region, two municipalities have removed a traffic lane for bikes. The City of Surrey along their East Whalley Ring Road and the City of Richmond along Williams Road. In both instances, four lanes of traffic (two in each direction) were reduced to three lanes to provide bike lanes. The third middle lane functions as a left turn lane for both directions of traffic. If you would like more details about this success story please contact, Doug Louie, P.Eng. City of Vancouver.
Since traffic calming is a new concept, members of the public are often wary of change. Typically, voiced opposition can effectively stop a traffic calming project in its tracks. Small business owners are often the most vocal opponents of traffic calming projects because of fear of lost revenue from changes to the streetscape. Small business support can be a significant factor in whether a traffic calming project is abandoned or approved.

Research suggests that traffic calming projects can actually improve business conditions and raise revenues for small businesses (Lockwood, 1998). In fact, business owners in areas that have previously received traffic calming measures can become some of the most vocal champions of this work. However, business owners in areas being studied for traffic calming are often not aware of how well these measures have worked for their counterparts across town and in other jurisdictions. If transportation engineers, city planners, and advocates were able to provide more effective outreach campaigns and tools for small businesses (including empirical data showing how traffic calming measures have improved small business conditions), traffic calming projects might be approved with fewer impediments, lower costs, and with more community support. The following arguments are in favor of traffic calming from the perspective of a small business owner in an urban area:

1. **Economic Revitalization and Property Values** — Traffic calming can increase residential and commercial property values, which attracts wealthier residents to the area and can increase retail sales and bring economic revitalization to a commercial corridor.

2. **Livability and Safety** — Traffic calming creates more attractive environments, reduces auto speed, and increases safety for pedestrians, bicyclists, drivers, and other users of the street, which is good for business.

3. **Sales and Attracting Customers** — Traffic calming encourages local residents to buy in their own neighborhoods, and also attracts customers from a wider area due to reduced travel time, hassle, and cost. Traffic calming can also help people live less car-dependent lifestyles, which will increase the amount of discretionary income they can spend on things other than transportation.

4. **Construction and Costs** — Traffic calming projects often require only minimal “down time” for construction, and most do not require any investment from business owners.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roadway Section</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>ADT (Before)</th>
<th>ADT (After)</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Lake Washington Blvd., Kirkland, Washington South of 83</td>
<td>4 lanes to 2 + TWLTL + bike lanes</td>
<td>23,000</td>
<td>25,913</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Lake Washington Blvd., Kirkland, Washington Near downtown</td>
<td>4 lanes to 2+ TWLTL + bike lanes</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>12,610</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Electric Avenue, Lewistown, Pennsylvania</td>
<td>4 lanes to 2 + TWLTL + bike lanes</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>14,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Burcham Road, East Lansing, Michigan</td>
<td>4 lanes to 2 + TWLTL + bike lanes</td>
<td>11-14,000</td>
<td>11-14,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Grand River Boulevard, East Lansing, Michigan</td>
<td>4 lanes to 2 + TWLTL + bike lanes</td>
<td>23,000</td>
<td>23,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. St. George Street, Toronto, Ontario, Canada</td>
<td>4 lanes to 2 + bike lanes + wide sidewalks</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. 120th Avenue, NE Bellevue, Washington</td>
<td>4 lanes to 2 + TWLTL</td>
<td>16,900</td>
<td>16,900</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Montuna (commercial street) Bellevue, Washington</td>
<td>4 lanes to 2 lanes + TWLTL</td>
<td>18,500</td>
<td>18,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Main Street Santa Monica, California</td>
<td>4 lanes to 2 lanes + TWLTL</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadway Section</td>
<td>Change and Date</td>
<td>ADT (Before)</td>
<td>ADT (After)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Dunforth</td>
<td>4 lanes to 2 + bike lanes</td>
<td>22,000</td>
<td>22,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toronto, Ontario, Canada</td>
<td>4 lanes to 2 + turning pockets + bike lanes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle, Washington</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Greenwood Avenue</td>
<td>4 lanes to 2, plus TWLTL Plus Bike lanes</td>
<td>11,872</td>
<td>11,2427</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. from N. 80th St to N 50th</td>
<td>April, 1995</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallingford Area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle, Washington</td>
<td>4 lanes to 2 lanes</td>
<td>19,421</td>
<td>20,274</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N 45th Street</td>
<td>plus TWLTL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December, 1972</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballard Area</td>
<td>4 lanes to 2 lanes</td>
<td>10,549</td>
<td>11,858</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle, Washington</td>
<td>plus planted median with turn pockets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January, 1994</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Martin Luther King Jr. Way.</td>
<td>4 lanes to 2 lanes</td>
<td>12,336</td>
<td>13,161</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>north of I-90</td>
<td>plus TWLTL, plus bike lanes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 1994</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Dexter Avenue, N.</td>
<td>4 lanes to 2 lanes</td>
<td>13,606</td>
<td>14,949</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East side of Queen Anne Area</td>
<td>plus TWLTL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. 24th Ave. NW.</td>
<td>4 lanes to 2 lanes</td>
<td>9,727</td>
<td>9,754</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from NW 85th St. to NW 65th St.</td>
<td>plus TWLTL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Madison St., from 7th Ave. to Broadway</td>
<td></td>
<td>16,969</td>
<td>18,075</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. W. Government Way/Gilman Ave.</td>
<td>4 lanes to 2 lanes</td>
<td>12,916</td>
<td>14,286</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W., from W Ruffner St. to 31st Ave. W.</td>
<td>plus TWLTL, plus bike lanes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1. Study sites and crashes used in the analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CITY</th>
<th>NUMBER OF SITES</th>
<th>NUMBER OF CRASHES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Road Diet</td>
<td>Comparison*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellevue, WA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain View, CA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland, CA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco, CA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle, WA</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunnyvale, CA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Each road diet had one or more comparison sites.

What are some Examples of Successful Road Conversions?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Road</th>
<th>ADT: Before</th>
<th>ADT: After</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Leandro, CA</td>
<td>East 14th Street</td>
<td>17,700</td>
<td>16,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duluth, MN</td>
<td>21st Ave. East</td>
<td>17,000</td>
<td>17,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramsey County, MN</td>
<td>Rice Street</td>
<td>16,700</td>
<td>16,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toronto, Canada</td>
<td>St. George Street</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirkland, WA</td>
<td>Lake Washington Blvd</td>
<td>23,000</td>
<td>25,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle, WA</td>
<td>North 45th Street</td>
<td>19,400</td>
<td>20,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covington, WA</td>
<td>SR 516</td>
<td>29,900</td>
<td>32,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellevue, WA</td>
<td>Montana Street</td>
<td>18,500</td>
<td>18,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Lansing, MI</td>
<td>Grand River Blvd.</td>
<td>23,000</td>
<td>23,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Monica, CA</td>
<td>Main Street</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>18,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helena, MT</td>
<td>US 12</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>18,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco, CA</td>
<td>Valencia Street</td>
<td>22,200</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland, CA</td>
<td>High Street</td>
<td>22,000</td>
<td>24,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orlando, FL</td>
<td>Edgewater Drive</td>
<td>20,500</td>
<td>21,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle, WA</td>
<td>Madison Street</td>
<td>17,000</td>
<td>18,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reno, NV</td>
<td>South Wells Ave</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>17,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Place, WA</td>
<td>67th Ave</td>
<td>17,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Place, WA</td>
<td>Cirque Ave</td>
<td>16,900</td>
<td>14,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Lansing, MI</td>
<td>West Grand River Ave</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>18,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Lansing, MI</td>
<td>Abbott Road</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>21,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) report Safety Effects of Marked vs. Unmarked Crosswalks at Uncontrolled Locations found that pedestrian crash risk was reduced when pedestrians crossed two- and three-lane roads, compared to roads with four or more lanes.(3)

The Iowa DOT- Office of Traffic Safety funded before and after evaluations of 15 sites that were converted from four lanes to three lanes, and compared these to 15 control sites, using annual crash data trends. The results of the study indicated were reduced by 34%. Source: Safety Impacts of “Road Diets” in Iowa (Stout, Thomas B., et al, 2005)
January 17, 2010

Members of the TRPA board,

Wanted to check-in with each of you as we approach the January 27 board meeting. I truly feel the decisions made there on the DOMUS affordable housing project and the KBCCIP, will determine the future of Kings Beach over the next generations. We are the oldest town on the Lake because it is arguably the best place to live. The residents of our town and the entire Tahoe-Truckee region deserve the revitalization of Kings Beach and your approvals of these projects will be the first step.

There are some in town that are making noise about environmental and social justice for the Latino residents of our town. I have been involved in supporting this community for nearly 20 years since co-founding the first Latino advocacy group in the region. In 1988, in a story I seldom talk about, I brought the Nicaraguan family, (mother and 4 kids) that I lived with when I studied Spanish in Nicaragua to live in King Beach. The children grew up in a mobile home in Kings Beach that had belonged to the first permanent Mexican family to settle in this town over 40 years ago. I traded work I had done for them for a down payment on the best-maintained trailer in town. This Mexican family remains amongst my very best friends today and I am a business partner with the two sons. I only say this to further demonstrate my commitment, knowledge and connection to our local Latino community. Recently, I have taken time to speak to many of them, and being the most prolific walkers in town and the biggest users of low-income housing, they are very much in favor of both projects including the KBCCIP with the "glorietas" (roundabouts). I also wonder where the opposition group, bringing up these issues at the last minute, has been for the last 20 years in helping to meet the challenges of these residents?

As some of you know, I currently sit on the Sierra Community College board. On February 2, we will be finalizing a plan to cut nearly $9 million dollars from our budget leading to the loss of some great instructors and also reducing the number of students we will be able to serve. The meeting is expected to be so large, that we will meet in the theatre. I know what it is like to make difficult decisions and I will respect whatever decision you make on the 27th. However, at Sierra College, we have done the research, planning and outreach for what needs to be done and the same is even truer for the plans for Kings Beach.

I thank all of you and the TRPA staff for the time and effort put in on these projects.

See you on the 27th and stay safe in the approaching storm.

Dave Ferrari
January 19th, 2010

Jerry Dinzes
Lake Tahoe Citizens' Media Group

RE: Valid Concerns, Position Papers, and Key Documents Relating To The Kings Beach Commercial Core Improvement Project

Dear TRPA Governing Board,

In the mounds of documents associated with the KBCCIP it is a difficult and time-consuming task for the most intellectual of minds to sift through. This document has been put together to introduce you to the content that has led us to our belief that an enhanced and improved four-lane option is the only acceptable course of action for highway improvement in Kings Beach. The following document is intended for the Board Packet on January 27th.

**Position Papers From Key Agencies**

The concerns expressed by emergency response agencies underscore the degradation that comes with reducing highway capacity. As SR 28 through Kings Beach is arguably the primary mass evacuation and emergency response route for North Lake Tahoe, staunch opposition to lane reduction has been drawn by the California Highway Patrol, the Washoe County Sheriff, and the Placer County Sheriff. While not selecting a preferred alternative, the North Lake Tahoe Fire Protection District has warned that the congesting of SR 28 would endanger North Tahoe residents and visitors.

Caltrans has also identified the improved four-lane alternative as superior, comments that are resonated by Senator Dave Cox. Kings Beach's representative in the California State Senate, Senator Cox, has expressed his opposition of reducing capacity of SR 28 and creating congestion. Each year California dedicates enormous sums of money to relieve our State's congestion issues.

**Gordon Shaw and LSC Transportation's Traffic Report**

Acquired in a Freedom of Information Act Request was a letter from Gordon Shaw stating that degradation to the neighborhood was unjustifiable by the safety gains on the highway of the improved three-lane option over the improved four lane option. Shaw states that nothing short of a 'full-scale' sidewalk program would reduce the impact of 'cut-through' traffic into the neighborhood. A 1.3 million dollar NTMP is not a full-scale sidewalk program.
In the Traffic Report prepared by Gordon Shaw and LSC Transportation and attached in the appendix of the final environmental document, Shaw references the extent of traffic that would occur under 2008 conditions if lane reduction occurs. Shaw claims that the project will result in 40 summer hours of LOS F. If the independently contracted roundabout analysis by Scott Ritchie (RTE) is superior to Shaw's analysis, then the hours of LOS F would be considerably greater than the attached forecast (attachment 7).

**LULAC Complaint**

Due to the diversion of commuter traffic into a residential neighborhood, the League of United Latino American Citizens has filed complaints with all major agencies, including the TRPA. An environmental justice issue arises when a project has adverse and significant impacts upon a disproportionately high minority or low-income neighborhood. It is important to point out that section 3.6 of the EIS claims that diverted traffic is an adverse and significant impact that can not be avoided by the proposed neighborhood traffic management plan (NTMP). Oddly, section 3.3 of the EIS claims there is no environmental justice issue. The EIS does not assume that the diverted traffic is not an adverse and significant impact, but that the affected Kings Beach neighborhood is not disproportionately Latino. This is blatantly false, and such assertions bring into question the validity of the EIS.

Thank you for your consideration of these issues,

Jerry Dinzes

**Attachments**

1. Caltrans' Position Paper
2. Washoe Sheriff's Position Paper
3. California Highway Patrol's Position Paper
4. North Lake Tahoe Fire Protection District's Letter of Concern
5. Senator Dave Cox's Letter Position Paper
6. Email From Gordon Shaw on Neighborhood Safety
7. Excerpt From Gordon Shaw's LSC Traffic Report on LOS
8. LULAC Administrative Complaint To Caltrans
October 2, 2007

Mr. Bruce Kranz, Chair
Board of Supervisors
Placer County
175 Fulweiler Avenue
Auburn, CA 95603

Dear Mr. Kranz:

Subject: Kings Beach Commercial Core Improvement Project

This letter is a follow-up to our telephone conversation on September 28, 2007, regarding the evaluation of alternatives for the Kings Beach Commercial Core Improvement Project on State Route 28 in Placer County. At this time, our Environmental Planning staff is reviewing the Draft Environmental Document public comments and responses. This review should be completed by mid-November, and we will submit our comments on the responses and the results of our NEPA Delegation review to the County at that time.

Caltrans will not make a determination as to which project alternative the County should select. The County will have the final decision of alternative selection. However, after careful review of the project studies, we have determined that Alternative 2 (three lanes with roundabouts and seasonal on-street parking allowed) would not be acceptable. Therefore, we will accept either Alternative 3 (four lanes with traffic signals) or Alternative 4 (three lanes with roundabouts and no on-street parking allowed) for Project Approval.

We have carefully reviewed the Traffic Operations studies for this project, and we believe that Alternative 3 is the superior alternative. This alternative minimizes congestion and delays during peak periods and improves pedestrian safety at Bear Street with the installation of a new signal.

Alternative 4 has serious traffic impacts that the County should clearly understand when making their decision. These impacts, including substantial traffic delays during peak periods and increased “cut through” traffic on the residential streets, will ultimately be the County’s responsibility to address. We would strongly recommend traffic calming

"Caltrans improves mobility across California"
Mr. Bruce Kranz, Chair  
Board of Supervisors  
October 2, 2007  
Page 2

and additional safety measures on the local streets if Alternative 4 were selected. We encourage the Board of Supervisors to carefully consider these issues when selecting an alternative.

If you have any further questions, feel free to contact me at (530) 741-4233. We look forward to working with the County to make this a successful transportation project.

Sincerely,

Original signed by

JODY JONES  
District Director

c: Ken Greinhm, Director of Public Works, Placer County  
Tom Miller, Placer County Executive Officer  
John Singlaub, Executive Director, TRPA

bc: Rebecca Mowry, Program/Project Management (VO)  
Gary Sidhu, D-3 SFP  
Shelly Chernicki, D-3 PIO  
D-3 Exec. Office

Rebecca Mowry/Jody Jones:en

(Bruce Kranz Ltr re Kings Beach 100207)
August 4, 2008

Placer County Board of Supervisors
175 Fulweiler Avenue
Auburn, California 95603

Dear Board of Supervisors:

I would like to voice an area of concern regarding the pending Kings Beach Commercial Core Improvement Project. I want to make it clear that we support economic development in North Lake Tahoe, as it is universally beneficial to the community at-large. Our focus is strictly limited to maintaining our ability to provide the same or better levels of public safety services to all our citizens and visitors in the Incline Village/Crystal Bay area.

Enclosed you will find a position paper and memorandum that briefly outline the concerns that we have regarding the proposed changes to State Route 28 in the Kings Beach area. No where else can you find a community like the Lake Tahoe Basin where both California and Nevada share the same issues and concerns. We look forward to an opportunity to meet and discuss strategies that will mitigate the anticipated challenges and provide solutions that are both economically beneficial and support public safety.

Captain Steve Kelly from Incline Patrol will be contacting you shortly to arrange a meeting at your earliest convenience. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL HALEY, SHERIFF

Enclosures (2)
MH/sk/tc

cc: Mr. F.C. Rocky" Rockholm
    Mr. Robert Weygandt
    Mr. Jim Holmes
    Mr. Kirk Uhler
    Mr. Bruce Kranz
    Mr. Thomas Miller
    Assistant Sheriff Marshall Emerson
    Mr. John Singlaub, Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
POSITION PAPER

KINGS BEACH COMMERCIAL CORE IMPROVEMENT PROJECT
(S/R 28 ROAD NARROWING)

The above proposed project is designed to change the traffic patterns on State Route 28 in Kings Beach California to achieve the following, lower traffic speeds, improved traffic safety, increased pedestrian access, and develop a more viable economic environment.

Information Source
A report was prepared for the Placer County Department of Public Works, The Tahoe Regional Planning Agency, California Department of Transportation, and U.S. Department of Transportation Federal Highway Administration by the firm of Jones and Stokes. The primary focus of the report is for environmental impact and directed to the above agencies.

Project Description
The proposed project encompasses S/R 28 in Kings Beach from Chipmunk St. to S/R 267. Chapter 3, section 6 discusses the impact to traffic. The scope of the report discusses 4 alternatives for the traffic flow. Alternative 1, proposes no change to the current traffic plan. Alternative 2 proposes reducing the roadway from a 4 lane to a 3 lane, with the middle lane being a turn lane. Alternative 3 leaves the roadway a 4 lane, but adds turn lanes at the appropriate intersections and provides for a bike lane and sidewalk. Alternative 4 again proposes a three lane roadway, but would prohibit parking on the roadway and provide for a wider sidewalk.

Concerns
The concern is for the proposed 3 lane alternatives (2 or 4), either of which would (according to the report) result in traffic queuing for westbound traffic during the summer months. It is projected that for 2008 westbound traffic would result in “absolute roadway capacity would be exceeded during 15 hours over the course of the summer. These hours would occur over 5 individual days, and up to 6 hours of traffic queues would occur on an individual day.” The report goes on to further predict for 2028 that the road capacity would be further exceeded during the summer months for 104 days with up to 11 hours of traffic queuing on a single day (page 3.6-17).

Summary
Clearly the above projections are undesirable for the following reasons: a majority of the westbound traffic that enters the project area at Chipmunk St. originates in Nevada. Therefore if the traffic is in queue on S/R 28 in Kings Beach, it will more than likely do the same on S/R 28 in Crystal Bay and on many days back up all of the way to Lakeshore Drive in Incline Village. This will slow or even prevent a timely emergency response to any priority call for service in the affected area. The inability to be able to serve our citizens in a timely manner is an unacceptable
consequence of this proposed project. If there is to be further discussion of this alternative, an expanded study of the impact on traffic flows to the Incline Village/ Crystal Bay area should be required to assure that a positive action for one area does not result in a negative for another. See attached memo from Sgt. Gross for a more detailed traffic analysis.

Prepared by Capt. S. Kelly

References

KINGS BEACH COMMERCIAL CORE IMPROVEMENT PROJECT report prepared by Jones and Stokes found at the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency website. The website is found at: http://www.trpa.org/, the above report is found at: http://www.trpa.org/default.aspx?tabindex=0&tabid=316
Retrieved on (7-15-08)
July 22, 2008

TO: Captain Steven Kelly
    Incline Village Patrol Division

FROM: Sergeant Michael Gross
      Traffic Unit

SUBJECT: Kings Beach Traffic Proposal

I have reviewed the TRPA proposal to change the number of traffic lanes on SR 28 in Kings Beach from four lanes to three and have determined the following:

Initially, this proposal seems intended to better serve the businesses that front SR 28 as it would create more of a shopper friendly/pedestrian friendly atmosphere. The reduction of traffic lanes would cause a major increase in the traffic backup into the Crystal Bay and Incline Village areas.

Based on the traffic data provided in the TRPA report, the peak hourly traffic on SR 28, east of SR 267 is 2,050 vehicles. Taking this into account and estimating that half of those vehicles are traveling westbound, that would equal a peak westbound flow of 1,025 cars an hour.

The TRPA report also states that the current traffic controlled intersections in Kings Beach have an average level of service (LOS) of D, E or F (poor, bad or failing). This would logically be multiplied two-fold if there is only one lane of traffic.

When the above factors are considered, the initial conclusion is that traffic would back up twice as far as it currently does. Based on the average length of a vehicle and the appropriate spacing between vehicles when stopped, the traffic back-up could extend as far as 4.8 miles during peak hours. The distance from Incline Village to Kings Beach is 4.5 miles.

This translates to a constant stream of vehicles, occupying one lane of traffic, from east of Crystal Bay to Kings Beach. This factor would create an additional burden on the traffic controlled intersection in Crystal Bay. This intersection is primarily controlled for pedestrian traffic. Additional delays and risks to pedestrians would be created by the additional traffic backlog.

Emergency vehicle response from Incline Village to Crystal Bay would be extremely difficult as the traffic back-up would create no travel lane for these emergency vehicles. In the worst case scenarios, emergency response could be delayed by as much as 15 minutes, based on the light signaling in Kings Beach.
Subsequent mutual aid responses, which are requested by both Placer County and Washoe County, could be delayed even more based on the extra number of vehicles backed up between Crystal Bay and Kings Beach.

In the event of a major disaster, emergency vehicle response and potential evacuations would be severely hampered by a reduction in travel lanes through Kings Beach. As the only artery connecting the city of Kings Beach and Incline Village, SR 28 would be a primary evacuation route. The ability to get vehicles to the junction of SR 267 is critical.

With this proposal, evacuations could be delayed by as much as 30 minutes. This would be based on both, the ability to get the needed emergency vehicles and personnel to the effected area, and the ability to clear traffic out and create alternate traffic control. The proposed center turn lane in Kings Beach could be changed to a westbound travel lane, but only after proper traffic control measures have been instituted by both Placer County and Washoe County.

I could not locate traffic data to review regarding SR 28 through Crystal Bay. According to the Nevada Department of Transportation, the Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT) on SR 28 just west of SR 431, is 10,500 vehicles. This compares closely to the traffic calculations in Kings Beach. There are few locations for most of the westbound vehicles to go, other than to travel to Crystal Bay.

There is a concern that there would be an increase in traffic accidents within the Incline Village and Crystal Bay communities. In Crystal Bay, this could also translate to an increase in auto/pedestrian accidents, based on the number of pedestrians crossing SR 28 to go from one business to another in the casino area.

Overall, my conclusion is that the proposal to reduce the travel lanes on SR 28 in Kings Beach would only be detrimental to the citizens and visitors within Crystal Bay and Incline Village. It would create a serious delay in emergency vehicle response and thereby create additional hazards to the public.

I believe that the Washoe County Sheriff’s Office must oppose this proposal.

If you have any questions or concerns, please contact me at your convenience.
August 15, 2008

File No.: 001.11106

Bruce Kranz, District Five Supervisor
County of Placer
175 Fulweiler Avenue
Auburn, CA 95603

Dear Supervisor Kranz:

Commissioner Farrow has asked that, as the local CHP representative for the roadway modifications under consideration, I respond to your request. The California Highway Patrol (CHP) has maintained the position this is a County project, and the County will make the final decision as to the selected alternative through the Kings Beach area. The CHP remains committed to the notion that people live, work and play in the Tahoe Basin through which roadways pass. It is our duty, by recognizing the needs of both non-motorized and motorized modes of transportation, to assure that congestion on the roadways is minimized and allows the CHP to provide high levels of public service to the surrounding community. We are committed to full cooperation with the citizens and elected officials of those communities to find transportation solutions that meet both our duty to protect the safety and mobility of travelers, as well as making main thoroughfares an integral part of the community.

Our focus is limited to maintaining our ability to provide the same or better levels of public safety services to citizens and visitors in the Kings Beach area.

The proposed project is designed to change the traffic patterns on State Route 28 (SR) in Kings Beach to achieve lower traffic speeds, improved traffic safety, increased pedestrian access, and develop a more viable economic environment.

The CHP echoes the concerns of the Placer County Sheriff Department and the Washoe County Sheriff of Nevada. We are also in agreement with the California Department of Transportation. Our chief concern is the timeliness of emergency response vehicles in an emergency situation and the ability for mass evacuations. Access to and from the Kings Beach area is limited to two routes for ingress and egress, SR 28 and SR 267. It is important to consider the ramifications of a roadway that is designed with limited capabilities to manage large amounts of traffic. Alternative 3 leaves the roadway a 4 lane roadway, but adds turn lanes at the appropriate intersections and provides for a bike lane and sidewalk. This has been identified as the superior alternative by the California Department of Transportation and I support their views.
I look forward to an opportunity to meet and discuss strategies that will mitigate the anticipated challenges and provide solutions that are both economically beneficial and support public safety.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

GARY ROSS, Captain
Commander
Truckee Area

Cc: Valley Division

_Safety, Service, and Security_
July 22, 2008

Governing Board
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
P. O. Box 5310
Stateline, Nevada 89449

Re: FINAL KINGS BEACH COMMERCIAL CORE PROJECT UPDATE

To Whom It May Concern,

The North Lake Tahoe Fire Protection District has done a thorough review of the: “FINAL KINGS BEACH COMMERCIAL CORE PROJECT UPDATE.” As with all emergency management/response agencies around the lake, special care and consideration has gone into the planning for emergency evacuation, as well as response of emergency vehicles and personnel to emergency incidents within the area of North Lake Tahoe.

Please be aware the current evacuation plan established with cooperating agencies in Washoe County (North Lake Tahoe Fire Protection District, Washoe County Sheriff’s Department and Washoe County Emergency Management), have in our evacuation plan during a catastrophic incident requiring emergency evacuation of Incline Village and Crystal Bay, three evacuation routes. In our evacuation plan Highway 28, through Kings Beach either to Highway 267 or continuation onto Highway 28 to Highway 89 is a primary evacuation route for our residents as well as visitor population that may be in the area at the time of an emergency incident. Mt. Rose Highway 431 exiting to the Reno area and Highway 28 exiting to Highway 50 to the Carson City area are the other two evacuation routes.

Whatever the TRPA and other regulatory agencies can do with ensuring steady and fashionable evacuation routes and access for emergency personnel and equipment during times of emergencies, will greatly ensure the safety of both emergency responders and residents/visitors to the north shore of Lake Tahoe.

North Lake Tahoe Fire Protection District
866 Oriole Way
Incline Village, NV 89451
775/831-0351
Fax 775/831-2072
www.nltfpd.net
Michael D. Brown
Your consideration for the movement of people and vehicles during times of emergency evacuation and your ability in making an informed decision is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Michael D. Brown
Fire Chief
May 16, 2008

The Honorable Bruce Kranz
Placer County Board of Supervisors
175 Fulweiler Avenue
Auburn, CA 95603

Dear Supervisor Kranz:

It has come to my attention that both the Placer County Board of Supervisors and the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA) will be considering shortly which alternative to support with respect to the State Route 28 Kings Beach Commercial Core Improvement Project. After reviewing both the three lane and four lane options, I am convinced that the four lane option is the best choice for this project.

It is clear that the three lane option does not adequately deal with the traffic problems that plague this region during the peak summer seasons, nor does it provide for sufficient parking within the Kings Beach Commercial Core. In fact, it appears that the three lane option will actually increase traffic congestion, adversely impact traffic flow and force cars onto the side streets as an alternative route to connect with Highway 267. Congested streets and inadequate parking has the potential to negatively impact local businesses, affect air quality and contribute to safety issues for pedestrians. Tourists will be less likely to stop at the local Kings Beach businesses if they do not have adequate parking access or the ability to navigate State Route 28 freely.

It is my understanding that this is a very contentious matter among decision-makers and local residents. Ultimately, it is vital that any project that moves forward have the elements in place to reduce traffic and improve the business climate for the corridor. I do not believe that the three lane option will provide those benefits. Further, in speaking to the Department of Transportation (Caltrans), they also feel that the four lane option is the preferred solution for this portion of State Route 28.

Thank you for your conscientious consideration of this request. If I can be of any assistance to you or if you have any questions or comments, please feel free to call me. I can be reached at my Capitol office at (916) 651-4001.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

DAVE COX
Senator, First District

cc: Placer County Board of Supervisors
Mr. John Singlaub, Executive Director, Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
Your question hinges on the role of a CEQA EIR analysis -- to identify the specific impacts of a proposed project, and the mitigation measures needed to address the specific impacts of the project -- versus an analysis of what is the best overall plan.

From a CEQA perspective, the "project" that the EIR evaluates is the roadway modifications, not some action on the part of the County to increase traffic. The future growth in traffic is included in the evaluation as a future cumulative condition, but is not the "responsibility" of the UIP. So the EIR does not (and probably legally cannot) identify means to mitigate the growth in traffic and associated increase in traffic accidents. The "project" also is not required to mitigate existing deficiencies, be they traffic safety, traffic capacity, visual, water quality or anything else.

In reality, the 3-lane alternatives would provide for safer pedestrian crossing conditions of SR 28 than would a 4-lane roadway. In addition to increased average speeds for a 4-lane roadway than 3-lane, the longer crossing distances for pedestrians and the fact that a stopped vehicle in one travel lane blocks driver sight distance in the second under a 4-lane roadway indicates that 3-lanes is safer. This is reflected on p3.6-25 of the environmental document.

Assessment of pedestrian safety for 3-lanes needs to consider the negative safety impacts of diverted cut-through traffic on the local streets. There is no way I know of to accurately forecast the number of pedestrian accidents that would be generated by cut-through traffic mixing with bikes and pedestrians on the narrow local streets. But there is definitely a trade-off with the 3-lane option of improved pedestrian safety crossing the highway versus reduced pedestrian safety on the back streets. My professional opinion is that unless there is a wholesale program to put sidewalks on the local streets and assuming the growth in traffic occurs, the increased hazard to pedestrians on the local streets from cut-through traffic (which also tends to drive at higher speeds) associated with the 3-lanes would outweigh the pedestrian safety benefits crossing the highway.

There is a lot of talk about friction factors for 3-lanes, because I needed that to evaluate traffic conditions for a 3-lane cross-section. For the 4-lane cross-section, there are standard traffic engineering procedures that were available, and which I applied. So there was no need to evaluate friction factors for 4 lanes.

Gordon R. Shaw, PE, AICP, Principal
LSC Transportation Consultants, Inc.
2690 Lake Forest Rd / PO 5875
Tahoe City, CA 96145
530/583-4053 P
530/583-5966 F
gordonshaw@lsctahoe.com
Section 3
Environmental Consequences/Impacts

3.1 Impacts of Alternative 2

Alternative 2 is proposed to consist of a three-lane cross-section along SR 267, with roundabouts at Bear Street and at Coon Street. Brook Avenue would be converted to one-way eastbound from Bear Street to Coon Street. While on-street parallel parking would be provided along both sides of SR 28, parking would be prohibited during the summer season.

Post-Project Intersection Level of Service - 2008

Level of service at signalized and Stop sign controlled intersections were evaluated using the Highway Capacity Software package. Per Caltrans requirements, SIDRA (Version 3.1) was used to evaluate roundabout LOS. Table 34 presents the intersection LOS results for 2008 summer conditions. These conditions include the following:

- The Stop sign controlled intersections along SR 28 at Secline, Deer, and Fox Streets would provide poor (LOS E or F) conditions for side street approaches to the state highway in 2008, while the Chipmunk Street worst approach LOS would be C.

- At the Bear Street roundabout, a single-lane roundabout with the geometry identified in the alternative plans would provide total intersection LOS E conditions in 2008, with a worst-case approach (SR 28 eastbound and westbound) LOS of E.

- At the Coon Street roundabout, a single-lane roundabout would provide total intersection LOS E conditions in 2008. The worst-case Coon Street eastbound approach would experience LOS F in 2008. This LOS F condition would occur for roughly 40 hours per summer.

- At the SR 267/SR 28 signalized intersection, LOS C would be provided.

The LOS analyses for the roundabouts also indicate that long traffic queues would be formed along SR 28. The 95th-percentile queue length (that length which would be met or exceeded 5 percent of the time during the design hour) at the Bear Street roundabout would be 2,390 feet in the westbound direction and 2,277 in the eastbound direction, extending back through other public street intersections. At Coon Street, the 95th-percentile queue length would be 1,374 feet and 2,193 feet in the westbound and eastbound directions, respectively.

Winter LOS analysis results indicate a worst-approach LOS of E at the Bear Street roundabout and LOS F at the Coon Street location, with overall LOS of D at both locations. Very long queues would also form in this season, particularly at the Coon Street roundabout. The unsignalized intersections provide worst-approach LOS of E or F, with the exception of Chipmunk Street (LOS C).

Post-Project Intersection Level of Service – 2028

Table 35 presents the intersection LOS results for 2028 conditions. These conditions include the following:

- The Stop sign controlled intersections along SR 28 (Secline, Deer, Fox and Chipmunk Streets) would provide poor (LOS F) conditions for side street approaches to the state highway in 2028.
### TABLE 34: 2008 Peak Hour Intersection LOS – Alternative 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SR 26 @</th>
<th>Traffic Control</th>
<th>Worst Approach(s/veh)</th>
<th>Total Intersection(s/veh)</th>
<th>No Project LOS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUMMER</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 267</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>29.0, C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sedline Street</td>
<td>Two-Way Stop Controlled</td>
<td>158.8</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deer Street</td>
<td>Two-Way Stop Controlled</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bear Street</td>
<td>Single-Lane Roundabout</td>
<td>74.3</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>68.8, E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coon Street</td>
<td>Single-Lane Roundabout</td>
<td>91.0</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>56.8, E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fox Street</td>
<td>Two-Way Stop Controlled</td>
<td>52.2</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chipmunk Street</td>
<td>Two-Way Stop Controlled</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WINTER</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 267</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>37.8, D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sedline Street</td>
<td>Two-Way Stop Controlled</td>
<td>115.8</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deer Street</td>
<td>Two-Way Stop Controlled</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bear Street</td>
<td>Single-Lane Roundabout</td>
<td>60.1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>43.9, D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coon Street</td>
<td>Single-Lane Roundabout</td>
<td>87.6</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>48.3, D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fox Street</td>
<td>Two-Way Stop Controlled</td>
<td>45.4</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chipmunk Street</td>
<td>Two-Way Stop Controlled</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note 1: Delay level too high to calculate*

### TABLE 35: 2028 Peak Hour Intersection LOS – Alternative 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SR 28 @</th>
<th>Traffic Control</th>
<th>Worst Approach Delay(s/veh)</th>
<th>Total Intersection Delay(s/veh)</th>
<th>LOS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUMMER</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 267</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>154.9, F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sedline Street</td>
<td>Two-Way Stop Controlled</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deer Street</td>
<td>Two-Way Stop Controlled</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bear Street</td>
<td>Single-Lane Roundabout</td>
<td>320.4</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>290.9, F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coon Street</td>
<td>Single-Lane Roundabout</td>
<td>320.5</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>262.7, F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fox Street</td>
<td>Two-Way Stop Controlled</td>
<td>558.1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chipmunk Street</td>
<td>Two-Way Stop Controlled</td>
<td>65.8</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Required Intersection Configuration (Mitigated)*

| SR 267      | Signal               | —                           | —                               | 57.0, E |
| Requires Separate Westbound Right-Turn Lane |

| **WINTER**   |                      |                             |                                 |     |
| SR 267      | Signal               | —                           | —                               | 188.6, F |
| Sedline Street | Two-Way Stop Controlled | 359.3                      | —                               | —   |
| Deer Street  | Two-Way Stop Controlled | (1)                         | —                               | —   |
| Bear Street  | Single-Lane Roundabout | 316.5                      | —                               | 277.6, F |
| Coon Street  | Single-Lane Roundabout | 317.5                      | —                               | 262.7, F |
| Fox Street   | Two-Way Stop Controlled | (1)                         | —                               | —   |
| Chipmunk Street | Two-Way Stop Controlled | 56.2                       | —                               | —   |

*Required Intersection Configuration (Mitigated)*

| SR 267      | Signal               | —                           | —                               | 74.2, E |
| Requires Separate Westbound Right-Turn Lane |

*Note 1: Delay level too high to calculate*
November 18, 2009

Randell H. Iwasaki, Chief Deputy Director of Caltrans
California State Department of Transportation – Sacramento
1120 N St.
Sacramento, CA 94273

RE: Administrative Complaint to stop the use of Public Funds to discriminate against Latinos and other Kings Beach residents in Placer County, California

Dear Mr. Iwasaki,

The League of United Latin American Citizens, the largest and oldest Hispanic membership organization in the country, advances the economic conditions, educational attainment, political influence, health, housing and civil rights of Hispanic Americans through community-based programs operating at more than 700 LULAC councils nationwide.

This Administrative Complaint is intended to express our serious concerns regarding the Kings Beach Commercial Core Improvement Project in the town of Kings Beach, Placer County, California and to request all appropriate administrative relief including an order to cease and desist; freezing funding and ordering a proper EIR.

The alternative choice by the Placer County Board of Supervisors would reduce the current four lanes of State Route 28 to two through lanes, a middle turn lane, and two single-lane roundabouts in the center of town.

This lane reduction would occur on the only through roadway along the North Shore of Lake Tahoe, and there is no bypass or alternate route. Kings Beach traffic counts averaging 24,000 all summer (and during winter holiday periods) far exceed “the typical” count of fewer than 10,000 vpd to reduce lanes on Main Streets. Serious congestion will force drivers to seek alternate routes through adjacent low-income residential neighborhoods (40+ blocks) comprised overwhelmingly of Hispanic residents.

Caltrans is the lead agency under NEPA and SAFETEA-LU due to a ‘NEPA delegation pilot program’ with the FHWA, in which Caltrans assumed the authority and legal responsibility for the FHWA review of this project. The NOI for this project was published in the Federal Registry in the spring of 2007. At that time, according to FHWA staff in Washington D.C., California was the first state to participate in this ‘pilot program’, and the KBCCIP in Caltrans’ District 3 was the first project.
We have read the letter from Caltrans to Supervisor Kranz dated October 2, 2007 stating Caltrans' position that the four lanes is a "superior alternative." However, since that letter was written Placer County and District 3 Director Jody Jones met "behind closed doors" and worked out a "Hybrid" option that is very similar to the Alternative #2 rejected in the October letter. There are many questions regarding this aspect of the process.

Caltrans has a significant responsibility for the consequences of any State Highway 28 reconfiguration that imposes public safety hazards to low income and minority residents in Kings Beach. The following concerns arose during the process:

1. The Purpose and Need Statement is too narrow to address the full range of community concerns and project impacts. It does not include congestion, delays, and traffic cutting through residential neighborhoods as significant factors.

2. The project boundaries encompass only the commercial core along State Route 28, excluding the adjacent residential neighborhoods from the geographical area analyzed in the EIR/EIS. However, these neighborhoods constitute the official diversion routes to relieve congestion, lie outside the project boundaries, shifting the burden of impacts due to congestion away from the highway.

3. Lack of participation by a substantial portion of the community in developing the project vision "missed" capturing the serious objections and public safety hazards imposed on the indigenous low income and Hispanic community of Kings Beach.

4. The alternatives (especially the four lane configuration) were not evaluated in an equitable and adequately broad framework. The comparison of mitigation measures across all alternatives is supposed "to ensure that a preferred alternative is not presented in an artificially positive manner as a result of design detail." (SAFETEA-LU)

5. Environmental justice concerns were inadequately addressed from the early visioning throughout the EIR/EIS process because the adjacent neighborhoods were outside the geographical boundaries of the project. Under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 the process must ensure nondiscrimination of minority and low income populations.

6. Public testimony by Steven Brown (a developer receiving Placer County funds) on June 25, 2008 revealed cronyism in the personal relationships with Placer County Executive Rich Colwell and Caltrans District 3 Director Jody Jones.
7. The Tahoe Regional Planning Agency and their TMPO will be reconsidering their rejection of the “Hybrid” alternative in January 2010. But Placer County’s Chairman of the Board of Supervisors (Jim Holmes) told the TRPA Board in July 2008 that they must approve the lane reduction or “there would be no project at all.”

8. Projections for the length of queues extend into Crystal Bay, Nevada to the east of Kings Beach. Highway 28 serves both California and Nevada on the North Shore, yet Washoe County submitted no written comment in the EIR/EIS. Incline Village/Crystal Bay has 10,000 year round residents and about 30,000 seasonal residents who depend on SR28 for their primary ingress/egress route.

9. Placer County has refused and to date there is no computerized simulation of the “Hybrid” alternative. The last simulation of a lane reduction was done by Caltrans in 1999 by Doug MacIvor (District 3 Travel Forecasting and Modeling) showing significant levels of congestion.

10. There has been no peer review by a qualified roundabout and traffic engineer regarding the capacity and public safety issues. The scale of controversy, EIR Traffic Study findings, and the unique location at Lake Tahoe certainly warrant the highest level of public scrutiny.

Please keep in mind that the California Constitution, Article I, Section 1, guarantees all Californians a constitutional right of safety. If you contend that there is a compelling government interest at stake in the current plan which trumps the constitutional right of safety, we insist that you specify what that compelling government interest is.

TRPA Board members have repeatedly asked “what is Caltrans’ position?” The October letter is the only public document released so far. But the existing traffic travels on the State highway, and any constrictions causing congestion and diversion through residential neighborhoods that knowingly result in increased public safety hazards would not reflect well on Caltrans. The cut through numbers of 2400-5500 vpd during the summer season and winter holiday periods were calculated by Gordon Shaw in the Traffic Study for the EIR/EIS based on Caltrans traffic counts. Our local consultants have a CD of Caltrans traffic count data since 2000 for Kings Beach and have analyzed and verified the numbers.

We also have an email from Gordon Shaw to Dave Polivy of the Sierra Business Council (prior to the public workshop to gain ‘community consensus’ for the lane reduction) stating that in his professional opinion the increase in public safety hazards in the residential neighborhoods due to cut-through traffic “outweighs” the public safety benefits of a lane reduction/roundabouts for pedestrians on SR28.
Highway drivers diverting from SR28 through narrow residential streets will degrade community cohesion, endanger children and families, and unnecessarily disrupt the safe walkable conditions that exist today. The low income and largely Hispanic residents do not use automobiles to attend the K-3 elementary school, the Boys and Girls Club, and the three churches within this residential area. The streets are designed only for residential use and are clearly unsuitable for highway traffic. The EIR/EIS confirm the environmental impacts of cut-through traffic as “significant and unmitigable.” If there was no traffic diversion allowed through the Kings Beach residential neighborhoods would Caltrans still allow Placer County to proceed with a lane reduction of SR28?

Political expediency by Placer County for short-term economic gain is no justification for violations of environmental justice and fundamental civil rights. We ask that you review and evaluate the technical facts and merits of this project and respond to our concerns. This may avoid an inadvertent error in a very serious public policy decision.

This complaint is filed by the LULAC California, LULAC District Thirteen and by aggrieved N. Kings Beach LULAC council # 3162 members and residents of Kings Beach, Placer County California.

Sincerely,

Argentina Dávila-Luévano
State Director, CA LULAC

Angel G. Luévano
LULAC National Vice President Far West Region

Jan Tucker, Chair, LULAC
California Civil Rights Commission

cc: President Rosa Rosales, President, LULAC National
Ronald Beals, Chief Counsel - Caltrans
Olivia Fonseca, Civil Rights Deputy Director - Caltrans
Lupe Martinez, Director of Organization, Center on Race, Poverty and the Environment
Abdi Soltani, Executive Director - American Civil Liberties Union of Northern California
Angelo Montalvo, District Thirteen Director – LULAC Sacramento
Jerry Dinzes, President, North Lake Tahoe LULAC Council # 3162
Jan Tucker, Chair, LULAC California LULAC Civil Rights Commission
Dr. Al Rocha, Deputy State Director, LULAC California

MISSION: Advance the economic condition, educational attainment, political influence, health, and civil rights of Hispanics in the United States. The California League of United Latin American Citizens (LULAC) is an affiliated unit of LULAC National.

PURPOSE: To develop and implement programs, services, and policies which advance the organization’s mission statewide and to support the local councils and districts that are engaged in the organization’s mission at the local level.
January 19th, 2010

Jerry Dinzes
Lake Tahoe Citizens' Media Group

RE: Documentation Showing Community and Regional Consensus

Dear TRPA Governing Board,

Many supporters of the lane reduction will shout that the majority of the community supports them. These supporters have gone as far as to shout that Supervisor Montgomery won the majority of Kings Beach's vote because she campaigned on a '3-lane' stance. However, these comments are utterly false. In fact, even when Sup. Kranz won the County seat, he lost handily in Kings Beach to his predecessor Rex Bloomfield. Sup. Montgomery's vote count exceeded Bloomfield's in Kings Beach, as did it exceed Bloomfield's count in all precincts throughout Sup. Montgomery's district.

This letter's intent is to spotlight surveys and polls that show that the majority of locals and visitors do not want a congested Kings Beach. This letter is intended for the Board Packet on January 27th.

The First Poll Conducted By Caltrans

Doug McIvor, Caltrans' Chief of Traffic Modeling and Forecasting, came to Kings Beach in 1999. In conjunction with the North Tahoe Business Association, Caltrans hosted a meeting about reducing lanes to two through lanes. Of the 44 people who attended this meeting, 40 initially expressed a preference for lane reduction. However, after viewing a traffic simulation conducted by Mr. McIvor, the people became aware of the congestion that such a proposal would cause. By the end of the meeting only 4 of the 44 supported lane reduction in Kings Beach.

This illustrates a very interesting concept. If people are not considering traffic, then the lane reduction seems like a great idea. But as soon as people actually learn about traffic congestion they want the four lanes. At the 2007 workshops hosted by the Sierra Business Council, very little effort was put into speaking about the congestion lane reduction would cause. In fact, the program directors went as far as to make references to the way roundabouts actually kept traffic flowing, thus downplaying the congestion and any focus upon it. This could very well be the reason the SBC meeting showed community support for the lane reduction.
Had traffic engineers who would actually speak about technical details hosted this meeting, the result of this meeting could have been very different.

**North Lake Tahoe Resort Association Polls Show Congestion is #1 Issue**

In 2004 the NLTRA contracted a mail back survey of Eastern Placer County that concluded in a 'measure of breadth of support' that congestion was the number one issue among residents. The 2003/2004 web survey contracted by the NLTRA concluded that both residents and visitors agree that improving congestion was the number one priority.

The numbers in these polls speak very clearly that there is a consensus that traffic congestion is the number one problem in North Tahoe. Tahoe City congestion is likely to blame for this sentiment. It is hard to believe that the majority of people support creating more congestion in Tahoe.

**The Tahoe Transportation District Survey**

The most recent survey conducted was by the TTD. This is perhaps the most substantial survey, as it shows very little awareness of what seems to many like the biggest decision North Tahoe has ever faced.

Though this survey has not yet been released, a preliminary summary by the TTD reveals that only 52% of registered voters were aware of the Kings Beach Commercial Core Project. This furthers our view that Montgomery was not elected to create congestion in Lake Tahoe. In fact, a very large percentage of those who voted for Sup. Montgomery had no idea what her stance was on the KBCCIP. Though the full Kings Beach survey report has not yet been released, exchanges from Placer County staff reveal that the community is split 50/50 in the survey. When the survey is released, I request that it be added to the public record.

Thanks, Jerry Dinzes

**Attachments**

1. An excerpt detailing the first 3 vs 4 lane poll, *Tech Transfer*, Winter 1999
2. North Lake Tahoe Resort Association Poll (Web and Mailback Results)
3. Preliminary Report Of TTD Survey
SIMULATION MODELS

(Continued from page 13)

On the Route 101 project, which is also still several years away from construction, CORSIM is being used to examine design choices as well as the impacts of construction schedules on local traffic, so the district can anticipate problems and take corrective action.

CORSIM Makes Choices Easier
As have others, MacIvor finds CORSIM a particularly useful tool for exploring options with local officials and the public. CORSIM was run to show what would happen if Route 28 were narrowed from four lanes to three lanes over a couple of miles of roadway in the Kings Beach area of Tahoe. The idea behind the proposal was to encourage motorists to patronize local businesses by slowing down traffic and making the area more pedestrian friendly. However, the model run indicated that traffic would back up farther than expected, possibly blocking the fire station. “We had a meeting with the North Tahoe business association, and of the 44 people at the meeting, 40 initially favored the narrower roadway. After we finished the presentation using CORSIM, 40 people favored the wider option,” MacIvor says.

Even the most sophisticated corridor analysis tool can be distorted if the assumptions underlying data inputs are unknown or inconsistent.

FREQ, on the other hand, is an effective tool for analyzing options to improve flows on urban freeways. In District 3 these focus on the north-south I-5 corridor and two related east-west segments of I-80, all in the area of Sacramento. FREQ has been used to model ramp meters and HOV lanes. John Holzhauser is lead traffic engineer for the ramp metering work. Based on the FREQ results for I-5, he recommended adding 11 new ramp meters during the morning peak and 12 during the evening. Holzhauser also looked at the effects of ramp metering projects on two sections of I-80, totaling roughly 16 miles. The results of the FREQ analysis suggested installation of 20 new meters over 13 interchanges. FREQ was also used by the district’s HOV unit to analyze HOV lanes on I-80 as well as State Routes 50 and 99.

INTEGRATION Gives a Big Picture
The third corridorwide simulation model taught in the ITS-Caltrans course is INTEGRATION. Still a fairly new program, it boasts the ability to do a large-scale simulation which can handle traffic assignments, route choice, and diversion. Utah DOT engaged SAIC’s transportation group (formerly Transcore) in a major project to use INTEGRATION on the reconstruction of I-15 in Salt Lake City to address the need for traffic control measures related to the 2002 Olympics. Prior to that, FREQ was used to model the entire Salt Lake City freeway system during the morning and afternoon inbound rush in connection with evaluating ramp controls. As a result of the FREQ analysis, ramp controls were imposed on I-15 north- and southbound. Both model projects were felt to be successful, according to Loren Bloomberg of SAIC’s transportation group. However, he says that adoption of INTEGRATION by local agencies may be slowed down by several factors. Since it is a very complex model, it requires a lot of expertise to use. The amount of data required is large, and the program reassigns traffic dynamically. Ongoing refinements continue, however, which will make it easier to use.

PARAMICS, produced in Scotland, has recently entered the scene and is receiving some attention. Its unique features include improved graphics and an ability to show 3-D renderings of vehicles, including views from inside the driver’s windshield. PARAMICS will be used at the UC Irvine-District 12 test bed to explore a variety of new dynamic operations and management strategies.

Data Quality Key to Success
Caltrans engineer Tom Persons, however, who is in charge of writing Caltrans’ Traffic Impact Study Guide, cautions that the output from even the most sophisticated corridor analysis tool can be distorted if the assumptions underlying data inputs are unknown or inconsistent. Corridor analysis in particular involves use of data derived from disparate sources, since travel corridors are by nature cross-jurisdictional in scope. Combining sets of data that don’t work well together or are inconsistent can affect output results tremendously. This is why, he notes, it is critical for all agencies within a corridor to understand what the models can do and to reach agreement on how data will be collected and used. With this kind of agreement, he says, “we’ll go a long way with simulation models.”

A simulation of a CORSIM model.
MAILBACK SURVEY

Introduction and Methodology

This report summarizes the results of the 2004 Eastern Placer County Community Mailback Survey, conducted by RRC Associates on behalf of the North Lake Tahoe Resort Association (NLTRA) in February/March 2004. The purpose of the survey was to gauge public opinion on a variety of community issues to help guide the North Lake Tahoe Tourism and Community Investment Master Plan (TCIMP) update currently under way.

The mailback survey was mailed to a sample of residents and absentee residential property owners in Eastern Placer County, specifically all portions of Placer County on the eastern slope of the Sierras. The resident survey mailing list was derived from two sources: the “Totalsource” list product sold by national list broker Equifax, Inc., and Placer County voter registration records. The Equifax database, which aims to be comprehensive (but can exclude some names, i.e., people who have removed themselves from direct marketing mailing lists), was used as the list source for zip codes lying entirely in Eastern Placer County. The Placer County voter registration database was used for zip codes which straddled Placer County and Nevada or Eldorado counties (in order to identify Placer County residents), including areas near Truckee, Soda Springs, and Tahoma. Altogether, 6,202 surveys were mailed out and 1,005 were returned, for a gross response rate of 16.2 percent. This is identical to the response rate for the December 2001 North Lake Tahoe Community Mailback Survey (16.2 percent response rate to a mailback survey of 6,419 North Lake Tahoe registered voters).

The absentee owner mailing list was drawn randomly from Placer County Assessor residential property records. A total of 1,000 absentee owner surveys were mailed out and 190 were returned, for a response rate of 19.0 percent.

A cover letter describing the purpose of the survey and background information about the NLTRA was also sent out in the mailing. The cover letter included a notice in Spanish that a Spanish language version of the survey could be obtained through the Centro de Recursos para la Familia in Kings Beach. As a
Eastern Placer County, respondents were asked to rate and rank the importance of 30 varied potential improvements. The results help to provide an understanding of the breadth and intensity of support for potential improvements in the area.

In a measure of breadth of support, the following improvements were identified as “important” by a majority of residents:

- Reducing traffic congestion (86 percent responding “important” (“4” or “5” on five-point scale)
- Water quality improvements (75 percent)
- Open space acquisitions and preservation (72 percent).
- Add shuttle service to the Reno/Tahoe International Airport (62 percent)
- Expand/complete network of bike-trails (60 percent)
- Construct workforce housing (59 percent)
- Add evening public bus service (59 percent)
- Construct indoor recreation facility with pool, gym, etc. (58 percent)
- Increase frequency of daytime public bus service (54 percent).

Additionally, in a measure of intensity of support, the following improvements were most commonly identified as one of the top three improvements by locals:

- Reducing traffic congestion (51 percent identified it as among the top three priorities)
- Open space acquisitions and preservation (32 percent)
- Construct an indoor recreation facility (30 percent)
- Water quality improvements (25 percent)
- Construct workforce housing (21 percent)
- Expand/complete network of bikepaths (14 percent)
- Add shuttle service to the Reno/Tahoe International Airport (12 percent)
- Add evening public bus service (11 percent)

The preferences of residents can be compared to the priorities of past and prospective visitors to the region, as measured by the 2003/04 NLTRA Web site Survey. Among the priorities that are common to visitors and residents are:

- Reducing traffic congestion
- Adding shuttle service to the Reno Airport
Web Site Survey

Introduction and Methodology

This report summarizes the results of the 2003/04 NLTRA Web Site Survey conducted in support of the NLTRA Tourism and Community Investment Master Plan effort (TCIMP).

The purpose of the Web Site Survey was to gather information and opinions from visitors to the North Lake Tahoe Resort Association (NLTRA) / Lake Tahoe Central Reservations (LTCR) Web Site (www.mytahoevacation.com), a consumer-oriented Web site which primarily attracts persons planning or considering a trip to Lake Tahoe. The survey was advertised with a pop-up window, and later additionally by a link advertised on the homepage. A drawing for one of several North Lake Tahoe backpacks filled with souvenirs was offered as an incentive, with one-in-fifty odds of winning. A total of 1,541 responses were collected between November 10, 2003 and February 17, 2004.

Respondents were randomly rotated between two versions of the survey, which shared a number of common questions in addition to having several unique questions. The surveys probed a variety of topics germane to the TCIMP planning effort, including priorities for improvement, travel planning issues, trip decision factors, characteristics of trips to North Lake Tahoe, perceptions of North Lake Tahoe, visitor demographics, and a variety of other issues.

As a result of the large sample size, consistency of implementation, and the level of detail on the questionnaires, the results of the survey are quite rich. Many of the results from the 2003/04 survey are generally consistent with results of the 2000/01 survey (e.g. trip characteristics), an indicator of the reliability of the survey methodology.

However, it is important to understand some of the limitations of the methodology in interpreting the results. First, it should be noted that the www.tahoefun.org Web site serves partially as the Web site for LTCR, which provides bookings for the entire Lake Tahoe area (not just the North Shore). As such, the Web site can be expected to attract many visitors interested in Lake Tahoe in general, not just the North Shore in particular. To control this issue, in the many instances where North Shore-specific data was
North Lake Tahoe if packages were offered which meet their needs, while out-of-staters tend to indicate a low to moderate likelihood of increased trips.

Trip decision factors and perceptions of North Lake Tahoe: Respondents identified a wide variety of factors as “important” in their decision where to take an overnight trip generally. Leading factors include scenery (88 percent “important” – rating 4 or 5 on a five-point scale), overall value for the money (85 percent), ability to rest and relax there (78 percent), variety/quality of lodging choices (78 percent), fun and excitement (76 percent), friendly people (74 percent), level of service (74 percent), ease of getting there (74 percent), level of crowding at attractions (70 percent), availability of good travel packages (68 percent), and a variety of other items.

A majority of respondents also have largely favorable impressions of North Lake Tahoe on many of the same items, led by scenery (88 percent “favorable” – rating 4 or 5 on a five-point scale), ability to rest and relax there (78 percent), fun and excitement (77 percent), variety/quality of lodging choices (75 percent), quality of downhill skiing/snowboarding (75 percent), friendly people (67 percent), and various other factors.

Comparing the “importance” and “favorability” ratings helps to identify areas that are potentially priorities for improvement. The largest gaps between “importance” and “performance” exist for overall value for the money (85 percent “important” vs. 61 percent “favorable” – 24 point gap), level of crowding at attractions (also a 24 point gap), traffic congestion (23 point gap), ease of getting there (16 point gap), availability of good travel packages (16 point gap), and level of service (9 point gap). These “gaps” represent areas that should probably receive some consideration and attention. High prices and traffic congestion, and, to a lesser extent, crowding and access issues, also emerge as concerns for respondents in various other questions on the survey.

- Priorities for Improvement: The most popular improvements include reducing traffic congestion (65 percent responding “important” – rating 4 or 5 on five-point scale), increasing parking availability (63 percent), and making developed areas more “walkable”/enjoyable for walking (60 percent). Other improvements that are viewed as important by approximately half of respondents include renovating lodging accommodations (54 percent), adding new lodging close to ski facilities (51 percent), improving beaches/public access to Lake Tahoe (50 percent), constructing a tram/gondola to link Tahoe City to one of the ski areas (49 percent), and adding a
MEMORANDUM

Date: January 4, 2010

To: Tahoe Transportation District (TTD) Board of Directors

From: Carl Hasty, District Manager

Subject: Status Report Regarding TTD Public Outreach Plan

---

**Action Requested:**
It is requested the Board review, receive and accept this Status Report, with further direction to staff as appropriate related to development of a specific public outreach and education plan.

**Background:**
With Board adoption of its Work Plan, the District has embarked on a major Capital Improvement Program, a program that involves many partners. As discussed by the Board in September, an effective program of public outreach and education will be needed to inform and support the timely advancement of projects identified in the Work Plan. The Board agreed to support the development of a "campaign approach" that addresses and promotes a program of projects - projects that add value to the community, the environment, and the economy. The Board and staff recognized the importance of customizing projects to address specific needs within our geographically diverse areas.

As an initial step in the development of a public outreach campaign, a random telephone survey of voters was conducted in the North Lake Tahoe area September 14 through 16, 2009 and September 21 through 24, 2009. The purpose of this survey was to sample voter awareness of the Tahoe Transportation District and perspectives on the importance of transportation and transit projects in the area.

There were two survey samples. One involved 400 registered voters (residents 18+) living within the 22 voting districts that comprise the Tahoe Basin portion of eastern Placer County. The second was among 400 registered voters living in Incline Village. This sample was among registered voters (residents 18+) residing in the ten voting districts located within Incline Village.
Level of Awareness of High Profile Projects
As part of the eastern Placer County portion of the survey, respondents were queried as to their awareness of a high profile transportation project. The Kings Beach Commercial Core Improvement Project has been in the planning and development process for well over ten years. Among respondents, 53 percent said they had heard of the project; 47 percent said they had not.

In Incline Village, the potential for improvements at the intersection of Nevada State Routes 28 and 431 has been discussed for several years. As part of its adopted Work Plan, the TTD is working with the Nevada Department of Transportation to help fund project studies and an environmental review of proposed alternatives. Incline respondents who indicated awareness of this project talked about it in terms of a roundabout. They were typically not aware of the broader study of multiple alternatives.

Discussion:
As part of developing the Kings Beach Commercial Core Improvement Project, the TTD recognizes that Placer County has conducted a very robust program of public workshops, meetings, educational outreach, and public hearings over many years. The fact that just over half of those surveyed indicated awareness of this high profile project underscores the challenge we face as a District, in collaboration with our project partners, in developing and implementing a successful public outreach and education plan. Similarly, in the case of intersection improvements at Nevada Highways 28 and 431 in Incline Village, the need for effective public outreach was clearly identified.

Professionals who plan and develop transportation projects understand that people tend to view and react to project proposals based on a wide variety of factors, including socioeconomic circumstances (e.g., age, employment, education), and personal preferences for mobility. Transportation projects also play an important role in land use, community design, and environmental improvements. An effective public outreach and education plan for a major transportation project of a Capital Improvement Program must address the diversity of its mission. District Staff looks forward to Board and project partner discussion and input as we seek to develop and implement an effective public outreach and education program.

Additional Information:
If you have any questions or comments regarding this item, please contact Carl Hasty at (775) 589-5501.
David McClure  
Kings Beach Business and Citizens Alliance  

January 18, 2010  

Board of Governors  
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency  

Re: Kings Beach Commercial Core Improvement Project Reconsideration  

TRPA Board Members,  

In the history of the TRPA there has never been a “project” with the extensive scope and complexity of consequences as Placer County’s alternative choice of reducing SR28 capacity from four through lanes to two through lanes (limited by the two single lane roundabouts in downtown Kings Beach).  

The TRPA staff has collaborated with Placer County to advocate this alternative not on technical merit but for the sake of a very abstract vision underlying the Land-Use element of the Regional Plan Update. The impacts or consequences of reducing the capacity of a State Highway, the only highway on the North shore, extend far beyond the “project boundaries” of the Kings Beach Commercial Core.  

State Route 28 is a regional highway serving a three month summer average of 55,000 drivers and passengers every day, and only 1500 pedestrians and about 100 bicyclists daily. Winter holiday periods of another month see a similar count of 24,000 daily vehicles occupied by 55,000 people with almost no pedestrians or bicyclists.  

The attachments to this letter include the following: the complete roundabout capacity analysis by RTE, and an email from Jennifer Merchant to Placer County’s CEO summarizing a meeting with Joanne Marchetta. The survey by the Tahoe Transportation District on the KBCCIP will be released in its entirety under the FOIA, and I ask that this forthcoming document be included in the record. We have received a summary of the key results at this writing.  

This letter is to serve as notice to the Board of TRPA that a decision to approve Placer County’s preferred alternative to reduce the capacity of SR28 will cause immediate LOS ‘F’ conditions, unprecedented congestion on a key regional highway, degrading emergency ingress/egress on a designated emergency/evacuation route, and not only causing diversion of highway traffic through a forty block residential neighborhood, but depending on it to relieve intolerable traffic queues. The notion of sovereign immunity to public liability
claims are for inadvertent or accidental decision errors, and not to deliberate, intentional decisions with full knowledge and well-documented evidence in the record warning of increased dangers to public safety.

**RTE’s Roundabout Capacity Analysis**

Scott Ritchie’s firm Roundabout and Traffic Engineering conducted a simulation of one proposed single-lane roundabout at the intersection of Coon St./SR28 in downtown Kings Beach. RTE used RODEL, more sophisticated roundabout specific software than the SIDRA software used by Placer County. The data was set was taken from EIR/EIS traffic study numbers. RODEL incorporates urban friction factors that enable a higher level of confidence in the results. In today’s traffic conditions RODEL produced an LOS ‘F’, whereas Placer County’s SIDRA analysis shows LOS ‘B’ for the same intersection. This discrepancy of LOS led to RTE’s conclusions that the single-lane roundabouts are “under-designed” and “inadequate.” The congestion will be far greater than the 5-10 days per year stated in the EIR/EIS documents. Assuming LOS ‘B’ instead of LOS ‘F’ has misled decision makers and the general public into believing negative impacts will only occur from future growth. An immediate LOS ‘F’ today has significantly higher negative impacts on air quality along SR28 due to gridlock, air quality and noise from increased cut-through traffic, and more serious degradations for emergency response/evacuation times. SR28 through Kings Beach is a designated emergency route from Incline Village, and has served as an alternate route when Highway 50 has been closed in the event of mudslides or avalanches. SR28 through Kings Beach also served as an alternate route when Interstate 80 was closed during the last fire event in the Truckee River Canyon.

Deliberately constricting a key interstate emergency route only degrades public safety from current levels and is not consistent with Federal policies nor does it justify Federal funding.

**Tahoe Transportation District Survey**

In a recent transportation survey done by the TTD there were seven questions about the KBCCIP asked of 400 registered voters as part of a larger assessment of transportation issues. The results showed a 50/50 split on the lane reduction alternative, not the “overwhelming majority” that Placer County and lane reduction proponents have been claiming. Leaders of the North Lake Tahoe Resort Association and the North Tahoe Business Association, and the North Tahoe Family Resource Center have consistently propagated in public this false claim, and their dependence on Placer County funding is well documented. The TTD survey is a significant independent finding that Placer County has asked to be released to them. The survey results never would have been made available to the public were it not for a request for release under the Freedom of Information Act.
During the NEPA scoping and environmental review of the KBCCIP Placer County refused repeated requests to undertake an unbiased survey or local vote to provide feedback of local sentiment on the lane reduction. The general public continues to be misled about the extent of congestion and its consequences with many repeating claims of minimal or minor inconveniences. These claims are based on 5-10 days per year of congestion with a current LOS ‘B’ derived from the SIDRA model in the EIR/EIS. Any questioning or opposition to Placer County’s claims has been ignored or condemned until the release of the RTE Capacity Analysis and the TTD survey. Now with an immediate LOS ‘F’ from a more accurate traffic model and an impartial TTD survey that clearly disproves the prior claims of majority support, Placer County’s manipulation of information to only support their predisposed position is becoming obvious.

**Placer County email about meeting with TRPA’s CEO**

The attached email from Jennifer Merchant (Tahoe Manager in the CEO’s office) to Tom Miller (Placer County CEO) and Ken Grehm (Dept. of Public Works) was released under the FOIA. This email reveals the desire of Resort Association CEO and TTD Board member, Steve Teshara, to suppress the TTD’s own survey. The email also reveals why the TRPA staff leadership is advocating the lane reduction so vigorously. Joanne Marchetta is reported as expressing the position that the lane reduction alternative is “a referendum on the concepts staff supports for inclusion in the Regional Plan and believes a failure on KB would damage the Regional Plan Update.”

This misperception that reducing the capacity of State Route 28 through Kings Beach upholds concepts to be included in the Regional Plan dates back to the previous Executive Director John Singlaub. While serving as CEO for the TRPA he was on the Board of Directors of the Sierra Business Council. He hired Darin Dinsmore, a former Sierra Business Council employee, to orchestrate the Place-Based Workshops and develop the language to codify the CEP’s into the new Regional Plan. In Placer County’s summary of the Place-Based workshops from 2006 the only roundabout mentioned was at the intersection of Highway 267 and Hwy 28. There were no plans, no vetting of impacts, and no presentation of the single-lane roundabouts now proposed. The exercise was conceptual, ideological, theoretical, and hypothetical.

The realities of congestion from under-designed single-lane roundabouts are concrete, specific, and detailed. Placer County chose the lane reduction as their preferred alternative in late May 2008 when the Final EIR was released. Rejection of this alternative one month later was a blessing that has allowed time for all decision makers to understand the impacts more thoroughly. The pushing by Placer County and the TRPA staff has been seriously misguided and has ignored the fundamental technical merit of this specific project. Please correct this error once and for all by affirming TRPA’s rejection of the lane reduction alternative.

Sincerely,

David McClure
Good morning-
I wanted to fill you in on what transpired at this morning’s meeting with Carl Hasty and Joanne Marchetta. Steve Kastan also attended.

So I don’t keep you on pins and needles too long, the upshot is that the Governing Board will hear the KB project in January and all parties pledged to work together in several areas to ensure a successful outcome.

Those areas are:
- Carl will provide the survey instrument, results and analysis to me via hard copy of fax.
- Joanne will initiate staff coordination after the November GB meeting is over. At this meeting, all “moving parts” will be identified and tasks assigned, including, but not limited to:
  - Necessary GB actions- goals and policies, community plan amendments, overriding consideration actions, EIS re-certification
  - Staff presentation- TRPA, Placer and others???
  - GB member outreach: County, TRPA and private party efforts
- Jennifer will assemble notes on recent McClure/Dinizles public comment so they can be addressed during the outreach and presentation process.

Jennifer initiated the discussion by asking Carl to review why we were getting together.

Carl explained that TTD is focusing on implementation of transportation projects, including the lakewide ferry, east shore bike trail, SR 89/89 realignment and the loop road near south state line. He added that they are also focusing on public awareness of the Regional Transportation Plan through a sustained public information and outreach campaign and that “there is a large amount of money in their budget to do that.”

To that end, they hired ESI, a firm owned by Kathy Jordan out of Carson City, who hired pollster Bill Cromer/Cromer Group out of Washington DC to initiate the first phase of outreach/base awareness data collection.

They have completed polls in Incline Village and Placer County in the basin only. The Placer poll was of 400 registered voters and also talked about bike trails, the ferry general environmental interests and transportation projects relation to the health of Lake Tahoe. They also polled on public sentiment regarding agencies and apparently individuals, from what I could understand, but no specifics were provided.

Carl handed out the seven specific questions asked regarding the Kings Beach project. I am not sure if you want me to send those to your electronically. The upshot was that only 53 percent of those polled were aware of the KB Project. 41 percent were unaware and 6 percent couldn’t state whether they were aware or unaware. Respondents were then read a statement about the project which was a fairly objective, if not too casual, explanation of the “three lane” vs. “four lane” differences of opinion, and then asked to respond to a series of questions. In all questions but one, the three lane alternative gets more support, but in no cases does it get more than 50 percent, mostly do to the uncertainty of many respondents.

Carl also mentioned that responses outside of Kings Beach were more favorable to three lanes that in Kings Beach, but did not have that data with him. I asked him for a copy of the survey.

After Carl shared his data, Jennifer jumped right in and said that polling is the wrong basis for decision-making on this or any project before TRPA. She said if they were going to poll on every project she planned to vote no on every item that comes before TRPA. She shared that she campaigned significantly on her position on the KB project and won 63 percent to 37 percent in Kings Beach.
She also said "I feel stabbed in the back. I'm outraged. I have been working very hard to establish an open and trusting relationship with TRPA and this puts us back."

Carl said "I mis-stepped and I apologize. I majorly stepped in it and I want to make it up to you. I will do all I can to support the Kings Beach project."

Steve Kastan mentioned that he was polled and I pointed out that he doesn't live in the Tahoe basin, questioning the validity of the data.

Quite a bit of discussion ensued about how this might or might not impact whether TRPA hears this item in January or not.

Joanne said she did not put this off to January for any reason other to ensure that we are all as prepared on all fronts as possible. She characterized this vote as a referendum on the concepts staff supports for inclusion in the Regional Plan and believes a failure on KB would damage the Regional Plan update.

I explained what Placer County had done to date to ensure that we put our best foot forward, including working with local community leaders, developing a multi-pronged effort, including County staff, electeds and private supporters, to outreach to Governing Board members, as well as working for more than a year to develop an iron clad EIS addendum, which was requested by her Board.

She agreed to support moving forward in January and discussion ensued which resulted in the specific outcomes listed at the top of the page.

I would say that all in all it was a good meeting on many fronts, including sending a very clear message that the project and staff are supported throughout our organization and that we are on the same page with our elected official.

Attached is a matrix of where I think we are with individual Governing Board members, their issues and people we can use to make positive contact with them. This did not go to Carl and Peter, but was reviewed by Jennifer, Peter and me before the meeting. Hopefully it's a helpful tool in at least the GB outreach component of our preparations.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

-Jennifer

Jennifer Merchant
Principal Management Analyst
Tahoe Manager
530-546-1952 FAX 546-1954
jmerchan@placer.ca.gov
Notes- Tahoe Transportation District Public Opinion Survey

Background Information:
TTD Conducted two Public Opinion surveys in September 2009 to assess public opinion on various transportation projects in the Tahoe basin.

Projects queried include:
- Stateline realignment project
- SR 43 I/SR 28 roundabout
- SR 89/89 realignment
- Kings Beach Commercial Core project
- Lakewide bike trail.
- Local organizations, including the North Tahoe Business Association

The survey pool included Placer and Washoe county like voters.

Will Garner is BOS-appointed rep on TTD Board.

Will provided me with staff report and minutes from this item (attached).

TTD staff did a presentation to their Board in Sept. re: Public Outreach and the survey was not discussed.

I was questioned by Theresa May Duggan on Oct. 16 about future of KB project based on comments at meeting she attended at TRPA. She would not tell me who made the comment, so I dropped it.

Carl Hasty spoke at NLTRA Infrastructure Committee last week and did not answer direct questions from me about Public Outreach strategy.

After I heard from Ken Grehm that this survey had been done, I called Steve Teshara to see if he was aware of it (because he’s on the TTD Board), and he was very nervous that I had contacted him. He said he did not know of the survey until Monday when Carl met with him. He said he told Carl he was upset this was done without TTD Board knowledge and suggested he put it in a locked drawer.

I called Theresa to ask if the person who asked why we shouldn’t go forward with the project was Carl Hasty. She said I was close. I guessed Kathy Jordan, who did the survey, and she was silent. Kathy Jordan is a Nevada-style pollster who also does some lobbying work in DC. She hired Cromer Group (Bill Cromer) to do the survey work. They also work out of DC, apparently.

Steve T. had not seen the questions re: KB project but heard responses were 50-50. He did see other parts of the survey and commented that it was not well informed and there were a lot of typos in there.
We pay $10,000 per year and allow NLTRA to allocate $10,000 per year from NLTRA's TOT allocation to help cover Carl's salary. Not all jurisdictions participate.

**Issues I think we need to consider:**
- There has got to be some public awareness that this was done and should we be the ones to "out" the information.
- Discuss with Carl and possibly TTD Board why this was done without knowledge of Board and Placer County.
- Explain to Carl from County's perspective the communication process.
- How do we best prepare Supervisor Montgomery for Friday's meeting so she supports our perspective/concerns.

**Possible Questions for Carl:**
- Who else has he shared this information with (a lot of people according to my intel)?
- Does he plan to go to other GB members with this information?
- What other survey work does he have planned? (I hear two more surveys (south shore) and focus groups (lakewise))
- What does he plan to do with this information?
- Will the TTD take a new position on the KB project based on this information? They're already on record in support.
- Can we have a copy of the survey instrument and results?

**Possible Statements to Carl:**
- This is not perceived as something a partner does to another partner
- No TTD Board knowledge/approval.
- Communication process.
- Let Placer handle it from here.

**Other???
November 19, 2009

David McClure / Jerry Joseph Dinzes  
Kings Beach Business & Citizens Alliance  
PO Box 349  
Tahoe Vista, California 96143  
P: (530) 546-8297  

RE: Kings Beach SR28/Coon Rbt Capacity Review  

Dear Mr. McClure / Dinzes:  

As you requested, **Roundabouts & Traffic Engineering** (RTE) has conducted a cursory review of the existing capacity requirements for a proposed modern roundabout at the intersection of SR 28 / Coon Street in Kings Beach, California. The purpose of this brief technical letter is to determine the capacity requirements of the intersection under the existing 2008 traffic volumes as provided in the EIR. In particular, these capacity analyses can be used to determine the effectiveness of the current proposed conceptual roundabout layout with respect to capacity.

A full roundabout design review (Peer Review) by a recognized roundabout design specialist is typically required by most jurisdictions nationwide and should be completed for this project prior to final PS&E document generation if the jurisdictions are to proceed with any civil engineering of a roundabout alternative for the corridor.

**DATA & CONDITIONS**

As stated in RTE’s scope of work: “Due to a limited budget, RTE’s scope of work will consist of a cursory peer review of one of the roundabouts in the project corridor primarily consisting of the capacity analyses and lane configuration requirements of the roundabout based on future pre-approved design year volumes.” However, the KBBCA elected to use the EIR’s representative design year 2008 PM peak hour traffic volumes since future 2028 design year volumes already demonstrate failing capacity conditions as a single lane roundabout. Hence, per your request, RTE has summarized the results of the 2008 PM peak hour capacity analyses herein for your use.
As directed, RTE utilized the vehicular turning movement volumes provided in the *Kings Beach Urban Improvement Project Traffic Report* (LSC, dated 1/25/2007) under Table 17: Peak Hour Summer 2008 Intersection Turning Movement Design Volumes (LSC, page 27) for the SR 28 / Coon Street intersection. These volumes developed by years of local data, traffic studies, and observations by LSC staff, are based on 2002 traffic counts (30th highest peak hour day of the year) and have numerous adjustments and assumptions therein including applied growth rates, conversion of two-way streets to one-way, and shifted traffic assumptions. It is not within RTE’s scope to dispute the use of these adjustments and assumptions therein, whereas RTE assumes all adjustments and assumptions are approved, appropriate, and accurate for the capacity analyses conducted herein.

RTE is familiar with the SR 28 Corridor, site conditions, and constraints since RTE was hired in 2006 by Dokken Engineering to develop preliminary feasibility sketches of two multi-lane roundabouts with small diameters along the SR 28 Corridor. Subsequently thereafter 2006, decisions were made to analyze only single lane modern roundabouts since the multi-lane roundabouts were considered by the jurisdiction infeasible due to a loss of parking spaces and cost of adjacent property acquisitions.

**2008 CAPACITY REVIEW & ANALYSES**

After obtaining and reviewing all of the pertinent information regarding the project and provided PM peak hour traffic volumes, a geometric analysis of the proposed roundabout at the intersection of SR 28 / Coon Street using the roundabout design software tool called RODEL (Roundabout Delay) was conducted. In most roundabout knowledgeable states nationwide, the RODEL software is the required analysis software and is considered superior to other software (such as SIDRA or Vissim) since it is based on an empirical analysis method and yields more accurate and consistent results over the entire spectrum of potential volumes and roundabout geometry. Caltrans has allowed both RODEL and SIDRA for the capacity analyses of modern roundabouts.

The RODEL calculations verify the initial recommended *number of entry lanes* and capacity requirements for the roundabout approaches based on the design year traffic volumes and the geometric design parameters of the intersection. In general, RODEL calculates the required geometry for the roundabout to function within the desired capacity or, as in this case, to determine if the proposed roundabout design or geometry of the roundabout will be adequate with respect to capacity and delay. Although only one set of volumes (2008 Summer PM Peak Hour) were requested as part of this capacity review, separate RODEL calculations were completed for the intersection location to review how the roundabout will operate under both 2008 peak hour traffic conditions.
conditions and slightly higher volumes using simple growth factors since this review occurs after a 2008 design year implementation.

In addition, separate RODEL calculations were also performed at an 85th percentile confidence level in order to:

(1) check the design to verify if the initial design parameters and conceptual layout would be adequate under the anticipated volumes and

(2) account for additional urban congestion such as pedestrians, parking, close driveway spacing, commercial structures close to the roadway, driver distractions of a narrow commercial corridor, resort town distractions, and other additional side friction or capacity reducing factors.

In addition, the traffic volumes did not indicate a typical bell curved peak hour, rather several hours of consistent peak hour volumes. Therefore, 100% of the peak hour volumes were assumed to already be present on the roadway before and after the peak hour analyses.

The ability to adjust the software’s analysis parameters (such as a higher percentile confidence level) is extremely useful and available within RODEL wherein other software only use the standard 50th percentile confidence level inherent in all capacity models. Typically, the 85th percentile confidence level is used and considered simply as a “design check” to ensure adequate capacity of the roundabout is available through both the lane configuration and the geometric values used in the design. However, under more urban conditions, this higher confidence level accounts for additional side friction factors. Some jurisdictions such as NYDOT require analyses to be only presented at the 85th percentile in more congested or urban areas. Hence, the capacity analyses conducted for this intersection (SR 28 / Coon Street) were completed at both a 50th and 85th percentile confidence levels.

Since roundabout designs have already been developed, RTE calculated and measured the geometric design parameters for the input into the RODEL software with respect to the following elements:

- Entry width (E) – limited to a single lane entry value
- Average Effective Flare Length (L') – as measured
- Half Width of the Roadway (V) – limited to a 12ft (3.66m) lane
- Entry radius (R) – as measured
- Entry angle (phi) – as measured
- Roundabout Diameter / ICD (D) – as measured
The geometric design parameters used in these analyses were measured from the most current design provided to RTE (see attached). Truck percentages were based on the provided Caltrans truck data at mile posts 9.34 and 11 on SR 28. Based on the established design criteria for the roundabout intersection analyses, the RODEL software program and roundabout engineering judgment, RTE determined the following capacity results for the single lane roundabout intersection at SR 28/Coon Street:

1. Based on the 2008 design year volumes and a standard 50th percentile confidence level, the single lane roundabout would function at an overall LOS “C” with 23.6 seconds of average delay occurring during the summer PM peak hour. The associated delays mostly occur in the EB and WB directions on SR 28 with queue lengths forming 250 to 375 feet eastbound and 150 to 175 feet westbound. Please refer to the attached Figure 1 for this scenario’s detailed results.

2. Based on the 2008 design year volumes and an 85th percentile confidence level, the single lane roundabout would function at an overall LOS “F” with 158.7 seconds of average delay occurring during the summer PM peak hour. The associated delays mostly occur in the EB and WB directions (both operating at LOS F) with queue lengths forming 2,200 to 3,225 feet (roughly ½ mile) eastbound and 1,125 to 1,475 feet (roughly ¼ mile) westbound. Please refer to the attached Figure 2 for this scenario’s detailed results.

The results of these analyses indicate a single lane roundabout would not be adequate for capacity purposes under 2008 conditions. Considering this “Urban Improvement Project” and urban conditions of the Kings Beach Corridor, the 85th percentile calculations are appropriate for the capacity analyses of this site.

Unfortunately, SIDRA underestimates the capacity needs of a roundabout at relatively lower volumes (such as in this case) and does not have the abilities to compensate for additional side friction or urban factors (such as pedestrians, parking, close driveway spacing, commercial structures close to the roadway, driver distractions of a narrow commercial corridor, resort town distractions, and other additional side friction or capacity reducing factors). Even with the 85th percentile calculations assumed as only a design check, the results clearly indicate the single lane roundabout is under-designed with respect to the geometric design and required lane configuration.

Taking into account the close proximity of another roundabout roughly 600 feet away, the capacity of each roundabout will be affected by the other’s limitations in capacity. In addition, reviewing the resulting queue lengths of this roundabout, it is clear the queues will “back up” or stack into the other roundabout at only 600 feet away. As each roundabout begins to queue, the capacity issue / degradation is compounded at the upstream roundabout and between roundabouts.
Based only on the capacity analyses, two lane approaches are recommended for the eastbound and westbound directions and single lane approaches northbound and southbound are needed at this roundabout. However, a partial multi-lane roundabout at this location has been evaluated and dropped from the viable alternatives list (as noted above) due to the lack of right-of-way to the south or impacts to adjacent properties in the southeast and southwest quadrants (as specified in the EIR). Ultimately, the final lane configuration of the intersection is determined at the discretion of the governing jurisdictions. This assumes all alternatives and constraints have been adequately analyzed and reported.

**2010+ CAPACITY REVIEW & ANALYSES**

The intersection was also analyzed under slightly higher volumes using simple growth factors since this review occurs in late 2009 and the 2008 design year assumes the project to be completed / built. Therefore, two additional scenarios are shown below first with a simple 5% increase in the traffic volumes and second increasing the volumes until the 50th percentile confidence level demonstrates failure, which occurred at a just over a 10% increase in 2008 design year volumes (85% percentile confidence level already demonstrates failure).

3. Increasing the 2008 design year volumes by only 5% and using a standard 50th percentile confidence level, the single lane roundabout would function at an overall LOS “D” with 36.9 seconds of average delay occurring during the summer PM peak hour. The associated delays mostly occur in the EB and WB directions on SR 28 with queue lengths forming 500 to 675 feet eastbound and 225 to 275 feet westbound. Please refer to the attached Figure 3 for this scenario’s detailed results.

4. Increasing the 2008 design year volumes by only 5% and using an 85th percentile confidence level, the single lane roundabout would function at an overall LOS “F” with 238.5 seconds of average delay occurring during the summer PM peak hour. The associated delays mostly occur in the EB and WB directions (both operating at LOS F with 5 to 11 minutes of delay EB and 3 to 7 minutes of delay WB) with queue lengths forming 3,350 to 4,925 feet (nearly 1 mile) eastbound and 1,925 to 2,750 feet (roughly ½ mile) westbound. Please refer to the attached Figure 4 for this scenario’s detailed results.

5. Increasing the 2008 design year volumes by 13% and using a 50th percentile confidence level, the single lane roundabout would function at an overall LOS “F” with 88.4 seconds of average delay occurring during the summer PM peak hour. The associated delays occur in the EB and WB directions with queue
lengths forming 1,450 to 2,050 feet eastbound and 575 to 750 feet westbound. Please refer to the attached Figure 5 for this scenario’s detailed results.

6. Increasing the 2008 design year volumes by 13% and using an 85th percentile confidence level, the single lane roundabout would function at an overall LOS “F” with 373.8 seconds of average delay occurring during the summer PM peak hour. The associated delays occur in the EB and WB directions (8 to 18 minutes of delay EB and 6 to 12 minutes of delay WB) with queue lengths forming 5,350 to 7,900 feet (1 to 1.5 miles) eastbound and 3,525 to 5,225 feet (roughly 2/3 to 1 mile) westbound. Please refer to the attached Figure 6 for this scenario’s detailed results.

As indicated above and in the attached RODEL output (Figures 3-6), the results of these analyses indicate a single lane roundabout would not be adequate for capacity purposes under more current 2010 traffic conditions (5% growth factor) with failing level of service during the 30th highest peak day assumptions. Furthermore, with slightly more than a 10% increase in traffic volumes, the intersections fall further into failure and create significantly long delays and lengths of stacked vehicles along SR 28 reaching over a mile in length.

RTE fully recognizes the obvious site constraints at this intersection and is not involved with this project’s decision process, local politics, right-of-way acquisitions, or rational for reducing the capacity of the existing SR 28 corridor. It should be noted herein, this is an objective 3rd party review of the capacity requirements and operations of the intersection.

If the roundabout was redesigned to allow more appropriate entry speeds of 25 miles per hour (opposed to 19 to 21 mph entry speeds), larger entry radii and smaller entry angles, the capacity of the roundabout could be improved and would extend the life of the single lane roundabout at least a few years. In addition to tight roundabout geometry creating capacity issues, RTE does not recommend truck aprons in the entry / approach of a modern roundabout wherein safety concerns apply. A larger roundabout diameter is recommended for larger trucks such as in this case with WB-67s or Caltrans design vehicles (FHWA Roundabout Guide recommends a 115 foot minimum diameter). In addition, the proposed roundabout design has extremely small entry radii at 17 and 18 meters (56 to 59 feet) which are not good values or recommended for a single lane roundabout. Most roundabout guides do not recommend a single lane entry to be less than around 70 feet. If possible, redesign of the conceptual layout is recommended to better accommodate trucks and speeds.

However, it should be noted this cursory review does not perform a full roundabout design review with complete recommendations, rather, only calculates the existing capacity of the potential roundabout design based on the provided volumes. The
provided roundabout design seems to be in preliminary form (not completed) and has not been verified by RTE to function adequately with respect to operational safety, proper speeds, proper truck capabilities, and other primary roundabout geometric parameters.

If this project proceeds further or if at any point during this project further design or peer review assistance is needed, RTE encourages the jurisdictions to allow RTE to either produce the roundabout designs and non-geometric design details with the project team or perform detailed peer reviews of the roundabouts to ensure these roundabouts will operate safely with more capacity and be implemented adequately in the field.

RTE hope this brief letter has provided you with all of the essential preliminary capacity information that was requested for this intersection. If you, the Kings Beach Business & Citizens Alliance, and/or the jurisdictions involved with this project (Placer County, TRPA, and Caltrans) have any questions or need anything further regarding this project or roundabouts in general, please feel free to contact me.

Respectfully Submitted,

Roundabouts & Traffic Engineering,

[Signature]
Scott E. Ritchie, P.E., President

Attachments: Capacity Analyses - RODEL Output

Figure 1: 2008 Summer Peak - 50th PCL
Figure 2: 2008 Summer Peak - 85th PCL
Figure 3: 2008 + 5% Grown Factor - 50th PCL
Figure 4: 2008 + 5% Grown Factor - 85th PCL
Figure 5: 2008 + 13% Grown Factor - 50th PCL
Figure 6: 2008 + 13% Grown Factor - 85th PCL
Preliminary Design Layout Used For Analyses
### Figure 1: 2008 Summer Peak (30th Highest) - 50th Percentile Confidence Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>16:11:09</th>
<th>SR 28 / Coon St. 2008, Kings Beach, CA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E (m)</td>
<td>4.33 4.33 8.37 4.33 4.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L' (m)</td>
<td>12.00 20.00 0.00 20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U (m)</td>
<td>3.66 3.66 3.66 3.66 3.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAD (m)</td>
<td>18.00 18.00 13.00 17.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHI (d)</td>
<td>21.00 22.00 31.00 31.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIA (m)</td>
<td>30.00 30.00 30.00 30.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAD SEP</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIME PERIOD</td>
<td>min 90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIME SLICE</td>
<td>min 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESULTS PERIOD</td>
<td>min 15.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIME COST</td>
<td>$/hr 15.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLOW PERIOD</td>
<td>min 15.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLOW TYPE</td>
<td>pcu/veh UEH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLOW PEAK</td>
<td>am/op/pm PM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEG NAME</th>
<th>PCU</th>
<th>TURNS (1st exit, 2nd...U)</th>
<th>FLOF CL</th>
<th>FLOW RATIO</th>
<th>FLOW TIME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coon St SB</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>87 27 78 0</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00 1.125 1.00</td>
<td>15 45 75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 28 EB</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>77 958 57 0</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00 1.125 1.00</td>
<td>15 45 75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coon St NB</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>42 7 32 0</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00 1.125 1.00</td>
<td>15 45 75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 28 WB</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>19 957 33 0</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00 1.125 1.00</td>
<td>15 45 75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Figure 2: 2008 Summer Peak (30th Highest) - 85th Percentile Confidence Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>16:11:09</th>
<th>SR 28 / Coon St. 2008, Kings Beach, CA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E (m)</td>
<td>4.33 4.33 8.37 4.33 4.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L' (m)</td>
<td>12.00 20.00 0.00 20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U (m)</td>
<td>3.66 3.66 3.66 3.66 3.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAD (m)</td>
<td>18.00 18.00 13.00 17.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHI (d)</td>
<td>21.00 22.00 31.00 31.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIA (m)</td>
<td>30.00 30.00 30.00 30.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAD SEP</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIME PERIOD</td>
<td>min 90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIME SLICE</td>
<td>min 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESULTS PERIOD</td>
<td>min 15.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIME COST</td>
<td>$/hr 15.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLOW PERIOD</td>
<td>min 15.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLOW TYPE</td>
<td>pcu/veh UEH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLOW PEAK</td>
<td>am/op/pm PM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEG NAME</th>
<th>PCU</th>
<th>TURNS (1st exit, 2nd...U)</th>
<th>FLOF CL</th>
<th>FLOW RATIO</th>
<th>FLOW TIME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coon St SB</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>87 27 78 0</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00 1.125 1.00</td>
<td>15 45 75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 28 EB</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>77 958 57 0</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00 1.125 1.00</td>
<td>15 45 75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coon St NB</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>42 7 32 0</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00 1.125 1.00</td>
<td>15 45 75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 28 WB</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>19 957 33 0</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00 1.125 1.00</td>
<td>15 45 75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FLOW</th>
<th>veh</th>
<th>AUEDEL s 23.6</th>
<th>LOS SIG C</th>
<th>LOS UNSIG C</th>
<th>VEHIC HRS 15.6</th>
<th>COST $ 234</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAPACITY</td>
<td>veh</td>
<td>685 1191 483 1174</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVE DELAY</td>
<td>secs</td>
<td>7.2 30.8 8.7 20.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAX DELAY</td>
<td>secs</td>
<td>8.1 42.6 9.9 25.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVE QUEUE</td>
<td>veh</td>
<td>0.4 9.9 0.2 5.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAX QUEUE</td>
<td>veh</td>
<td>0.4 12.7 0.2 7.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Figure 3: 2008 Summer Peak + 5% Growth Factor - 50th Percentile Confidence Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEG NAME</th>
<th>PCU</th>
<th>TURNS (1st exit, 2nd..U)</th>
<th>FLOF</th>
<th>CL</th>
<th>FLOW RATIO</th>
<th>FLOW TIME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coon St SB</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>E 87 27 78 0</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 28 EB</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>U 77 958 57 0</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coon St NB</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>L 42 7 32 0</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 28 WB</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>DIA 19 957 33 0</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.125</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4: 2008 Summer Peak + 5% Growth Factor - 85th Percentile Confidence Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEG NAME</th>
<th>PCU</th>
<th>TURNS (1st exit, 2nd..U)</th>
<th>FLOF</th>
<th>CL</th>
<th>FLOW RATIO</th>
<th>FLOW TIME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coon St SB</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>E 87 27 78 0</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 28 EB</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>U 77 958 57 0</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coon St NB</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>L 42 7 32 0</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 28 WB</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>DIA 19 957 33 0</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.125</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 5: 2008 Summer Peak + 13% Growth Factor – 50th Percentile Confidence Level

Figure 6: 2008 Summer Peak + 13% Growth Factor – 85th Percentile Confidence Level
TO: TRPA Governing Board c/o Judy Nikkel, Secretary

SUBJECT: Submittals for the January 27, 2010 Governing Board Packet re: (1) Certification of supplemental EIS for Kings Beach Project and (2) The Project Itself.

I am herewith submitting The following documents* as a private citizen who is a former TRPA Governing board member and is knowledgeable about the subject matter. Please include all of them in the packet. If there are any questions or problems please contact me right away by both phone and email. My cell phone number is 775-232-1076.

Best regards, JIM

*List of documents:
1. My letter to TRPA Governing Board dated 1/19/2010 opposing the project because of the proposed highway configuration. (1 page)
2. My letter to the TRPA Advisory Planning Commission dated 1/13/2010, with my comments on the inadequacy of the supplemental EIS regarding CO2 emissions, and the insufficiency of the present EIS package to support approval of the project with the proposed highway configuration. (2 pages)
3. Letter dated 1/15/2010 from Andy Goodrich of the 3 Washoe County Health District Air Quality Management Division re CO2 emissions. This letter states, among other things that that the EIS finding that increased Greenhouse gas emissions is "less than significant" is unsupported and therefore erroneous. (1 page)
4. Letter dated 11/10/2008 from Andy Goodrich of the Washoe County Health District Air Quality Management Division re the project EIS. (3 pages)
TRPA Governing Board
Stateline Nevada

I urge the TRPA Governing Board to vote NO on the highly controversial Kings Beach commercial core project that is back for reconsideration on Jan. 27. This project was previously denied in 2008, because it includes a “Three Lane Alternative,” which would narrow about one mile of highway from four traffic lanes to two, plus a center turn lane. That turn lane will be interrupted by two new single-lane roundabouts. At these new roundabouts pedestrians would cross “at-will,” so even a single person can stop traffic that is already struggling during summer peak hours. This project comes back to the Board essentially unchanged, except for the addition of a Traffic management Plan that fails to mitigate the most important concerns that caused denial of the project in 2008.

Based on the 2008 TRPA record and subsequent new information I believe that the “three lane” plan will greatly increase traffic congestion and delay, and thereby greatly impair emergency services -- especially in the event of fire. These unintended adverse effects are not limited to Kings Beach. They will impair the delivery of emergency assistance both to and from other nearby communities.

In 2008 I was a TRPA Governing board Member. In that year I voted NO on the project (which was denied) and NO on a subsequent motion (which passed) to allow reconsideration at some later date. I am presently even more strongly opposed to this project because I have become increasingly aware that human lives are at stake here -- in quantity. Imagine a major summer fire near Kings Beach during peak traffic. In such a situation consider how difficult it will be for fire and other emergency vehicles to navigate the congested and backed-up highway, then the crowded one-lane traffic circles, and finally the narrow side-streets already packed full with cut-through vehicle traffic. Imagine how difficult it will be to get assistance from other communities if, as identified by our Washoe County Sheriff, traffic could be backed up on SR 28 all the way through the Mt. Rose intersection.

There is a better alternative to this road narrowing that would still allow the rest of Kings Beach commercial core project to proceed with only minor adjustments. This is the “improved four-lane alternative” that was identified in the EIS, but which has so far been rejected by Placer County officials. Rather than make this change, they are asking you to make a finding of overriding consideration, that redevelopment both requires and justifies violation of TRPA’s own traffic standards. Unknowingly they are also asking you to override an even higher priority. Reducing the risks of catastrophic fire in the Tahoe Basin was officially adopted as the TRPA’s top priority in 2008.

Respectfully,

Jim Galloway

What is expressed above is the opinion of Jim Galloway and does not necessarily reflect the positions of Washoe County, TRPA, or any other persons or entities. Jim Galloway was the Washoe County Commissioner for District 1, which includes Incline Village and Crystal Bay from 1997 through 2008. During that time Jim also served as a member of the TRPA Governing Board.
I'm Jim Galloway. Many of you know me as a former long-term member of the Governing Board. In 2008 when I was still on that board, I voted against this project because of adverse traffic impacts of the proposed lane reduction on North Shore communities and residents and on the visiting public. These visitors consider Tahoe to be their lake as well, and they have paid hundreds of millions in tax money to preserve and improve the Tahoe environment. I don't regret my eventual vote against the project, but I do regret that in a previous vote I mistakenly voted to approve the project EIS. Since then I have been increasingly aware of various items not covered by that original EIS including some critical public safety issues involving emergency response and possible increased loss of life in the event of a major fire. I am increasingly aware that those issues were not adequately addressed by the EIS, and neither was the issue of increased carbon emissions. I am here entirely at my own initiative and expense to urge you not to make a similar mistake in your decision today.

I hope that you many important questions will be addressed, and answered, today. starting with this one for you and your legal counsel.

How thoroughly and in what manner is this body allowed to evaluate the supplemental EIS? Must you look at it narrowly? For instance, do legal blinders force you to assume that because the original EIS was approved in 2008 that all the data and conclusions in that document are accurate insofar as it goes.

Or are you allowed to look at the entire matter of project impacts in a broader more sensible way. In that case I believe that you must render an opinion as to whether or not the supplement, in combination with the prior EIS, properly addresses all the relevant impacts of the preferred alternative. These including the following impacts of Alternative 3:

1. Increased vehicle carbon emissions from the greater summer traffic delays predicted in the EIS as a result of this project. Example: If a vehicle in stop/start
traffic burns 1 gallon per hour then an average of 6000 vehicles per day operating under conditions of 10 minute additional delay will burn 1,000 extra gallons of gas per day or 90,000 extra gallons each summer season. Excess fuel consumption of this order of magnitude is certainly not negligible in terms of carbon emissions and I understand that quantification of these emissions is now a requirement of California law.

2. The impact of the additional delay and the loss of two lanes vehicle storage capacity caused by this project on traffic backup through key intersections.

3. The impact of having narrow Kings Beach streets already filled with cut-through traffic on emergency medical and fire response -- under typical summer conditions.

4. How much will the above described project impacts be increased in the event of a nearby major fire during the summer.

5. If such a fire called for an evacuation of Kings Beach neighborhoods under could that still be accomplished under these cut-through traffic summer conditions. If so, how much additional injury or loss to human life would result from the extra traffic congestion caused by this project.

6. Did the traffic models used in the EIS realistically consider all factors that can cause delay and congestion, such as pedestrians being able to cross at-will at the two roundabouts. If not, how much may the EIS have understated the delays and traffic backup and other related impacts that will result from this project.

I hope to hear all of these seriously relevant questions addressed today, along with questions that will undoubtedly be raised by others, including APC members.

If you should find, at the end of the day, that certain serious impacts have been ignored, or that they are inadequately or incorrectly assessed, in the EIS documents then it is both your legal and moral duty to advise the Governing board that this EIS supplement is inadequate.

Respectfully,

Jim Galloway

Past member of TRPA Governing Board
Past Washoe County Commissioner for District 1

What is expressed above is the sole opinion of Jim Galloway and does not necessarily reflect the positions of any other persons or entities, private or governmental.
January 15, 2010

Mr. Jim Galloway
Delivered via email

Dear Mr. Galloway,

I am writing this letter to clarify my assessment of the environmental documentation for the Kings Beach Commercial Core Improvement Project delivered to you on November 10, 2008.

My statements regarding the adequacy of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) were directed to the current applicable state and federal regulations for criteria air pollutants and not greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. It is my opinion the analysis of GHG emissions contained in the EIS is incomplete due to the fact that significant thresholds have not been established and therefore the finding of "less than significant" is unsupported and therefore erroneous.

As far as technology for controlling GHG emissions from petroleum-powered motor vehicles; controls have been implemented for NOx emissions, but nothing for the mitigation of carbon dioxide (CO2) emissions. There is considerable work being done on this front and two key strategies are 1) the development of a low-carbon fuel standard and 2) the reduction of fuel consumption through improved efficiency. I am not aware that either of these strategies, specific to the control of GHG emissions, has been fully implemented to date.

The Washoe County Health District – Air Quality Management Division is in process of developing a GHG emissions inventory for the county. To assist us in the development of that product we have obtained Clean Air Climate Protection (CACP) software, published in 2009 by the International Council for Local Environmental Initiatives (ICLEI). This software is also being utilized by the California Climate Registry, the Climate Registry (national), and the National Association of Clean Air Agencies. The emission factor provided in the software for gasoline motor vehicles is 19.412 pounds of carbon dioxide (CO2) per gallon of gasoline burned in an internal combustion motor vehicle.

Please let me know if I can be of further assistance,

Andrew Goodrich, Director
Air Quality Management Division
Washoe County District Health
PH: (775) 784-7213, FX: (775) 784-7225
November 10, 2008
Kings Beach Project

Dear Commissioner Galloway:

My staff and I have performed a relatively brief review of the voluminous final environmental documents (EA/EIR/EIS) posted on the Internet for the Kings Beach Commercial Core Improvement Project. In addition, we have contacted Mr. Tom Christofk, Placer County Air Pollution Control Officer; Mr. Gordon Shaw, Traffic Engineer - LSC Transportation Consultants Inc., Mr. Jeff Houk – Federal Highway Administration, and Ms. Jeanne McNamra with TRPA to discuss this project.

Below is my attempt to answer your questions regarding the project. I have divided my response into 3 sections – 1.) Air quality, 2.) Fuel consumption, and 3.) Greenhouse gas emissions and the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

Review of Air Quality Analysis

The final environmental documentation includes the environmental assessment (EA), Environmental Impact Report (EIR), and the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and appears to be thorough and in compliance with all state and federal applicable regulations. The environmental documentation for this proposed project, regardless of the chosen alternative, reports that state or federal air quality standards would not be violated. I concur with this analysis.

I do have one concern regarding the final environmental report. The Executive Summary of the Final EA/EIR/EIS document contains Table ES-2: Summary of Environmental Impacts-Proposed Action. The final section heading of that Table is “Climate Change” and the impact is listed as “Impact CC-1: Generation of Significant Levels of Greenhouse Gasses” with a rating of “LS” or less than significant. I believe it is erroneous to place a rating on this impact due to the fact that significant thresholds for greenhouse gas emissions have not yet been developed. I could not find any supporting documentation for this finding in any of the environmental reports. I discuss this issue further in this document under the greenhouse gas section.

Fuel consumption data

Fuel consumption or fuel economy data is relatively easy to find for a specific vehicle measured under a federal test procedure. A good example of this metric is the fuel economy labels required on all new vehicles. However establishing an average fuel consumption rate for a non-specific fleet in specific local conditions presents many challenges. There are many factors that greatly determine the fuel consumption of a motor vehicle, including: vehicle characteristics, environmental conditions, and fuel qualities.
November 10, 2008
Commissioner Jim Galloway
Kings Beach Project – page two

Through a personal communication with Jeff Houck of the Federal Highway Administration we were able to obtain the following data the FHWA utilizes for their transportation modeling needs. The data are for gasoline-powered vehicles only.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vehicle Speed (mph)</th>
<th>Miles per Gallon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>24.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fuel consumption for vehicle idling also has great variability. The only fleet average data I could obtain was published in an idling reduction brochure from the Environmental Defense Fund. The EDF states that an idling gasoline-powered vehicle consumes between 1/5 to 7/10 of a gallon per hour.

Specific data on vehicle delay through the proposed project area was not apparent in any of the documentation. However a personal communication with Gordon Shaw, Traffic Engineer with LSC Engineering Consultants revealed that under current conditions (listed as “no-build/Alt. 1” in the report) there is minimal to no delay on State Route 28. Section 3.6 of the report states an average speed of 30 mph (page 3.6 -15) for the year 2008 and an average speed of 15 mph in the year 2028.

Mr. Shaw’s estimation is that if a three-lane alternative is chosen, the capacity of the roadway will be exceeded and there will be traffic delays from 5 to 8 minutes per vehicle. He stated that the relatively short delay times were due to drivers diverting to local parallel side streets and because of this behavior it is difficult to quantify an exact time of delay. He said that the side streets have capacity to carry the additional traffic growth up to the 2028 time period so no additional delay is anticipated in the future years.

The length of the project, from Chipmunk Street to the intersection of SR267 is approximately 0.875 miles.
Greenhouse gas emissions and the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)

The California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006, otherwise known as AB32, is a monumental commitment by the state of California to reduce its greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions to 1990 levels by the year 2020. The law called for a list of early actions in 2007, mandatory reporting of emissions in 2008, a final scoping plan in 2009, and further actions until the goal is met in 2020.

Many strategies in the list of early actions are focused on the transportation sector with new vehicle and engine technologies and fuel conservation measures. Climate change impacts from roads and highways were not specifically addressed in these early actions. However, California law provides that climate change is an environmental effect subject to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Projects will need to be assessed for greenhouse gas emissions and if they exceed a significant threshold than those emissions will need to be mitigated. Currently the California Air Resources Board (CARB) is developing criteria for determining the significant threshold. The final adoption of significant threshold levels for greenhouse gases will not occur until sometime in 2009. Meanwhile road and highway projects may estimate the GHG impacts, but there is no requirement for any action at this time. I have attached a CARB document discussing the recommended approaches for setting those threshold levels.

Please let me know if I can be of any further assistance.

Sincerely,

Andy Goodrich

Andrew Goodrich, REM
Director
Air Quality Management Division
Washoe County Health District
PH: (775) 784-7213
FX: (775) 784-7225
From: James Galloway [mailto: james-galloway@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Tuesday, January 19, 2010 4:20 PM
To: Joanne Marchetta; Judy Nikkel
Subject: Protest on APC motion passed 1/13/10

Please include this protest email in the Governing Board Packet for the Kings Beech items on the Supplemental EIS and the Project itself.

On Jan 13, I submitted in writing to the APC members the following sample calculation, based on the lowest possible estimates from Placer County study traffic delay and predicted traffic counts subject to that delay. Because my time to speak was only a few minutes I encouraged the APC members to discuss this and ask relevant questions of me, TRPA staff, Placer County, etc.

*Increased vehicle carbon emissions from the greater summer traffic delays predicted in the EIS as a result of this project. Example: If a vehicle in stop/start traffic burns 1 gallon per hour then an average of 6000 vehicles per day operating under conditions of 10 minute additional delay will burn 1,000 extra gallons of gas per day or 90,000 extra gallons each summer season. Excess fuel consumption of this order of magnitude is certainly not negligible in terms of carbon emissions and I understand that quantification of these emissions is now a requirement of California law.*

What I presented clearly and credibly conflicts with the unsupported EIS conclusions that increased carbon emissions are not significant. Nevertheless, the APC asked no followup questions of anyone and did not even discuss this merits of this issue. Had I been given an opportunity, I could have shared supporting information I received from Washoe County Air Management Division. That supporting information is contained in one of two letters from the Washoe County Health district Air Quality Management Division. I had that letter in my possession on Jan 13 and I have now submitted it for the Jan. 27 Governing Board Packet.

My calculation showed that AT LEAST 90,000 additional gallons of gasoline will be burned each summer season as a consequence of the added delay caused by the highway lane reduction. I stated verbally that the additional CO2 emissions would be in the millions of pounds -- order of magnitude. You will see in the reference letter from Air Quality that for each gallon of gas burned there are 19.4 lbs of greenhouse gases (GHG) released into the air; so the total ADDITIONAL GHG per season is on the order of 1.7 MILLION POUNDS. In the absence of any standard cited in the EIS to show that this quantity is "not significant" the APC had a duty to advise you that the EIS was inadequate.

Given the events that I have described I hereby ask TRPA management and legal counsel to advise the Governing Board of this protest and to advise them whether or not the APC failed to give reasoned consideration to this matter. I submit that reasoned consideration was NOT given.

Sincerely,

Jim Galloway