

Mads Odom

From: Charles Sharpe [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, May 16, 2023 5:58 AM
To: Alex Stillman; Meredith Matthews; Kimberley White; COM DEV; Delo Freitas; Sarah Schaefer; Stacy Atkins-Salazar; Greg Sparks
Subject: NYTimes: The 100-Year-Old Reason U.S. Housing Is So Expensive

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

<https://www.nytimes.com/2023/04/14/opinion/housing-nimby-zoning.html?smid=nytcore-ios-share&referringSource=articleShare>
The 100-Year-Old Reason U.S. Housing Is So Expensive

It's Herbert Hoover's fault. In the early 1920s, as a reform-minded secretary of commerce, Hoover wanted to bring order to America's chaotic cities and towns, where a lack of controls on land use allowed grimy factories, livery stables and the like to spring up in residential neighborhoods. He convened a committee that drafted a model act encouraging state governments to authorize local governments to do something new: zoning.

Hoover's brainchild soon became a plague whose effects continue to be felt today. Local governments figured out that they could use zoning to achieve racial segregation. Suburbs adopted exclusionary zoning that prohibited the building of the least costly forms of housing, not just to keep out racial minorities, but also to boost local housing values and save on the costs of educating poor children. Localities lack incentives to take into account the impact of their policies on people who live elsewhere. Growth in the most economically vibrant regions, such as Silicon Valley, is constrained by a lack of housing for employees. People end up trapped in places with more affordable housing but no work.

This tale is well told by Robert Ellickson, a professor emeritus at Yale Law School, in his book "America's Frozen Neighborhoods: The Abuse of Zoning." It's a valuable contribution to the growing movement against NIMBYism: "Not in My Backyard." Although the book came out last year, I just got around to reading it, and I learned a lot, not just about Herbert Hoover.

Ellickson isn't against all zoning. He supports the preservation of open spaces and historic buildings, within reason, as well as keeping noxious activities away from homes. But it has gone too far.

The most important word in the book is "frozen." Ellickson quotes from the 1992 edition of Jane Jacobs's book, "The Death and Life of Great American Cities": "The purpose of zoning ... should not be to freeze conditions and uses as they stand. That would be death."

Yet that's what has happened, Ellickson writes. Once a neighborhood is zoned for single-family detached homes, it almost always stays that way, even when a city's growth makes

such low density inefficient. Los Angeles permits the building of only detached houses on 75 percent of its residentially zoned land; Chicago, 79 percent. First, those detached houses are built to last. Second, “the politics of local zoning almost invariably works to freeze land uses, especially in a neighborhood of detached houses,” he writes. “This is a significant finding, not yet part of urban lore. I chose the title of the book to emphasize it.”

It doesn’t have to be this way. France, “hardly a nation averse to regulation,” in 2014 prohibited its municipalities from setting minimum lot sizes for houses, Ellickson writes. Within the United States, he approvingly cites land-use rules in Texas, focusing on the northwestern portion of the capital, Austin. It matches up well with the other two places he analyzes: Silicon Valley and the environs of New Haven, Conn., the home of his university, Yale. Home prices aren’t as high in greater New Haven as in Silicon Valley, but that’s because job growth is weaker; zoning restrictions there are even tighter than they are in Silicon Valley, he writes.

Austin is a blue splotch of liberalism in a mostly red state. But Ellickson writes that being pro- or anti-zoning doesn’t line up neatly with political preference. Some liberals oppose increased housing density because they feel development harms the environment, or don’t want to reward “greedy” landlords. Others favor it because it lowers housing costs for the poor. And so on. (Read David Brooks’s Thursday [column](#) for more on the politics.)

People who choose to stay in Austin or move to the city are probably more likely than someone in a New Haven suburb to buy into the idea that higher density in cities is good, Ellickson writes. There are also institutional factors. In Texas, a central city can veto the incorporation of a nearby suburb. That prevents unincorporated areas from forming new cities with restrictive zoning, which happened in Silicon Valley. And school district boundaries don’t follow city lines, so loosening zoning doesn’t automatically raise costs by causing an influx of low-income students to the schools.

Ellickson praises the Biden administration for trying to weaken exclusionary zoning. This week, the Department of Housing and Urban Development [announced](#) \$98 million in grants to jurisdictions that remove barriers to affordable housing developments. It’s also offering \$10 million to support local planning efforts. Ellickson also cites the Harvard economist Edward Glaeser, who has [suggested](#) that the federal government could tie highway grants to the level of housing construction in high-demand areas.

But Ellickson argues that given the U.S. tradition of strong states’ rights, the states will have to play a bigger role than the federal government in breaking down local zoning restrictions. Most states have the power to pre-empt local zoning laws, he notes.

Ellickson cites economic research by a variety of scholars, including The Times’s own Paul Krugman, showing that bigger cities are more productive. Even apart from fairness considerations, that alone is a strong argument for breaking down exclusionary zoning that suppresses growth.

Mads Odom

From: Fred [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, May 15, 2023 3:25 PM
To: David Caisse; David Loya; Scott Davies; Dan Tangney; Judith Mayer; Peter Lehman; Matthew Simmons; Joel Yodowitz
Subject: from Fred Weis: May 16, 2023 Transportation Safety Committee, forwarded to the Planning Commission
Attachments: TransSafeCom - 2023-05-16 May 16 Fred Weis letter.pdf

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

To: Planning Commissioners, Transportation Safety Committee members, David Loya, David Caisse BCC to Dave Ryan, TSC Chair
From: Fred Weis
Subject: Circulation Element, L Street - K Street Couplet, Issues with Planning Commission recommendations, Issues with improper summary of TSC recommendations, More.
For discussion at the May 16, 2023, Transportation Safety Committee

As a Gateway-oriented document, this should be included with the Gateway documents received. There is nothing in this document that needs to be redacted.

Note to the Planning Commissioners: This message is not specifically directed to the Commission. You may wish to look at the Contents and see if there is anything here for you. "Recent actions of the Planning Commission" might be of interest, particularly the inclusion of an entire paragraph when Commissioner Simmons was only talking about Level of Service.

This document was intended to be handed to the Transportation Safety Committee members at their meeting on March 21, 2023, and then again at their April 18, 2023 meeting. Both of those meetings were cancelled. The original March 21 document has been added to and edited for distribution at the May 16, 2023 meeting.

All links in this document and much more can be found via your "TSC" page at: arcata1.com/tsc

Contents

Note: Not in order of importance

1. Recent actions of the Planning Commission
2. Minutes of the February 21, 2023 meeting – small corrections needed
3. Quote from Wendy Ring, from the January 17, 2023 TSC meeting.
4. Discussion on the inaccurate summaries created by staff of the Transportation Safety Committee's recommendations on the L Street – K Street couplet

5. Discussion of the “L Street – K Street Couple” sections from the General Plan Circulation Element and the Gateway Mobility Chapter

This is the discussion for the May 16, 2023 meeting. See also Appendix A, toward the end of this document.

6. Parking Discussion
7. From the document: “Other Considerations Gateway Draft 2-1-23 Posted” that purportedly shows the Transportation Safety Committee’s recommendations
8. Transcriptions from previous meetings on the L Street - K Street couplet situation

Appendix A: Draft Circulation Element: Instances of the L Street – K Street Couple

For discussion at the May 16, 2023 meeting

1. Recent actions of the Planning Commission

At the April 11 meeting of the Planning Commission:

- The Commission proposed to **eliminate parking on both sides of K Street**. There would then be **sufficient room for wider sidewalks and protected bike lanes**. This, along with bulb-outs for pedestrian crossing and introducing more stop signs on K Street, might make **K Street be adequate for traffic and safer for pedestrians and cyclists**, and possibly also have a left-turn lane when desired. Further, it was noted that **the Gateway Plan did not have to be adopted for these changes to take place** – that is, this could be started immediately, and further yet that **many improvements could be made with paint** (i.e. not concrete or road work required).
- The Commission made a motion to view the L -K Street Couplet as an **option** (one of perhaps several options). At the direction of David Loya, this motion was altered to have the couplet be a **recommendation**. This was a substantial change from the original motion of it being an option. There are two articles on the Arcata1.com website about this – links also on your arcata1.com/tsc page.

The Planning Commission’s “Compiled Comments” now include the following (highlighting added):

- 25) With regard to the Gateway Area, within the Circulation Element: The draft’s “Proposed Circulation Network” section addresses street and circulation changes City staff now propose in the draft Gateway Area Plan. Current language is “Additionally, implementation of mobility improvements within the Gateway Area Plan, including the “K” and “L” Streets couplets, and the 8th and 9th Street couplets extension, will alleviate traffic congestion within the Gateway and will ensure all transportation modes remain comfortable, convenient, safe, and attractive ...” **However, significant disagreement among Arcatans, is far from resolved, especially about the proposed K/L Street one-way couplet.**

At the May 9, 2023 Planning Commission (about 2:00:34 on the YouTube video, about 2:00:15 on the City video), there is a discussion from Commissioner Simmons about removing Level of Service (LOS) from the language of Arcatans the Circulation Element. A proposal was incorporated as what the Planning Commission wanted. Unfortunately this paragraph included reference to this: “K” and “L” Streets couplets – and the entire paragraph was included in “green” as what the Planning Commission was recommending. **In reality, it was**

just the LOS comments, but it has the appearance of having the entire paragraph be recommended – which was NOT the case. The paragraph that appears to be recommended includes:

At the US 101/Sunset Avenue interchange, the City is currently undergoing the Project Approval and 7 Environmental Document (PA&ED) phase of the interchange improvement, which proposes to install two roundabouts at the interchange including pedestrian and bicycle facilities. Additionally, implementation of the mobility improvements within the Gateway Area Plan, **including the “K” and “L” Streets couplets**, and the 8th and 9th Street couplets extension, will alleviate traffic congestion within the Gateway and will ensure all transportation modes remain comfortable, convenient, safe, and attractive to residents, workers, students, and visitors.

Note to Director Loya and the Planning Commission: Please correct this inadvertent green highlighting, as it gives the appearance that the Commission approved this – which they did not.

2. Revision of the February 21, 2023 minutes – small corrections

1. The minutes show Dave Ryan as absent. The audio recording indicates that Dave Ryan was present.
2. The minutes currently show:

PRESENT: Cashman, Wolf, Johnson, Ring, Straka, Serna, Caisse, Loya

It is suggested that this be modified to include first names and to show which people are on the Committee and which are Staff. As:

PRESENT, Transportation Safety Committee: Dave Ryan, Sue Cashman, Josh Wolf,
Korina Johnson, Wendy Ring, Mishka Straka, Genevieve Serna.

PRESENT, Staff: David Caisse, David Loya

3. Items VI and VII were reversed. In the minutes, Item VI should be listed as:

New Business A. Discussion of TSC Goal(s) for FY 23/24

Item VII should be:

2045 Arcata General Plan: Transportation Element (Continued)

1. Circulation Element

3. Quote from Wendy Ring, from the January 17, 2023 TSC meeting

This was brought up at the February 21 meeting also.

“That's a question is sort of, I mean, along the same lines as -- **We took a position on the L Street couplet, and it doesn't seem to have made any difference.** So I am wondering, I mean, we could do a lot of work and try to rewrite this Circulation Element. Does it make any difference? How can someone educate me about the process? What happens to our input? How does the decision get made? I'm sorry, I don't know.”

4. Discussion on the inaccurate summaries created by staff of the Transportation Safety Committee's recommendations on the L Street – K Street couplet

This is covered in detail in a separate document, also [intended to be] passed out at the March 21, 2023 TSC meeting.

5. Discussion of the “L Street – K Street Couplet” sections from the General Plan Circulation Element and the Gateway Mobility Chapter

One option is to remove all figures and references to the L Street – K Street Couplet.

Another is to insert a clause – **in each and every instance** – along the lines of:

The L Street – K Street Couplet is shown here as one of several possible scenarios for handling current levels and proposed future levels of traffic in this area. Other alternatives will be developed and displayed prior to the next release of the Draft Plan, in June-July 2023. The Transportation Safety Committee has recommended that “L Street” not be a through road. The Transportation Safety Committee has recommended the removal of L Street from consideration as a traffic-carrying roadway and instead promotes the designation of the L Street Corridor as a linear park.

In my view, to continue to include these diagrams a *fait accompli* is a very poor management decision on the part of staff.

(**Fait accompli:** A thing that has already happened or been decided before those affected hear about it, leaving them with no option but to accept it.)

For details of the instances where the “Couplet” is mentioned, see Appendix A.

6. Parking Discussion

Please see the articles on Arcata1.com:

Getting rid of parking in Arcata: A social engineering experiment

<https://arcata1.com/getting-rid-of-parking-in-arcata-a-social-engineering-experiment/>

Gateway Street Parking: Why it will be inadequate

<https://arcata1.com/gateway-street-parking-why-it-will-be-inadequate/>

In the October 2022 Draft Gateway Plan, the word “parking” appears 21 times in the Mobility Chapter. In the 52 pages of the Draft Circulation Element of the General Plan, the word “parking” appears 70 times. Parking is important. It is my view that an entire TSC meeting could be devoted to parking.

The Committee should be aware:

The Draft Gateway Plan states the following:

[NOTE: These policies have seen new recommendations from the Planning Commission since this was written. See the current “General Plan Update Discussion Guide” that is found on the SIRP Engagement page, under “Engagement Calendar” at: <https://www.cityofarcata.org/940/Engagement-Information>

1. “Provide an **adequate** supply of parking.” (Policy T-6)

“Ensure that new development provides an **adequate but not excessive** supply of parking.”

“Addressing the cost and complexity of planning, designing, and constructing new infrastructure, including a transportation system that serves everyone across all modes of transportation, **while also supplying sufficient parking spaces.**”

“Reconfiguring the street network **also provides opportunities to increase the quantity and quality of on-street parking.**”

2. The Gateway Plan shows a minimum number of parking spaces required by a housing development or a commercial space. That minimum is Zero – that is, buildings can be put up with NO parking.

There is also a MAXIMUM. For the main sections (Hub and Corridor) of the Gateway area, the maximum quantity of parking is 0.25 parking spaces per unit of housing, and a maximum of 1 per 1,000 sq.ft. of commercial space.

Putting this into perspective:

- a. **100 studio and one-bedroom apartments**, with an average size of 400 square feet. This would be a building about the size of Sorrel Place. Potentially there'd be around 150 adult-age people living there. **There could be zero parking there.** Or there would be a **MAXIMUM of 25 spaces** for the 100 apartments.

That's 25 spaces for 150 adult-age people. That is **one parking space for every six tenants.**

- b. A building with **20 two-bedroom apartments** — conceivably over **40 people** of driving age living there. Again, there could be no parking at all. There would be a **MAXIMUM of just 5 parking spaces** allowed by this code. That is **one parking space for every eight tenants.**

- c. **A restaurant.** Let's say the size of Dead Reckoning, on J Street, or the Sushi Spot, or Campground on 9th Street, or Japhy's in Northtown. A restaurant in a 1,000 square foot space might have seats for 35 or 40 diners and require a staff of six. **That restaurant could be built with no parking at all. Or it could have a MAXIMUM of ONE space.** (The code maximum is 1 space per 1,000 square feet.)

3. The diagrams shown in the Draft Gateway Plan show an amount of parking that will not occur, in reality. The diagrams are “high level” and do not show the necessary practicalities of driveway cutouts and many business entrances.

Here is one example: On K Street between 8th and 9th there are about **16 parking spaces currently**. If the parking layout as proposed in the Draft Plan were put in place, **there would be 2 spaces.**

Here is another, in the block between 8th & 9th Streets, between K and L Streets

	Currently	In the Draft Plan	If the plan is enacted, spaces in reality	Parking Spaces Lost
9th Street	17	13	4	13
K Street	16	6	2	14
8th Street	15	9	5	10
Totals:	48	28 shown currently in the Draft Plan	11 in reality	27 parking spaces lost

Instead of the 48 current spaces, there would be 11.
Those 11 spaces amount to just 23% of what is there now.

7. From the document:

“Other Considerations Gateway Draft 2-1-23 Posted” that purportedly shows the Transportation Safety Committee’s recommendations

This document is said to contain considerations from the public and from community members that are not in agreement with the Draft Gateway Plan.

Chapter 7: Mobility

L Street

Recommendation: Maintain current configuration; remove concept of L Street as an arterial couplet with K Street from figures.

Source: TSC

Policy Implications / Staff Recommendation:

Direct conflict with plan as drafted. On PC list of concerns and alternatives will be presented with opportunity to discuss.

My opinion: (This is Fred Weis communicating to the Transportation Safety Committee)

I say that this statement, with regard to L Street, is not an accurate representation of what the TSC has very strongly voice.

Your recommendation is NOT: “Maintain current configuration”

Rather, it is: **Create an L Street Linear Park.**

Your recommendation is NOT: “remove concept of L Street as an arterial couplet with K Street from figures.”

Your goal is not to remove the drawings that are in the plan. Your goal is to see one or more alternate

plans for K Street. To replace what is in the Draft Plan with a working, viable street design for K Street. Or recommend that the City recognize that K Street, properly configured, can handle expected vehicular traffic.

8. Transcriptions from previous meetings on the L Street - K Street couplet situation

From the Transportation Safety Committee meeting,
January 17, 2023

The transcription is intended to be accurate, but may contain minor errors.

Fred Weis 55:52 on the audio track

In terms of the L Street - K Street couplet -- I've been following you and what you're doing. It seems like you've been extremely clear on this. I don't know what is needed. As Patricia [Cambianica] mentioned, there's a second draft [of the Gateway Plan] that came out on [October] 1, but it only includes things that -- the word is "comport" -- with the original draft. So it doesn't include your findings about the L Street - K Street couplet. In this draft of the 2045 General Plan, I counted seven instances that referred to the L Street - K Street couplet. If it's helpful to any of you, I've got the page numbers. It can be in there, if it's worded in a different way. Worded as one of the considerations rather than stating it as a fact, as something that's done. This is a small item, but important: When you do your revisions and inserts, amendments is up to this, I would strongly request that you label, if you're going to have them as individuals, that use all three initials of your name, not just two initials, and then you do TSC, dash, ABC (the initials of your name). Because some of the Committees only use two initials, they don't identify the Committee. And it's difficult for the reader.

In terms of the L Street - K Street couplet, if I can support you on that, please ask anything. You may know my website, Arcata1.com There are about six articles about the L Street - K Street couplet. I have videos and transcriptions from meetings and quotes. As far as I know, you requested an alternative plan back in January [2022]. And then again, I think in May or June [2022]. No alternative has ever been offered. As Patricia mentioned, the depiction that exists does not provide adequate room for an emergency vehicle. Todd Tregenza of GHD gave a talk, a presentation during the [City Council / Planning Commission] joint study session. It was about 12 minutes long. His video and slides are on Arcata1.com along with my critique. I think that he's just flat out wrong in many many cases, including there being no room for emergency vehicles.

Otherwise, I just keep repeating what Jim and Patricia have said. That in an ideal world, this L Street - K Street couplet would be done [that is: A decision would be made] and complete before the General Plan, before any of this stuff was done. But that doesn't seem to be the case. The reason why it's important to me, aside from the thinking that it's an ideal location for a Linear Park, is that the codes for the Form-Based Code -- for the creation of building heights, building styles, building massing -- will be very different if L Street is a thoroughfare or if it's a linear park, as linear park buildings will likely be two stories high next to it, so you get adequate sunlight. If it's a thoroughfare, they could be four or five or six stories, say four or five stories. So this is a very different situation. And I've been hammering on the Planning Commission and the City Council that

this is a decision that needs to be made before other decisions. So now you're confronting it again with this General Plan update. So thanks again. And, again, my website is there, with maps. I made it to make things easier for everybody. If there's something that you can suggest that would make things easier for you, or for anything you think of, please contact me.

Wendy Ring 1:00:12 on the audio track

That's a question is sort of, I mean, along the same lines as -- **We took a position on the L Street couplet, and it doesn't seem to have made any difference.** So I am wondering, I mean, we could do a lot of work and try to rewrite this Circulation Element. Does it make any difference? How can someone educate me about the process? What happens to our input? How does the decision get made? I'm sorry, I don't know.

Dave Ryan 1:00:53 on the audio track

I'm going to surmise that, since all we can do is make recommendations to the City Council. And they're also getting input from a lot of other sources, whether it's the public or whether it's staff or whether it's their consultants, that, I guess they can take it or leave it based on their own personal positions and maybe weighing that other input in deciding what. So yeah, I hear you. I didn't know there was a second draft out, even though I'm kind of on the email list of when their meetings and things like that I have not seen the second draft of the gateway. Did you see that?

Wendy Ring 1:01:40 on the audio track

I guess I'm asking about this part of the General Plan that we're working on. And then my other question about it was if there hasn't been community input, because, you know, COVID changed a lot of things about that, if there hasn't really been kind of robust community input about the Transportation Element, is that something that our Committee could sponsor?

Dave Ryan 1:02:02 on the audio track

Some kind of a workshop? Yeah, maybe we can, we can recommend it to City Council that, you know, that this deserves something more than just us. **That maybe it's something that involves a representative or two from the TSC, along with creating an ad-hoc committee of public members, workshops, this thing.** So to me, if you're getting a sense, which I think is somewhat justifiable at this point, that they may just take what we say and "Ah, well, that's what they said" and we'll move on, then. Maybe we need something that suggests a separate committee. And that's a little bit what I was getting at when I kind of early on find out how much or you know -- this is important. It's not going to be done against supposedly, until 2045.

Twenty years ago, it seemed like it was heavy public involvement, and not just three minutes standing at a lectern-involvement. It's like getting a chance to have big maps, and back and forth. And not following parliamentary procedures, et cetera. It's, you're doing the job. So I think that's a recommendation we could make to come out of this. I would certainly support that. That idea and concept.

From the minutes of the October 18, 2022 meeting:

Gateway Plan Update: Transportation and Circulation Element--L Street Couplet Discussion Staff Member David Caisse opened up the discussion asking the TSC Members if they wanted to further discuss the Gateway Project or if the TSC is satisfied with their original submitted recommendation. Dave Ryan commented that he attended the City Council meeting where the Council read the TSC recommendation on the Gateway Project. **He went on to say that he mentioned the time that the TSC has studied the project, the discussion that has taken place, and listening to public comment. He suggested to the Council that if they needed more information, they can view the YouTube videos of past TSC meetings.** Discussion followed with TSC Members agreeing to leave the TSC's recommendation to the Council as is. non-warrantable condo financing

From the minutes of the January 17, 2023 meeting:

A. For Discussion: 2045 Arcata General Plan Draft Circulation Element

Lots of discussion about the L street couplet with mention that the TSC Committee is not in favor of the L Street couplet.

Appendix A:

Draft Circulation Element:

Instances of the L Street – K Street Couplet

Request: REMOVE all instances of “L Street – K Street Couplet” from the Circulation Element

This was stated above:

One option is to remove all figures and references to the L Street – K Street Couplet.

Another is to insert a clause – **in each and every instance** – along the lines of:

The L Street – K Street Couplet is shown here as one of several possible scenarios for handling current levels and proposed future levels of traffic in this area. Other alternatives will be developed and displayed prior to the next release of the Draft Plan, in June-July 2023. The Transportation Safety Committee has recommended that “L Street” not be a through road. The Transportation Safety Committee has recommended the removal of L Street from consideration as a traffic-carrying roadway and instead promotes the designation of the L Street Corridor as a linear park.

In my view, to continue to include these diagrams a *fait accompli* is a very poor management decision on the part of staff.99999999

(Fait accompli: A thing that has already happened or been decided before those affected hear about it, leaving them with no option but to accept it.)

Examples of the phrase “L Street – K Street Couplet” or references to it:

Page 21 in the packet Page 2-50 in the Draft Circulation Element

Additionally, implementation of the mobility improvements within the Gateway Area Plan, including the "K" and "L" Streets couplets, and the 8th and 9th Street couplets extension, will alleviate traffic congestion within the Gateway and will ensure all transportation modes remain comfortable, convenient, safe, and attractive to residents, workers, students, and visitors.

Page 22 Page 2-51 in the Draft Circulation Element

K Street & L Street One-Way Couplets Redesign "K" and "L" Streets to be one-way couplets south of 14th Street. Traffic Signal coordination at Samoa Boulevard....

Page 23 Page 2-52 in the Draft Circulation Element

Figure T-k "General Plan Vehicular Circulation" shows L Street as the one-way southbound

Page 24 Page 2-53 in the Draft Circulation Element

As part of the Gateway Area Plan, the City is exploring mobility concepts and proposing circulation patterns to convert two-way streets into one-way couplets on K Street, L street, 8th Street and 9th Street (continuation west of I Street).

Changing K Street to a one-way couplet maintains a travel lane and parking but would then allow the street to be upgraded with a Class IV facility through implementation of the Gateway Area Plan.

Page 45 Appendix T-A in the Draft Circulation Element

Existing and Projected Traffic Volumes

The traffic model run also included the proposed circulation network improvements identified in the Gateway Area Plan, including conversion of "K" and "L" Streets to one-way couplets between Alliance and Samoa Boulevard.

Also: "Traffic Volumes" states: "The largest percent increases in daily traffic volumes is on Samoa Boulevard west of "K" Street are on Alliance Road, "K" Street, "L" Street, and 11th Street." **This is a false statement.**

There is no through traffic volume on L Street. (The sentence also needs a grammatical correction.)

Page 49 Appendix T-A in the Draft Circulation Element Table T-3

K St & 11th St (one-way couplet)

K St & 9th St (one-way couplet)

K St & 8th St (one-way couplet)

Mads Odom

From: Colin Fiske [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, May 19, 2023 1:19 PM
To: Peter Lehman; Scott Davies; cfigueroa@cityofarcata.org; Judith Mayer; Dan Tangney; Matthew Simmons; Joel Yodowitz
Cc: David Loya
Subject: Open Streets & Upzoning

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

Commissioners,

Regarding the draft Design Element you'll be reviewing at next Tuesday's meeting, CRTP requests that you keep in mind in your deliberations the impact of design policies on the city's ability to both allow and encourage economically feasible, dense, mixed-use, walkable and transit-oriented development.

We also specifically call your attention to Policy D-2b, which as currently written commits the city to maintaining vehicle access on all downtown streets ("shall include amenities...while maintaining vehicle access"). This appears to preclude any future car-free or "open" streets being implemented in the future. CRTP has long supported open streets on some of the Plaza-fronting rights-of-way and other downtown streets, and we believe that this broadly popular idea should not be foreclosed by a General Plan policy.

Finally, regarding the proposed Land Use map changes which you may also review on Tuesday, we reiterate our support for upzoning low-density neighborhoods, particularly those near major activity centers such as downtown, Cal Poly Humboldt, and Valley West, in order to allow the development of more walkable, transit-oriented housing.

Thank you.

--
Colin Fiske (he/him)
Executive Director
Coalition for Responsible Transportation Priorities
www.transportationpriorities.org