

Continued February 24, 1982

**CONSIDER IMPROVE-
MENT PLANS FOR
DOWNTOWN TRAFFIC
CIRCULATION:
SPECIFICALLY
ONE-WAY STREETS
ON OAK AND
WALNUT STREET**

The matter was introduced by Staff, Mr. Harry Tow of Quad Consultants then addressed the Council stating that "with respect to the streets under discussion, the original report which was prepared for CLIC and submitted to the City Council, included as a minor component of the proposal, the recommendation that the traffic on Oak and Walnut be one-way east and west.

East on Oak Street and west on Walnut and that proposal was to go from Sacramento Street to Pleasant. Since the time of the original report the westerly boundary of the proposed assessment district and the improvements which would be included in that assessment district have been modified to stop one block further east at Church Street. The original rationale for the one-way street pattern was two-fold. One, the improvement in circulation because of the facts that you have less conflict at intersections, you have a traffic flow pattern which permits ready circulation at the bottom end of the proposed parking area; and secondly, because you would pick up a good deal of additional diagonal parking. --- You are now looking at a project which in its reduced form has lost some of the impetus for the one-way street pattern, since you will pick up less than a score of additional parking spaces because of the number of driveways involved between Church Street and Sacramento Street. We would indicate to you that if the reduced area involved in terms of only a two block length makes it still desirable from a traffic and parking standpoint to undertake the one-way street pattern, there are inevitably some inconveniences and dislocations involved in terms of businesses located on one-way streets which feel that their business, because of its peculiar nature in terms of either service or service to its customers, would prefer not to have the one-way street pattern, it is not essential or vital to the project as a whole that that pattern would be maintained. It is a minor component of the overall downtown program and one which the Council should have some leeway and some consideration for". Mr. Tow concluded his remarks by stating "that the Council should weigh the advantages and disadvantages and make that decision without fear of having done mortal damage one way or the other or having done marvelous things for one-way or the other, the project as a whole".

A very lengthy discussion followed with questions being directed to Mr. Tow by the Council.

Mr. Walter Sanborn, Chairman of the CLIC Committee then addressed the Council stating that the CLIC Committee will not object to those streets remaining two-way streets as they now are, because in talking with people and merchants, they have given "us" some good points. Mr. Sanborn concluded his remarks by stating that "We recommend you leave it like it is."

Continued February 24, 1982

The following persons spoke in opposition of establishing one-way streets on Oak and Walnut Streets in the City of Lodi:

- a) Ron Mettler, Manager, First Interstate Bank, Walnut and School
- b) Mr. Larry Mallory, 2216 Cabrillo Circle, Lodi
- c) Mr. John Oschner representing the Senior Citizens.
- d) Mr. Bob Gray, Manager of the Bank of Stockton
- e) Mr. James Flaherty, Secretary of the Eagles Lodge
- f) Terry Knutson, representing five pieces of property in the downtown business district
- g) Mr. Reo Nathan, owner operator of Reo's Appliance Center on Oak Street
- h) Mr. Stanley Hust, owner of Hust and Son Plumbing, School Street
- i) Bob Rivers, President of Senior Citizens Club in Lodi
- j) Bill Canepa, 131 South Orange Street, Lodi
- k) Dale Prohaska, owner of the Montgomery Ward Catalog Office, Lodi
- l) Barbara McWilliams, partner in Poser's TV and Radio
- m) Richard Linton, Central Valley Trophy
- n) Frank Poser
- o) Neal Koch, 805 Wightman, Lodi
- p) Betty Blewett Smith, Blewett Ice Cream

City Clerk Reimche Reported that three letters opposing the one way streets (Oak and Walnut) were received from:

- 1) Mr. Blewett
- 2) Judy Van Rooyam, and
- 3) Elizabeth Emery

A very lengthy discussion followed with questions being directed to Staff, Mr. Tow, Sanborn, and to various individuals heretofore listed who had given testimony.

Councilman Katnich then moved that "we maintain what we have in the downtown and make no change at this time - that we let downtown remain exactly as it is with two-way traffic on School Street, Church and all of the streets that are involved." The motion was seconded by Mayor Pro Tempore Murphy, and following additional discussion carried by unanimous vote.

Following discussion, Councilman Katnich then moved that School Street remain as it is right now, with two-way traffic. The motion was seconded by Mayor Pro Tempore Murphy and carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen - Hughes, Katnich, Murphy, and McCarty

Noes: Councilmen - Pinkerton

Councilman Hughes indicated that "as you know I was concerned about authorizing the engineering portion of this project until we dealt with this issue, and certainly the change in School Street is going to have a major impact on that plan, good or bad, but it's going to have a major impact. Councilman Hughes indicated that he has been concerned all along that the City not obligate itself to approximately \$50,000 to pursue this study through the protest hearing, because, he indicated, he is afraid that we might not have a project at the end of that period, and there's \$50,000 of City money down the drain." Councilman Hughes then moved that "we" not issue the Contract to Tow Engineering until we've had a chance to further evaluate the CLIC position and that "we" come back and decide whether, in fact, the City is willing to foot the bill for that 90 days study.

The motion was seconded by Councilman Katnich. A very lengthy discussion followed with questions being directed to Staff and to persons who had earlier given testimony. The motion carried by unanimous vote.

Again, lengthy discussion followed with Councilman Hughes, Mayor Pro Tempore Murphy and Mayor McCarty volunteering an evening for a special meeting just to serve as a forum and have everybody come down and discuss the subject, to find out what is acceptable and what isn't and what the pros and cons of the whole thing are.

Mayor Pro Tempore Murphy then asked to have the record show that he would like to change his vote on the direction of School Street to a "no" vote, because he did not want to see this killed if at all possible and that he would like to have the pros and cons try to get together to work something out, because he thinks it can be.

A full transcript of this hearing is on file in the office of the City Clerk.