



CITY OF SACRAMENTO

1

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS
915 I STREET SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95814
CITY HALL ROOM 207 TELEPHONE (916) 449-5281

M. H. JOHNSON
Director

March 13, 1985

Transportation and Community Development Committee

Honorable Members in Session:

SUBJECT: Cleaning of City Streets

SUMMARY

This report informs the Transportation and Community Development Committee of two downtown leaf fall garden refuse collection projects and Public Works' analysis of possible added street sweeping and the implementation of prohibitive parking.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Public Works managers, specifically Parking and Solid Waste, have analyzed and, where economically and logistically feasible, implemented programs to enhance the cleanliness of City streets. The programs include:

A. Sunday Central City Street Cleaning

The 1984-85 Budget authorized the implementation of two projects designed to facilitate the collection of garden refuse and street sweeping in the downtown area.

The initial project was designed as a public awareness program. The Public Information Officer designed a mailer that informed commercial property owners that they could subscribe to the garden refuse collection service for a limited period, the 3 - 4 months of leaf fall season. This mailer was sent to all central city business and property owners prior to the 1984 leaf fall season.

The second project was a Sunday garden refuse collection in an area from 21st Street to 5th Street and from E Street to R Street. Previous studies had indicated this area as one which had the most on street parking for any 24-hour period, and this was the area where City crews had the least access to curbs and gutters to either remove leaves and/or sweep streets. These studies had also indicated that Sunday between 8:00 A.M. and 1:00 P.M. was the period with least on street parking and therefore provided crews with the greatest access to the curbs and gutters. Thus, this second project

resulted in the rescheduling of two garden refuse collection crews and a motor sweeper to work in the area on Sunday rather than on Monday. This rescheduling to a Sunday collection in downtown was only for the three month period of leaf fall season.

The Sunday project, as implemented, provided the greatest crew access for garden refuse collection and street sweeping with the least inconvenience to the area's residents. It is staff's opinion that this program can be improved; however, the program was vastly superior to our standard leaf fall garden refuse collection and street sweeping in downtown.

B. Prohibitive Parking for Sanitation Services

Public Works does not recommend prohibitive parking for sanitation services at this time. Staff, both Parking and Solid Waste, have analyzed this option on several occasions. Attached Exhibit 1 contains the Parking Manager's most recent cost analysis of signing and enforcing prohibitive parking.

Evaluations conducted by other cities that recently, within the last three years, instituted prohibitive parking for street sweeping indicate that public acceptance of these parking restrictions is the key to the success of the programs. The program can result in cleaner streets, as has occurred in San Francisco, or it can result in constant battles between persons receiving tickets and enforcement and the courts, as has occurred in San Jose.

Public Works would prefer, at this time, to develop a definitive public awareness program which would insure that citizens were aware of their street sweeping day and some other aspects of public support for maintenance of our infrastructure, e.g., not placing crankcase oil in the sewer system. The cost of a public awareness program has not been determined.

C. Weekly Street Sweeping

The City of Sacramento has never swept residential streets on a weekly basis. Prior to 1975, some city streets were swept every two weeks, while others were swept once per month. In 1976 the baseline was changed so that all city residential streets were swept at the same frequency: once per month.

Sweeping city streets on a once per week basis would require a one-time investment of \$1,488,000 to purchase mechanical sweepers, and a 1985-86 annual operating cost of \$773,160.

The financial data section of this report provides the cost of sweeping weekly and/or every two weeks.

FINANCIAL DATA

The cost of increased motor sweeping is as follows:

A. Basic Cost/Sweeper

1. Employee Services	\$ 29,477
Direct Salary	\$ 22,331
Benefits @ 32%	7,146
2. Other Services & Supplies	34,983
4234 Eqm't Rental	34,524
4282 Laundry	269
4431 Safety	165
4492 Clothing	25
3. Equipment Purchase	# 93,000 each

B. Annual Sweeping Cost

<u>Cost Element</u>	<u>Basic</u>	<u>Every 2 Weeks (4 employees)</u>	<u>Weekly (12 employees)</u>
Employee Services	\$29,447	\$ 117,788	\$ 353,364
Other Services	34,983	139,932	419,796
Annual Operating		\$ 257,720	\$ 773,160
Equipment Purchase		372,000 (4)	1,116,000
		186,000 (spares)	372,000
		<u>\$ 558,000</u>	<u>\$ 1,488,000</u>

This report does not identify a funding source for added street sweeping, nor does it include the cost of public awareness and/or prohibitive parking.

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that this report be received by the Committee for information and filed.

Respectfully submitted,

Reginald Young
Reginald Young
Deputy Director of Public Works,
Public Services

FOR COMMITTEE INFORMATION:

Solon Wisham Jr.
Solon Wisham, Jr.
Assistant City Manager

APPROVED:

Melvin H. Johnson
Melvin H. Johnson
Director of Public Works

RY:v1

EXHIBIT I
JMM
Poy
Ted

March 6, 1984

REF:84-3-9

TO: J. Mark Morgan, Parking Manager
FROM: Ted Nunes, Assistant Parking Manager
SUBJECT: UPDATE COST ANALYSIS FOR STREET SWEEPING

At your request, I am submitting the update costs for street cleaning the East area; G Street to T Street and 16th Street to 19th Street, 544 block faces and the South Area; S Street to W Street and 5th Street to 9th Street, 62 block faces. As you will notice there is a \$4690 less cost difference for materials from the 1979 estimate against material costs today, and you will also find that equipment costs and additional employee costs was a considerable increase. The material cost difference is due to the change in type signing. In 1979, the 1818 signs in place required a large number of total installations, but since the Southside Residential Permit program was implemented we can utilize existing posts and electroliers by using the butterfly method of installing the additional sign.

It is my understanding in talking to Reg Young, that other cities have experienced some problems with this program. They find the program is highly successful in the business areas where streets are totally vacant in early morning hours, but find in residential areas the program becomes less successful, especially in areas that lack off street parking. He found the pilot experimental plan on weekends by using barricade signing was successful on early Sunday morning, but was a partial failure on Saturday, however we do not believe one weekend would be a fair trial.

In summary, it is my opinion that the program would be a success in the business sections of the city, but I feel it impossible because most residential sections in the older part of the city lack facilities for off street parking. It could be possible that parts of the street can be picked up one week and the remainder picked up the following, or one side of the street can be picked up one day leaving the opposite side for parking and then reverse it the following day. However, if the program is set up to eliminate the unsightly gathering of leaves, keep open drains clear, and stop an unhealthy condition we would only be accomplishing 50% of our goals if we continue to go as we are or try complete neighborhood pickup. This is a program that would require 100% neighborhood participation.

If there are any questions, I will be available at your convenience.

Ted Nunes
Ted Nunes

TN/cs

attachment

Total initial costs are as follows:

1818	Signs in place		
	Material	\$46,813	
	Labor	28,240	
	Benefits	12,143	
	Equipment	<u>13,700</u>	
			\$100,900
	1 Scooter	\$ 6,225	
	1 Radio	2,500	
	1 New Uniform	<u>150</u>	
			<u>8,875</u>
			\$109,775

Total Annual Costs

	1 Parking Enforcement Officer	\$14,660	
	Benefits (43%)	6,304	
	Scooter Maintenance	3,200	
	Materials, Supplies	800	
	Sign Replacement	<u>10,302</u>	
			\$ 35,266

TO: Reg Young, Superintendent-Waste Removal

FROM: L. M. Frink, Traffic Engineer

SUBJECT: Cost Analysis of Restrictive Parking that would permit Street Sweeping

The two areas for experimental street cleaning are described as follows:

East Area - G Street to T Street and 16th Street to 29th Street including G Street and T Street but excluding 16th Street and 29th Street. All of R Street and those blocks with parking meters are also excluded. There are 544 block faces in this area.

South Area - S Street to W Street and 5th Street to 9th Street including S, W and 5th Streets but excluding 9th Street. There are 62 block faces in this area.

The estimates are made on the assumption that parking would be prohibited one day throughout the South area. The area is small enough that there is unrestricted parking within a block and a half of each residence. In the East area parking would be prohibited on all north block faces one day, south the next, west the next and east the next, for a total of four days to cover the whole area.

The estimate for signs based on three signs per block face with half on existing posts is \$85 per block face. This results in a total initial cost of \$51,510. We also estimate that it will cost \$15 per year per block face for maintenance and replacement of signs or an annual cost of \$9,090.

The number of enforcement people depends on how well the signs are obeyed. If obedience is good, one Parking Checker should be able to cover the area. Due to the time it takes to write tickets, it would require two Parking Checkers, if there are a lot of violations. In either case, the revenue from the tickets should cover the annual costs of the Parking Checkers but not the initial costs. It is proposed that we start off with one Parking Checker and increase the number later, if the need can be shown. Additional appropriations will be required, if additional personnel is needed.

Total initial costs are as follows:

1818 Signs in place	\$51,510
1 Scooter with radio	6,400
1 New uniform	150
Total	<u>\$58,060</u>

Total annual costs are as follows:-

1 Parking Meter Checker	\$11,464
Benefits	4,938
Scooter maintenance	2,650
Materials and supplies	700
Sign replacement	9,090
Total	<u>\$28,862</u>

LMF:js

Copies to: Ron Parker
John Varozza