

COUNCIL COMMITTEE MINUTES

Concurrent Special Committee Meetings of the Sacramento City Council, Redevelopment Agency of the City of Sacramento, Housing Authority of the City of Sacramento and the Parking Authority of the City of Sacramento.

COMMITTEE NAME: LAW AND LEGISLATION

MEETING DATE: April 18, 1991

MEETING TIME: 3:00 p.m.

LOCATION: 915 I STREET, 2ND FLOOR, COUNCIL CHAMBER

I HEREBY CALL Special Meetings of the Sacramento City Council, Redevelopment Agency of the City of Sacramento, Housing Authority of the City of Sacramento, and Parking Authority of the City of Sacramento to be conducted concurrently with the Council committee meetings listed below, which are incorporated herein by reference. The Special Meetings are called to permit Members who are not on the listed committees to attend the meetings and participate in the discussions. In the event five (5) or more members of the City Council are present at a Committee meeting, only those items listed on the agenda can be acted on or discussed.

The meeting was called to order at 3:05 p.m. by Chair Lynn Robie.

PRESENT: Committeemembers Robie, Chinn, Pane and Serna.*

*Serna arrived at 3:10 p.m.

Chair Robie explained to the Committee and members of the audience that Mayor Rudin had requested postponement of Item 13, which is related to concert permits, in order to allow the newly formed Downtown Cultural and Entertainment District Commission an opportunity to review the proposed ordinance before the Committee takes action. She said that Gary Little, the City's Citizen's Assistance Officer, had gone to ask the Mayor to come to the meeting to discuss this. When the Mayor spoke with Chair Robie, it was agreed to hear testimony on Item 13 today, and continue the item to the next Law and Legislation Committee meeting in order to receive additional comments from the Downtown Commission and others.

1. **SB 136 (Leonard) relating to suspension of driving privileges for persons 21 years of age or older who are convicted of a violation involving controlled substances.**

Recommendation of Staff: Recommend support.

Committee Action: Supported.

ITEM CONTINUED ON FOLLOWING PAGE.

COMMITTEE ACTION SHEET

1. ITEM CONTINUED FROM PREVIOUS PAGE.

Voting Record:	Moved:	Pane
	Seconded:	Chinn
	Ayes:	Pane, Chinn, Robie
	Absent:	Serna

2. SB 139 (Leonard) relating to forfeiture of materials, products and equipment used in cultivating or harvesting of controlled substances.

Recommendation of Staff: Recommend support.

Committee Action: Supported.

Voting Record:	Moved:	Pane
	Seconded:	Chinn
	Ayes:	Pane, Chinn, Robie
	Absent:	Serna

3. SB 387 (McCorquodale) relating to enactment of the California Park and Recreation Enhancement Act of 1992.

Recommendation of Staff: Recommend support.

Committee Action: Supported.

Voting Record:	Moved:	Pane
	Seconded:	Chinn
	Ayes:	Pane, Chinn, Robie
	Absent:	Serna

4. ACA 6 (O'Connell) relating to local government facilities funds: bonds.

Recommendation of Staff: Recommend support.

Committee Action: Supported.

ITEM CONTINUED ON FOLLOWING PAGE.

COMMITTEE ACTION SHEET

9. AB 1109 (Campbell) relating to railroad grade crossings.

Recommendation of Staff: Recommend support.

Committee Action: Supported.

Voting Record: Moved: Pane
Seconded: Chinn
Ayes: Pane, Chinn, Serna, Robie

MINUTES:

Roberta Larson of the Department of Public Works presented this item. She explained that this bill would regulate the operation of freight and passenger trains over at-grade crossings during peak commute hours. There was discussion of the Light Rail trains passing through Sacramento during peak hours, and it was concluded that Light Rail did not present as much of a problem because the length of a Light Rail train was far less than that of a freight or passenger train. Pane moved to support AB 1109 relating to railroad grade crossings, Chinn seconded the motion, and it was unanimously supported.

10. Report regarding the City's support for Senate Bill 751 (Deddeh) regarding Proposition 111 maintenance of effort requirements.

Recommendation of Staff: File

MINUTES:

Roberta Larson of the Department of Public Works explained to the Committee that a letter of support of SB 751 has already been sent by Chair Robie, since the bill was scheduled for hearing on April 16th in the Senate Committee on Transportation. She said that SB 751 is designed to avoid penalizing cities and counties which had large, one-time expenditures, and would alter the penalty for failure to meet the MOE level. She went on to explain that at this time the penalties for not meeting the MOE level is severe and is not fair. She said that RT is also in support of this bill. No action was taken at this time, as this is an informational item.

COMMITTEE ACTION SHEET

11. Cable TV legislation:

- A. AB 821 (Moore) establishing a Video Consumer's Bill of Rights.
- B. AB 589 (Moore) extending the requirement for equal public, educational and governmental access to a second franchise.
- C. SB 1010 (Rosenthal) requiring cable operators to develop their own customer service standards in five specified areas.
- D. AB 1218 (Murray) requiring that cable operators establish a statewide, nonprofit organization to promote use of community cable channels and the hiring of women and minorities in the cable industry.
- E. SB 927 (Killea) specifying that if a public trustee is not designated for a community service channel(s) the trustee shall be selected by new language added to the Education Code.
- F. Summary of federal cable legislation.

Recommendation of Staff:

- A. Recommend opposition unless amended.
- B. Recommend opposition.
- C. Recommend opposition.
- D. Recommend opposition.
- E. Recommend opposition.
- F. File

Committee Action:

- | | |
|------------|------------|
| A. Neutral | D. Opposed |
| B. Opposed | E. Opposed |
| C. Opposed | F. Filed |

Voting Record:

- Moved: Chinn
Seconded: Pane
Ayes: Chinn, Pane, Serna, Robie

MINUTES:

Richard Esposto, Executive Director of the Sacramento Metropolitan Cable Television Commission, presented this cable TV legislation to the Committee and gave a brief rundown of each bill. He said that due to amendments to AB 821 regarding establishment of a Video Consumer's Bill of Rights, he would like to change the recommendation from opposition to neutral. Chinn moved to remain neutral on item A and oppose items B through E, Pane seconded the motion, and Serna and Robie concurred. As to the federal legislation relating to cable television, Mr. Esposto noted that SB 12, which would re-regulate cable television, has a low chance of passing, and that the President has said he would veto such a bill.

COMMITTEE ACTION SHEET

*Item 12 was continued until Ken Emanuels, the City's Legislative Advocate, arrives at this meeting.

13. **Ordinance amending Chapter 13 of the City Code to reduce concert permit exemptions, establish sound limits at outdoor concert facilities, clarify the permit's coverage and modify the basis for rejection and revocation of concert permits.**

Recommendation of Staff: Recommend support and forward to Council.

Committee Action: Continued to the May Committee meeting.

MINUTES:

Gary Little, the City's Citizens' Assistance Officer, explained that the Committee would hear testimony today on this issue and bring it back to this Committee next month so that the newly formed Cultural and Entertainment District Commission will have an opportunity to also give input.

Mr. Little gave some background for this ordinance, saying that persons or organizations must file for a permit to put on a concert, but that there are now several exemptions: (1) government facilities; (2) 100 persons or less; (3) religious; and (4) fixed seating for the primary use as a theater. He said there is some confusion because the City now calls a concert a "dance" concert, and since there is not always dancing at concerts, the word "dance" has been eliminated in the proposed ordinance. He said that the City wants to make sure this proposed ordinance is constitutionally correct and that the provisions be applied equally. He explained that the City is also trying to resolve a problem with noise associated with outdoor facilities. Mr. Little then pointed out that Art Siepel of the Sacramento County Environmental Management Department, Environmental Health Section, and members of his staff were present to answer questions relating to the issue of noise.

There was discussion as to what facilities were required to obtain permits. Diane Balter, Deputy City Attorney, explained that Cal Expo was a State-owned facility and Hughes Stadium was owned by the Los Rios Community College District, and that they were both considered governmental. She said the City would not require a concert permit during the State Fair at Cal Expo or during school-related functions at Hughes Stadium, but permits would be required for non-State or non-school (i.e., private) activities. She continued by stating that the Crest Theater and Arco Arena are not affected by the sound limit requirements, as that part of the proposed ordinance applies only to outdoor concerts. Gary Little added that the City also regulates dances that occur, the hours of operation, security concerns, etc.

ITEM CONTINUED ON FOLLOWING PAGE.

COMMITTEE ACTION SHEET

13. ITEM CONTINUED FROM PREVIOUS PAGE.

Committeemember Chinn asked about the method of monitoring sound in the proposed ordinance. Gary Little explained that equipment can be set up right at the sound mixing area at concerts which would determine sound levels. Mr. Siepel of the County's Environmental Health Section, explained that such monitoring equipment can be left at the site for such monitoring. There was considerable discussion regarding the proposed decibel levels, and Mr. Siepel explained that these levels could be adjusted lower for different sites, if necessary, and that the number of complaints will determine the need for such a lowering of sound levels. Mr. Siepel handed out a summary of a two-year survey of decibel levels of local concerts. A copy of this summary is attached.

*At this time Chair Robie stated that Ken Emanuels, the City's Legislative Advocate, had arrived, and that due to the potential for lengthy discussion on the matter of concert permits, she asked that Item 12 be heard at this time.

12. Legislative update from Ken Emanuels, the City's Legislative Advocate, including discussion of SB 631 relating to the Sacramento-Yolo Port District legislation; SB 229 (Boatwright) relating to water meters; and SB 169 (Boatwright) relating to State Budget deliberations.

Recommendation of Staff: File

MINUTES:

Ken Emanuels, the City's Legislative Advocate, discussed the above bills. He said that SB 631 adds two members to the Sacramento-Yolo Port Commission (from 5 to 7), and that the City and County would not object to adding *one* more member but not two, so the City will oppose. He said negotiations are in progress at this time. There was some discussion regarding the fact that a six-member Commission would not have a tie-breaker vote, if needed. Regarding water meters (SB 229), Mr. Emanuels said that the President Pro Tem of the Senate, the Chair of the Senate Agriculture and Water Committee, and author Boatwright insisted and agreed upon moving this bill under the condition that it would not be amended to include existing residences. If it is amended so that it is retroactive in its application to existing residences, it will come back to that committee. Mr. Emanuels then noted that the measure which applies to *future* residences will most certainly go to the Governor,

ITEM CONTINUED ON FOLLOWING PAGE.

COMMITTEE ACTION SHEET

12. ITEM CONTINUED FROM PREVIOUS PAGE.

who has indicated that he will sign. Regarding SB 169, the legislation to repeal county booking fees, Mr. Emanuels explained that this has been moved out of two committees and is now in the Appropriations Committee. He said booking fees have been very unpopular, but that the property tax collection fee imposed on counties by cities is not likely to be repealed.

Serna requested Ken Emanuels to come back to the Committee with comments on AB 1738 (Chacon) regarding liquor license renewal and transfer. Mr. Emanuels said that this comes up on Monday. He also said he thinks the bill reducing the City's VLF allocation is stalled. The Governor has said under no conditions would he sign such a bill. Chair Robie said that SB 27 regarding elections would lower the number of signatures needed to put a charter amendment on the ballot, and that the City should go on record as opposing such a bill. Mr. Emanuels informed the Committee that this bill is still alive.

13. CONTINUED.

Howard Harris, representing CSUS, told the Committee CSUS opposes the proposed ordinance. He said that governmental agencies should be exempted, which would include CSUS. When it was explained that school-related activities were exempt, he said the ordinance should reflect what is and is not considered government-sponsored or exempt. He said it seems to him that with this ordinance he could have an event in CSUS's music hall for 150 people and need a concert permit, but if he had the same event in a church, a permit would not be required.

Mr. Richard Shiffers, also representing CSUS, said that they will have approximately 20 events that would require a permit this year, and that CSUS has its own enforcement procedures. He went on to say that to require permits would be voluminous and that the proposed ordinance was too wide in scope. He said that it was unfair for the ordinance to have a religious exemption, as he knows there are some extremely loud Christian rock groups around. Deputy City Attorney Balter stated that if the events at CSUS were school-related, they would not need a permit, and that she would have to look at the 20 events to see where they fall. Chair Robie suggested that Deputy City Attorney Balter talk with CSUS staff to determine how they feel the ordinance could be tightened up. Attorney Balter said that the law of sovereign immunity exists outside the City Code and she advised against trying to restate that body of law in a City ordinance. At this time Gary Little explained that the permit requirement consists not of one permit per event, but rather, one permit which covers all concerts at that location.

ITEM CONTINUED ON FOLLOWING PAGE.

COMMITTEE ACTION SHEET

13. ITEM CONTINUED FROM PREVIOUS PAGE.

Sue Shelly, general counsel for the Los Rios Community College District, spoke at this time. She stated that the City has absolutely no jurisdiction over their concerts, and that getting a permit as a governmental agency simply is inappropriate. She said this is not a constitutionally valid ordinance and is overreaching. She also noted that the school district has its own internal sound regulations.

Danny Scher, representing Bill Graham Presents, explained that Bill Graham Presents has been in business for 25 years and has never had a negative problem in Sacramento. He said that they put all their net worth into Cal Expo when it was built in 1983, and that when Cal Expo was first built they received tons of complaints so, in 1984, they built sound walls to combat the noise problem and the complaints went down. He said they try to be "good neighbors."

*Committeemember Chinn left at 4:15 p.m. because he had to attend another Council committee meeting.

Mr. Scher went on to say that this proposed ordinance would put Bill Graham Presents out of business. He explained that in 1990 they entered into an agreement with the City to keep their sound levels down and to end concerts earlier than any other city in the country, and that of the 23 concerts they put on last year, only two received numerous complaints due to noise levels above 98 decibels. He said they feel that this is not bad, considering what they bring to the City of Sacramento. He added that they have even received complaints about the noise at their concerts on nights when they weren't even *having* a concert! He went on to say that they feel that the ordinance is aimed solely at Bill Graham Presents, and that it is discriminatory.

There was some discussion regarding the agreement made last year between the City and Bill Graham Presents, and what violations of this agreement, if any, occurred. Gary Little explained that there were two to three concerts which went over the noise limit and one that went over the curfew. Chair Robie asked Mr. Scher how Bill Graham Presents would go out of business with this ordinance. Mr. Scher replied that a limit of 94 decibels is totally unrealistic, and that performers would not want to perform concerts at that low level. Art Siepel from the County stated that they have received complaints about noise at several concert locations, not just at Cal Expo, and that this ordinance is not aimed specifically at Bill Graham Presents. Chair Robie expressed concern for the decibel limit in the proposed ordinance of 94, which she said she feels might be too low. Mr. Siepel stated his office recommended

ITEM CONTINUED ON FOLLOWING PAGE.

COMMITTEE ACTION SHEET

13. ITEM CONTINUED FROM PREVIOUS PAGE.

96 decibels rather than 94, and that often the complaints at Cal Expo are aimed at the crowd noises or horse races rather than the concerts. Serna agreed that 94 decibels is too low, and that perhaps 96 would be better. Chair Robie explained that it is not the goal of the City to close down Bill Graham Presents; it is the goal of the City to live together peacefully.

Ruth Huck said this was her second time before the Council and that she also went before the County regarding concert noise. Ms. Huck said that she felt Bill Graham Presents did not bring "good culture" to the City of Sacramento, and that it is up to the City to encourage its young people to put on concerts and the like themselves, rather than go to such concerts.

Pat McDonald, representing Assemblymember Lloyd Connelly, spoke at this time. She said Mr. Connelly's concern is with the people in his district, but that he also does not want Bill Graham Presents to go out of business because of this ordinance. She said the 94 decibel limit was suggested by Mr. Connelly because no one could give him a reason why it should be higher.

Charlie Shoemaker, representing Citizens Against Noise, told the Committee that no data has been shown why concerts cannot play at 94 decibels and still be enjoyable. He noted that the Grateful Dead played at 88. He said they feel that to increase the decibel level from 94 to 96 is unreasonable because two decibels is a larger increase than 2%; it is more like tenfold each, or 20 times an increase in noise.

Mike Duncan of Arco Arena said he knows everyone is aware of the economic impact of not having activities in the City of Sacramento, and that as this ordinance is written, it will eliminate concerts from the stadium now under construction. He said there are a number of major concerts on the circuit who will shut out Arco Arena and Sacramento in the future if this new ordinance goes into effect.

Maurice Read, representing the Sacramento Sports Association, spoke next. He said that Arco Park is specifically situated so there would be no neighbors around to disturb. Speaking for himself, Mr. Read said that he lives in Curtis Park and that he occasionally hears things going on at Hughes Stadium but that it doesn't bother him. He said he feels there is a disturbing trend to monitor activities in the City, and that when one chooses to live in a city one should be tolerant of city activities.

ITEM CONTINUED ON FOLLOWING PAGE.

COMMITTEE ACTION SHEET

13. ITEM CONTINUED FROM PREVIOUS PAGE.

Hilda Kerfut, a resident of River Park for 40 years, explained that noise from Cal Expo is often so bad in the evenings that she can't even sit outside. She said she lives in River Park, and she feels *she* is being discriminated against, since she has lived in her home long before Cal Expo was built. She said she represents many people who were unable to be at the meeting today.

Bob Slobe, representing the Woodlake Improvement Club, said it would be difficult to put a number on decibel levels for reasonableness. He said he hears noise from activities held at the Radisson as much as at Cal Expo.

Kip Skidmore of the Cal Expo Board said he was opposed to the ordinance in its present form. He said concerts bring in from \$3.5 to \$5 million dollars a year to Sacramento, and that approximately 200,000 people attend these concerts. If they don't attend concerts in Sacramento, they will take to the roads and go elsewhere, which would be an environmental disaster. Chair Robie asked Mr. Skidmore to put together the parts of the proposed ordinance he opposes, other than noise. Mr. Skidmore said one issue is that 194 complaints were all that were recorded for concerts where some 200,000 people attended.

*Committeemember Serna left at 5:10 p.m. to attend another meeting.

Ruth Morgan, a City resident, told the Committee she was definitely upset about the noise, as she has lived in the area of Cal Expo long before Cal Expo was even built. She said it is up to the City to do everything it can for the residents, and that many people just don't bother to complain because nothing happens anyway.

Richard Greene, outside counsel for Bill Graham Presents for over ten years, explained that there are legal issues involving sovereign immunity, and that the City of Sacramento cannot pass an ordinance directed at just one person. Chair Robie again said that this is not true and that the City has had many complaints from other groups. Mr. Greene went on to say that Bill Graham is the only organization putting on outside concerts in Sacramento. Mr. Siepel interjected that, again, this is not true. Mr. Greene said that putting a limit on the artists is a big problem, and that it is his understanding that 98 decibels in an outside facility is possible and has a chance of working. He went on to say that lots of people don't like concerts and will complain no matter what. He said that the City should take a long, hard look at the practical effect of this ordinance, as this would put Bill Graham Presents out of business in Sacramento, since artists don't want to put limits on their concerts. He concluded that he also disagrees as to whether the City even has a right pass such an ordinance.

ITEM CONTINUED ON FOLLOWING PAGE.

COMMITTEE ACTION SHEET

13. ITEM CONTINUED FROM PREVIOUS PAGE.

Bart Cavanaugh said at this time that if the only issue here is noise, he doesn't understand why the City has to rewrite the entire City Code for that one issue. He asked Attorney Balter to discuss the First Amendment issue. Attorney Balter said that she is not aware of anything in this ordinance which is different from the one proposed last year relative to the First Amendment. She said the existing ordinance allows the City Manager to deny a permit on general welfare grounds, but the right to deny has been taken out of the ordinance now and a permit can only be denied for limited reasons. Mr. Cavanaugh said this was a distortion of public policy. Attorney Balter said that her office will be meeting with several groups to discuss this proposed ordinance, and that she will be happy to also meet with him.

At this time Chair Robie said that the purpose of this Committee is to introduce new policies and get public testimony, and that she would like to make this ordinance as livable as possible. She said she thinks another hearing should be held. She suggested that meetings be held with the different interested groups and individuals to give them an opportunity to look at this again and give their input. She went on to say that this ordinance is not for Cal Expo alone; that it is very appropriate to regulate these concerts in a responsible manner; and that the City does not want to put anyone out of business. She said she questions the requirement of 94 decibels, as it may be too low, and she would like staff to look at 96 instead. She then asked everyone to put their thoughts down in writing. She also stated that the City expects Bill Graham Presents to continue to abide by their existing agreement. Gary Little suggested that everyone write directly to the City Manager's office regarding this issue. This matter will then be brought back to the May Law and Legislation Committee meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:35 p.m.


LYNN ROBIE, Chair

ATTEST:


JUDY SANDERS, Secretary

Cal Expo Amphitheatre
1990 Sound Level Monitoring

Show ====	Date ====	LEQ ===	L50 ===	# of Complaints =====
Whitesnake	90/05/18	98.7	98.0	0
David Bowie	90/05/24	98.3	96.5	12
Fleetwood Mac	90/06/01	98.8	98.0	1
Milli Vanilli	90/06/03	94.9	94.0	1
Grateful Dead	90/06/08	88.4	86.0	12
Grateful Dead	90/06/09	0.0	0.0	0
Grateful Dead	90/06/10	0.0	0.0	1
Erasure	90/06/22	97.3	97.0	0
Hank Williams, Jr.	90/06/24	94.1	93.0	0
Rush	90/06/26	100.6	100.0	5
Alabama	90/07/06	96.3	93.0	0
Depeche Mode	90/07/22	97.1	96.0	0
Steve Miller	90/07/29	96.0	95.0	7
Allman Brothers	90/08/05	95.8	95.5	4
Anita Baker	90/08/10	94.9	92.0	0
Robert Plant	90/08/14	96.2	95.0	17
Kiss	90/09/12	101.1	99.6	60 - 70
K.T. Oslin	90/09/14	91.8	89.5	2
Crosby, Still & Nash	90/09/15	96.8	94.5	0
Bonnie Raitt	90/09/19	91.4	89.5	0
Bad Company	90/09/20	96.9	96.0	70
James Taylor	90/10/19	91.1	89.5	2
Linda Ronstadt	90/10/26	93.8	91.5	0
*** Total ***				

Leq dB	L50 dB	Date	Exterior Levels L50 dB	Complaints
104.0	103.5	7/22/89	49.5 ES N/A AP 52.0 WL*	0
102.1	101.0	9/8/89	48.5 AP	0
101.1	99.6	9/12/90	54.0 WL 54.5 AP	70
102.3	N/A	9/30/89	51.0 ES	3 (ES)
100.6	100.0	6/26/90	54.5 WL* 46.0 ES 50.5 AP**	4
100.3	99.0	9/8/89	56.5 WL**	0
100.1	100.0	6/26/90	46.0 AP	1
99.6	99.5	6/1/90	N/A	0
99.6	99.5	9/30/89	INAUDIBLE WL 53.0 ES INAUDIBLE CC	6 (ES)
99.1	N/A	8/12/89	N/A	N/A
98.8	98.0	6/1/90	47.0 WL 45.5 ES 44.5 ES	1
98.7	98.0	5/18/90	50.5 ES 47.0 AP 50.0 WL**	UNKNOWN
98.6	98.0	10/6/89	48.0 ES 49.5 ES	5 (ES)
98.6	97.5	8/12/89	51.0 AP 49.0 ES 58.5 WL**	7
98.4	98.0	9/20/90	48.0 AP 66.5 ES*	30

AP - ARDEN PARK
 CC - CAMPUS COMMONS
 ES - EAST SACRAMENTO
 WL - WOODLAKE
 * - VIOLATION BEFORE 10:00 p.m.
 ** - VIOLATION AFTER 10:00 p.m.

Leq dB	L50 dB	Date	Exterior Levels L50 dB	Complaints
98.3	96.5	5/24/90	50.0 WL 52.0 ES 48.5 ES	12
98.2	97.5	10/18/89	INAUDIBLE WL	UNKNOWN
97.3	97.0	6/22/90	43.5 ES 46.0 ES 53.0 WL	0
97.1	96.0	7/22/90	47.5 AP 52.0 WL	0
97.1	96.0	10/18/89	51.0 ES 55.5 ES* 52.5 ES**	UNKNOWN
97.1	95.5	7/23/89	N/A	1
97.0	95.0	9/12/90	46.5 ES	4
96.9	96.0	9/20/90	50.0 ES 60.0 WL**	40
96.8	97.0	8/5/90	45.0 AP	0
96.8	94.5	9/15/90	46.0 ES 44.5 ES 47.0 WL INAUDIBLE AP	0
96.7	96.0	5/18/90	INAUDIBLE ES	UNKNOWN
96.5	96.5	7/22/90	49.0 AP	0
96.3	95.5	7/7/89	54.0 ES* 63.5 CC - (HEAVY TRAFFIC)	UNKNOWN
96.3	93.0	7/6/90	47.0 ES 51.5 WL 48.0 AP	UNKNOWN
96.2	95.0	8/14/90	64.5 CC - (HEAVY TRAFFIC) 57.0 WL 53.5 WL	17

AP - ARDEN PARK

CC - CAMPUS COMMONS

ES - EAST SACRAMENTO

WL - WOODLAKE

* - VIOLATION BEFORE 10:00 p.m.

** - VIOLATION AFTER 10:00 p.m.

Leq dB	L50 dB	Date	Exterior Levels L50 dB	Complaints
96.1	95.5	7/29/90	43.0 ES	0
96.0	95.0	7/29/90	48.0 AP 53.0 WL INAUDIBLE ES	7
95.8	95.5	8/5/90	49.0 ES 46.0 ES	4
95.6	95.0	10/6/89	INAUDIBLE WL	4 (ES)
95.4	95.0	9/21/89	UNKNOWN	2 (ES)
95.4	95.0	7/7/89	54.8 (Leq) CC	UNKNOWN
94.9	92.0	8/10/90	48.5 AP 51.0 WL 47.5 ES 49.0 ES	0
94.9	94.0	6/3/90	49.5 ES 47.0 ES INAUDIBLE AP 48.0 WL	1
94.8	94.0	6/24/90	42.5 ES	UNKNOWN
94.7	94.0	9/21/89	54.5 CC	5 (ES)
94.6	N/A	7/23/89	N/A	0
94.1	93.5	8/10/90	N/A	0
94.1	93.0	6/24/90	49.5 ES 52.0 WL	UNKNOWN
93.9	93.0	6/3/90	INAUDIBLE ES	0
93.8	91.5	10/26/90	49.5 ES	0
93.8	92.5	8/14/90	INAUDIBLE AP	0
93.6	92.0	8/4/89	53.0 AP	UNKNOWN
93.5	92.0	6/22/90	N/A	0

AP - ARDEN PARK
 CC - CAMPUS COMMONS
 ES - EAST SACRAMENTO
 WL - WOODLAKE
 * - VIOLATION BEFORE 10:00 p.m.
 ** - VIOLATION AFTER 10:00 p.m.

Leq dB	L50 dB	Date	Exterior Levels L50 dB	Complaints
91.9	90.5	10/26/90	50.0 AP INAUDIBLE WL	0
91.8	89.5	9/14/90	46.0 ES 51.5 WL 49.5 WL 44.0 AP	2
91.4	89.5	9/19/90	45.0 ES 49.0 WL	0
91.3	89.0	7/6/90	48.0 AP	UNKNOWN
91.1	89.5	10/19/90	47.5 AP 50.5 ES 51.0 ES INAUDIBLE WL	2
91.0	90.0	9/19/90	48.5 AP	0
90.7	90.0	9/14/90	N/A	0
90.6	88.0	5/24/90	N/A	N/A
88.4	86.0	6/8/90	50.5 WL 48.5 AP 51.0 ES	12

AP - ARDEN PARK
 CC - CAMPUS COMMONS
 ES - EAST SACRAMENTO
 WL - WOODLAKE
 * - VIOLATION BEFORE 10:00 p.m.
 ** - VIOLATION AFTER 10:00 p.m.