



**TRAFFIC AND SAFETY COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES**

**City Council Chambers
1000 San Pablo Avenue
January 28, 2016– 7:00 PM**

1. **CALL TO ORDER** Meeting was called to order at 7:10 pm by Chair Chomsky.
2. **ROLL CALL. Members present:** Del Rosario, Javandel, Reeves. McCroskey. Chomsky was absent and excused. Staff present: Bond.
3. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES.** Minutes of the December 2015 meeting were considered. McCroskey had corrections on pages 3 and 6.

Motion McCroskey/Reeves: Moved to approve the December 2015 minutes as amended. Vote in favor: Del Rosario, Javandel, Reeves,. Vote opposing: None, Abstained: None.

4. **PUBLIC COMMENT.** Brian Beall, and Ken McCroskey spoke
 - Upcoming Certified Emergency Response Training (CERT) class on March 8th from 6-9 pm. The CERT program trains residents on how to help in case of an emergency.
 - Albany Strollers and Rollers (AS&R) had started a petition to City Council on establishing a regular source of funding for sidewalk repairs. The petition is on the AS&R Facebook page.

5 PRESENTATION

5-1 Police Report

No police report was delivered at the meeting as Police Department staff was unavailable. Bond said that the report would be provided next month for two months.

6.0 Discussion and possible action on matters related to the following items:

B. Speed Humps along the 500 blocks of Kains, Stannage, Talbot, Cornell and Evelyn Avenues.

Bond provided feedback on the project and said that it was a continuation of the discussion held by the Commission in October, 2015.

The Commission had the following clarifications:

- Are there two speed humps on Evelyn? Yes.
- How did you determine if you could fit one or two per block? Bond said that Chavez had done the analysis according to the existing policy and existing conditions of the street.
- What is the intention of the implementation of the speed humps? Didn't his Commission approve the installation of the speed humps on the 400 blocks first and those of the 500 block in a second phase? Bond said that the City would like to implement the speed humps this year and leave the traffic circles later as they would need more time and process.

Discussion was open to the public. The following people spoke: Robert Shaw, Brian Beall, .

Comments were:

- The house address where the speed hump is shown on the plan is 515 Stannage. It should be 521 Stannage. Please correct the location. Bond said that staff will go to the field and mark the locations of the speed humps.
- Support for the speed hump installation as El Cerrito Plaza construction is moving forward.
- Stannage is used as a shortcut from El Cerrito Plaza because it is the first two-way street east of San Pablo Avenue.

The Commission had the following comments:

-The place mark on the map should govern the location of the speed humps as it seems the locations shown are correct. We may need to re-notify the blocks.

Motion Reeves/Del Rosario: Moved that the Traffic and Safety Commission approve the location of the speed humps on the 500 blocks of Kains, Stannage, Cornell, Talbot, and Evelyn with the address correction on Stannage. Vote in favor: Del Rosario, Javandel, McCroskey, Reeves. Vote against: None. Abstained: None.

B. Installation of Crosswalk on Posen at Ordway.

Bond introduced the subject. This agenda item came up a few months ago in regard to pedestrian safety at this intersection. Staff has proposed a standard approach. Several emails have been received about this agenda item from residents that expressed concern about losing parking. Bond said that staff had initiated the collection of parking data, but it was not complete at the time of the meeting. Bond introduced the proposal, which involved red-curb, and crosswalk striping.

The Commission asked for the following clarifications:

- Has there been any injuries at this intersection? Bond said that Chavez had done this research but unfortunately she was not able to be at the meeting.
- How is the street light at this intersection? Not very good.
- What is the extent of the red curb? 15-20 feet from curb return.
- Have you been implementing this red curb systematically at all intersections? Not systematically, but we are trying to implement it as we go.
- When are these streets going to be repaved? We need to install curb ramps that are ADA compliant when the streets are repaved and perhaps, extend the sidewalk on the northwest and southwest side of the intersection.
- In term of red curbs, the most important area is before the intersection, not after.

Discussion was open to the public. The following people spoke: Aaron Frankel, Judy Harte, Susan Ellard, Eric Fuller, Carl Kelley, Chris Henri, Carlos Iribarren, Jason Horst, Ethan Miller, Florence Landau, Gib Cattanachi, and Elliott Zeller.

- The intersection has been safe. Children play there and feel safe.
- parking is an issue at this neighborhood. It is more impacted by Saint Mary's events.
- red curbs make the neighborhood look like a commercial area.
- This proposal would impact the availability of parking in the neighborhood.
- The crosswalk striping is fine for pedestrian safety
- Very few intersections have red curbs leading to the stop sign. Why has this intersection been singled out?
- The red lines would take away 7 or 8 parking spaces.
- This is the safest intersection in town because of the four-way stop.
- The California Vehicle Code refers back to local ordinances.
- The proposal would impact property value.
- There is plenty of time for people to look around and make sure there are no approaching vehicles.
- All of the parking spots are taken at night.
- We do not have large cars parked there.
- The traffic circle really improved safety at this intersection.
- In support of the improvements to increase visibility of pedestrians.
- It seems that the notification time was too short.
- There is a visibility and speed issue on Ordway due to the mini-circle, particularly when the vegetation is thick in the summer.

The discussion was back to the Commission

-The traffic circle in this neighborhood was well received and according to the community feedback, it is working well.

- Nobody is guaranteed a spot in front of their homes. Are there opportunities to implement back-in angled parking?
- When we have this much space, we wonder what we could do with that space.
- Curb extensions may be explored at this intersection.
- We should conduct a parking assessment to see what the availability of parking per time of day is in the area. Also, we need to assess off-street parking availability in the area.
- We never want to prioritize anything over safety. But we need to balance all the needs.
- Could you explain why when we improve something, it unchains a series of events? Bond said that for instance, when we stripe a crosswalk, we need to build an ADA-compliant curb ramp.
- It is important that if we touch an intersection, we bring it up to code. Maybe when we are ready to repave the street, we can talk about bulb-outs.
- If the purpose of the red striping is to allow for sight lines, what purpose does that red line around the corner provide? Javandel said that the red line ensures that there is not vehicle parked before the crosswalk. While the vehicle code states this, this is a rule that is widely ignored or enforced unless there is a red curb. Technically, we do not need to have the red curb around the curb return.
- At what point do we decide to implement these improvements? When a major capital improvement project takes place, we can start talking about curb extensions and curb ramps.
- Crosshatching the area may be an idea, for instance, painting bulb-outs. What if we were to come up with a striping layout as a short-term solution and curb extensions later when the street is repaved? But the Commission must strive to look for solutions with the minimum loss of parking space.
- Since this is a parked up area, striping can work very well, particularly when the car acts like the barrier.
- Light is also a problem. What does it take to improve the lighting?

Frederika A. questioned the lack of lighting at the crosswalk at night. Javandel said that lack of illumination was a pervasive problem in the City.

Bond said that these streets would be repaved in the next five years. When the pavement project comes along, we need to remember these concepts and re-engage the community.

The Commission members said that this issue would be looked at in the near future and work on a design approach that improved safety and kept the maximum amount of street parking.

The Commission also ask for cost data on street light poles, solar-powered, self sustained poles. Bond said that staff was working on this and that probably in February or March there would be something for Commission discussion.

The Commission also asked staff to allow for ample time to send notifications, such as a minimum of 10 days. Bond said staff was working on improving the notification practices. Planning and Zoning meetings get notified 10 days in advance. He also mentioned that residents could register online and get e-notified. The Commission asked to notify property owners and tenants.

Bond said this issue would be low-priority and staff would revisit the improvements when the pavement project is about 1 or 1-1/2 year in the future. At this point, staff would start working with the neighborhood.

C. Election of Chair and Vice-Chair

The Commission members tabled this agenda item to the February meeting when the full Commission is present.

7. Announcements and Communications

McCroskey said that the AS&R petition is time-sensitive as the City Council would be considering what measures they would put on the ballot this coming Monday.

Bond said that General Plan EIR comment period was completed. Staff did not get any major comments on the EIR or the General Plan. There were good comments from the City Commissions and Committees.

Staff is currently preparing the changes to the General Plan, which would be presented to this Commission in March for subsequent Council approval.

8. Future Agenda Items.

Peralta and Francis would be similar to the Ordway and Posen in the sense that it has visibility issues.

9. Adjournment—Meeting was adjourned at 8:42 pm.