

**TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION MINUTES**  
**July 23, 2008**

*Chair Knox White* called the Transportation Commission to order at 7:35 p.m.

1. **ROLL CALL** – Roll was called and the following recorded.

Members Present:

John Knox White  
Michael Krueger  
Robert McFarland  
Eric Schatmeier  
Srikant Subramaniam

Members Absent:

Kathy Moehring

Staff Present:

Obaid Khan, Supervising Civil Engineer  
Barry Bergman, Transportation Coordinator

2. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

- a. June 25, 2008

*Chair Knox White* noted that page 6 discussed the 100 block of Regent Street, and believed it should be the 1000 or 1100 block.

*Commissioner Krueger* noted that page 7 should be changed to read, “Commissioner Krueger asked about Mr. Rabin’s claim ~~stated~~ that he heard there was street sweeping.”

*Commissioner Schatmeier* moved approval of the minutes for the June 25, 2008, meeting and minutes as presented. *Commissioner Krueger* seconded the motion. Motion passed 6-0. Abstain: *Commissioner Subramaniam*.

3. **AGENDA CHANGES**

*Chair Knox White* noted that Item 7A would be heard at the beginning of the meeting, followed by Item 6A. He added that the appellant for Item 7A has offered to withdraw his appeal after a discussion with Public Works staff during which he suggested that instead of weekly sweeping, that a biweekly sweeping schedule would be amenable. Public Works has indicated that this solution would be acceptable. However, because the time for filing an appeal has passed, and because people were in attendance for this item, he suggested that the appeal be heard.

## 7. NEW BUSINESS

### 7A. Resident Appeal of the Public Works Director's Approval of the Installation of "NO PARKING" Street Sweeping Signs on the 3000 and 3100 blocks of Catalina Avenue, Odd Side Only

*Staff Bergman* presented the staff report, and detailed the background of this item. Staff conducted a field analysis and solicited input from the residents. In April 2008, the Public Works Director approved the installation of the No Parking Street Sweeping signs on the odd side of the 3000 and 3100 blocks of Catalina Avenue. He noted that Mr. Alan Thompson appealed the decision to the Transportation Commission. He noted that earlier in the day, Mr. Thompson approached the Public Works Department and suggested that the street sweeping be done biweekly, rather than weekly, as a compromise. The Public Works Director was amenable to that idea. *Staff Bergman* distributed the document submitted by Mr. Thompson. He described the orientation and configuration of Catalina Avenue, as well as staff's determination of the impact on parking of the street sweeping. The Public Works Director approved the proposed parking restrictions in April 2008, and the notification was distributed to residents at that time.

*Staff Bergman* noted that the installation of the street sweeping signs was being proposed with the cooperation of the homeowners association. There was a question of whether the homeowners association would adequately represent the wishes of the residents. Given that the homeowners association was an elected body, Public Works felt that was sufficient representation of the neighborhood to provide that kind of input.

Staff noted that a minority of residents had signed the petition supporting the appeal. He noted that the street was only 32 feet wide, the standard width of a parking lane was 8 feet, and the minimum width for a travel lane was 10 feet. He stated that if two parking lanes were provided there would be insufficient space for two vehicle lanes on the street. He noted that the street-sweeping prohibitions were in effect for only three hours at a time, and were required as part of the countywide Clean Water Program and the Federal Clean Water Act.

*Staff Bergman* noted that the third basis for the appeal was that Verdemar and Fontana were swept on Tuesday and Wednesday, and that the residents had to move their cars on those days, and park on Catalina. Since parking was only permitted on one side of Catalina, the options for alternative parking locations were limited. Staff conducted a survey during the proposed hours of the parking restrictions, and found that the number of vacant spaces in the immediate vicinity was approximately equivalent to the number of vehicles that were parked on Catalina at that time. In addition, according to the homeowners association, each of the properties in the association did have a two-car garage; given the available on-street and off-street parking, staff felt that the parking could be accommodated during those times. In response to the point raised in the appeal about the creation of additional emissions due to the movement of automobiles, he noted that the Municipal Code already required that vehicles cannot remain in the same place for more than 72 hours; as a result, they would have to be moved regardless of the parking restrictions.

*Staff Bergman* noted that the original staff recommendation was to support the Public Works Director's decision to implement the no-parking street sweeping signs. Mr. Thompson's recommended compromise solution of biweekly instead of weekly parking restrictions was amenable to the Public Works Department.

In response to an inquiry by *Commissioner Schatmeier* regarding the original complaint of the appellant, *Staff Bergman* replied that it had to do with the extra debris accumulating in the street.

*Commissioner Krueger* recalled that during the last appeal, it was noted that the City typically implements biweekly street sweeping if the demand for on-street parking is above 70%. He believed the demand here was 58% for the 3000 block, and 33% for the 3100 block, and inquired whether it was common to make such an exception to this policy. *Staff Bergman* stated that given the limited parking on Catalina, staff felt that this was an appropriate place to make an exception to this rule. *Staff Khan* noted that the Public Works Department felt that biweekly sweeping would still provide sufficient cleaning, addressing the debris accumulation, so this was an appropriate compromise for the neighborhood.

In response to an inquiry by *Commissioner Schatmeier* whether parking could be allowed on the other side of the street while the street sweeping parking restrictions were in effect, *Staff Khan* replied that staff felt that would create additional confusion.

*Commissioner Krueger* believed there would be an issue of creating a fire access concern with cars parked on both sides of the street. *Staff Khan* confirmed that was a concern.

### **Open public hearing.**

*Mr. Thompson*, appellant, wished to speak later.

*Charles Obenchain* noted that he supported the appeal, and did not believe it was mentioned that 42 signatures were gathered from people who did not support the signs. He did not know when the parking occupancy survey was taken, and displayed photos of every space on Catalina being occupied by a car. He noted that a streetsweeper he observed left more dirt than it picked up, and that he had called the Public Works Department to reclean it. He noted that when water came down from the Sierras, many cubic yards of silt per minute was incorporated in the water as well. He expressed concern about the cleanliness of the water. He noted that some of the people who lived at the properties who signed the petition for the signage did not live on Catalina, and were not affected by the traffic issues on the street.

*Staff Khan* noted that Public Works typically solicits input from residents who live within 300 feet of the impacted area for these types of decisions. In reviewing the signatures, staff totaled the number of households represented, rather than the number of individuals.

*Chuck Bianchi*, president, Casitas Homeowners Association, supported the original recommendation as stated in the staff report. He noted that every home in the development had a two-car garage, and that it was not the business of the association whether it was used for two

cars or one car and storage. He noted that the landscape committee hired a landscaping company to work on the association's grounds. He noted that the properties on the north side of the 3000/3100 block of Catalina did not have a sidewalk, and that the cars parked in that area prevented the landscapers from doing an efficient job in picking up debris.

*Norm Brasel* noted that he was a member at large of the Casitas Homeowners Association. He supported the weekly sweeping plan. He noted that offering an exception to one neighborhood with respect to street sweeping was divisive. He added that they believed in keeping their streets clean. He complimented staff on the thoroughness of the staff report.

*Bob Perata*, landscape chairman, Casitas Homeowners Association, noted that the landscape company had complained for more than two years that they have not been able to edge, clean or access the area, although they have damaged cars. As a result, they will not do it; he noted that it was very important for them to do the work. He added that greenery was already growing in the gutter because they could not clean the gutters.

*Alan Thompson* noted that he filed the original appeal, and did not believe it was necessarily the City's responsibility to oversee maintenance problems for the association as far as the gardening. He understood it was important to keep the gutters clean, and that he had done so in the past. He had experience with a street sweeper leaving more debris in the gutter after it had passed. He noted that the homes had two-car garages, and added that more than two drivers in the house created the need for additional parking.

*Jon Spangler*, 1037 San Antonio, noted that although his neighborhood was not close to this one, they dealt with the same problem every week as well. He noted that because the City had legal and moral obligations with respect to the environmental issues of keeping the Bay clean, he hoped that the original staff recommendation would be upheld. He noted that the homes had two-car garages and driveways, and that too many vehicles could be a problem.

### **Close public hearing.**

*Commissioner Krueger* inquired whether there had been additional checks made on the parking occupancy. *Staff Khan* replied that staff had made several field visits, and that they looked at the site between 12 and 3 p.m., the times when the restrictions would be in effect. He noted that the table on page 4 indicated that the number of spaces represented an average value calculated from these field reviews.

*Chair Knox White* believed it was important for the City to be flexible when the situation called for it. He commended the City for its flexibility in finding a solution for the area. He noted that the appeal addressed a situation governed by City guidelines, and that it was the Transportation Commission's role to assess whether the guidelines were followed. He believed the HOA needed to figure out the landscaping for their property independent of the parking situation. He would

support the original staff recommendation because staff had examined the gutters, and found there were problems with the cleanliness. He noted that because of the no-parking situation on the other side of the street, it may behoove City staff to examine the street the day before the sweeping occurs. He noted that the City streets were a public right of way, not a public parking space; he noted that the public may park there when the use is available.

*Staff Khan* noted that the Chair's recommendation was to look at the street after six months. Staff wished to raise the concern that installing and then removing the signs would cost additional money.

*Commissioner Krueger* inquired about the landscaping issue, and whether a homeowners association would need to get a permit for a temporary "no parking" sign. He noted that the cleanliness of the street and the gutters was an environmental issue, and that there was an additional access issue for the landscaping.

*Chair Knox White* noted that the appeal was the only issue before the Transportation Commission at this time.

*Commissioner Krueger* noted that *Mr. Brasel* brought the fairness issue up, and inquired whether there were any other streets in the area that had parking on only one side, and were swept weekly. *Staff Khan* noted that he did not have that information at this time. A member of the audience stated that the block on Catalina by the Islandia homeowners association and with similar parking conditions was swept weekly.

*Commissioner Krueger* was concerned about making an exception in this case, and while flexibility in the guidelines was important, fairness was also important. He was concerned about setting a precedent regarding street sweeping for other locations where parking is permitted on only one side of the street. He noted that in June 2008, the Commission heard an appeal regarding the block of Regent Street that had a 97% parking occupancy during the street sweeping period; this block had a maximum of 57%. Many of the homes on Regent Street had one-car garages. He had a hard time extending the exception in this case where every home had a two-car garage, and the parking occupancy was not as high.

*Commissioner Schatmeier* noted that he would probably vote no on this item because there was no consistent staff recommendation, and he did not believe the substitute methodology met the needs of the neighborhood. He believed that street sweeping was important, and that it was the City's responsibility to be appropriately responsive to resident complaints about lack of street sweeping. He did not know what the appropriate response was in light of the two different recommendations.

<p><i>Commissioner McFarland</i> moved to uphold staff's original recommendation of sweeping weekly. <i>Commissioner Krueger</i> seconded the motion. Motion passed 4-1 (Schatmeier).</p>
---

## 6A. Update on Completing Analysis of Thresholds of Significance

*Staff Bergman* summarized the staff report, and detailed the background of this item. Staff received comment from the Commission was that the recently developed street functional classification system may be used to help resolve the conflicts between modes. The schedule presented in June included the following major steps:

1. The final selection of the method of evaluation and level of service to be provided for each transportation mode;
2. Development of draft implementation policies to address conflicts among the different transportation modes when the mitigation for one mode created a significant impact for another mode based on the threshold selected;
3. Run the transportation model to determine where the impacts to the transportation mode will occur;
4. Modify the draft policies as appropriate; and
5. Process the necessary environmental document for the Council approval.

*Staff Bergman* noted that in order to follow up on the Commission's recommendation to apply the street functional classification system to resolve the conflict, staff prepared a table to identify the potential conflicts more concretely. For the majority of street segments in the City, the functional classification system worked fairly well, and several were identified in the attached table that illustrate the potential difficulties. He noted that all the streets that had more than one classification were examined, and described the methodologies used to examine the traffic models on the 70 segments. He presented the following examples of guidelines to resolve the conflicts; these guidelines are examples, for discussion purposes:

- The top transportation priority for regional arterials would be the motor vehicle, followed by transit; the alternative modes would be accommodated along regional arterials as long as the vehicular Level Of Service (LOS) D was maintained.
- The top transportation priority for island collectors could be defined as bicycles, followed by transit; the acceptable LOS for bicycles would be accommodated along an island collector, followed by transit. The LOS for the intersection along the island collector could degrade to LOS E.

*Commissioner Schatmeier* inquired if this policy would have impacted the Park Street reconstruction, as buses now stop in the traffic lane. *Staff Khan* replied that Park Street was already a regional arterial and part of the congestion management program network. If there were concerns about LOS, it would have already been discussed or evaluated.

### **Open public hearing.**

*Nathan Landau*, AC Transit, thanked staff for performing this analysis, which he believed could be a model for the rest of AC Transit's service area; only Emeryville, which is smaller, had performed a similar analysis. He noted that transit was involved in 44 of the segments with conflicts. He noted that a wide street with a conflict could be resolved; a narrow street with a conflict could be tougher.

*Jon Spangler* commended the City for taking the initiative in performing this analysis, and added that many cities would not do it. With respect to the conflicts, he suggested thinking about the number of people moved per segment of roadway. He noted that it could easily be balanced in favor of transit, pedestrians or bicycles. He would like to see the analysis fleshed out more fully, and noted there was a column for school districts. He suggested balancing it more in favor of the Safe Routes to School process and priorities is the streets would be safe for kids to walk to school. He believed it was very important not to automatically default to the automobile.

### **Close public hearing.**

*Chair Knox White* believed this matrix should be more useful if it is to be used going forward, and he believed the conflicts should be shown more clearly. He believed using LOS C from 2030 projected data to examine potential conflicts was overkill. He believed it was important to look at what the matrix data meant, and wanted to more clearly identify the conflicts. He noted that the entire High Street section jumped out at him because it was an arterial and a school zone, and inquired about the conflict. He believed that whether the number of conflicting segments was 72 or 52, it still seemed very high. He was surprised by the proposed levels of threshold, which went against the EIR policies.

*Chair Knox White* inquired whether staff was prepared to take a recommendation to a joint meeting with the Planning Board in August. *Staff Khan* noted that staff would continue to work on the document, and get the feedback from the Transportation Commission. He noted that staff was only moving forward with the Transportation Master Plan EIR at this time, not the recommended thresholds.

*Chair Knox White* believed that was a different outcome than what staff had previously stated. He believed the staff proposal should be there in August.

*Staff Khan* noted that staff was looking into how to resolve conflicts, and both Planning and the City Attorney's office agreed that the thresholds of significance should be kept on a separate track. The TMP EIR would be delayed if staff were to implement all five of the listed steps required to develop the thresholds of significance.

*Chair Knox White* recalled that the direction of the Transportation Commission was to use the maps and their overlays as the way to work out the thresholds of significance. He suggested that a significant impact would be "any project that negatively impacted transit, bicycle, pedestrian

facilities, or reduces the LOS for these modes.” He believed that the modes had been given short shrift in past EIRs, and believed that statement should be placed in the beginning to identify the key impact. He suggested that a significant impact be anything that increased the average pedestrian delay to more than 25 seconds in various zones where pedestrians walk. He noted that the light at Encinal at Park was one of the longest lights in the City at 25 seconds. He believed there should be clarifying statements in the documents as well, including LOS impacts for bicycles caused by pedestrian improvements that would not be considered a significant impact. He added that pedestrians had the right of way, and that there should be a clarifying statement indicating that a decrease of automobile LOS created by accommodating one of the alternative modes not be considered significant. He noted that would be an acceptable impact if accompanied by some kind of TDM. He suggested that the gateway street classification could be useful to ensure that transit service would remain a priority at these locations.

*Commissioner Krueger* recalled another city, perhaps Portland, that had ranked its transportation modes – pedestrian, bike, bus, automobile. *Staff Bergman* noted that may have been for a limited, probably not citywide. *Commissioner Krueger* indicated that he believes that the example he was referring to was for planning purposes, not to resolve conflicts regarding the environmental impacts.

*Commissioner Krueger* noted that the regional arterials were important for transit and other modes, and was concerned that if the vehicle LOS trumped everything else, that the City would be in trouble as it continued to rely more on transit in the future, not to mention pedestrians and bikes. He believed there should be another means of resolving the conflicts.

*Commissioner Schatmeier* shared *Commissioner Krueger’s* concerns, and did not agree that transit should always come in second when there was a conflict. He viewed transit as a method of relieving congestion.

*Staff Khan* noted that if the City were to maintain a certain level of service for automobiles, the transit LOS would automatically be associated with the automobile LOS. In rare circumstances where a queue jump lane would be provided, where the transit would bypass the backup at an intersection that would trigger that concern. In general, a good LOS for automobiles would be a good LOS for transit.

*Commissioner Krueger* believed that Mr. Spangler’s idea of measuring persons moved per segment was an interesting idea, although it may short-shrift pedestrians and bicyclists.

*Commissioner Schatmeier* believed there was value in looking at transit as high-occupancy vehicles.

*Chair Knox White* noted that the Planning Board was the body that would approve the EIR, and that the Transportation Commission did not generally have that authority. He noted that the Transportation Commission and the Planning Board would be able to discuss the core key issues during the joint meeting.



In response to an inquiry by *Staff Khan* whether Monday, August 25, 2008, would be a good date for the joint meeting, the Commissioners concurred.

No action was taken.

## 7B. Review of Current Research of the Effectiveness of In-Pavement Crosswalk Lights

*Staff Bergman* presented the staff report, and noted that the Transportation Commission had requested a discussion of the in-pavement lights, and to discuss whether they were the best use of City resources. He noted that the major factors considered in determining whether the lights are appropriate for a given location included an engineering evaluation, the location of the crosswalk, the volumes of pedestrians, the volume and speed of vehicular traffic, and sight distance for drivers approaching the crosswalk. He noted that considerable research had been done, and that there was an improvement in the devices' capabilities since their initial installation in Alameda in 2002. He summarized the variables studied in other cities as presented in the tables, such as driver yielding behavior; there was an increase in yielding since the crosswalks' installation; there was also one location where the yielding decreased. The second variable examined in the study was the braking distance of drivers as they approached the crosswalk; there was an increase during the daytime, and a more marked increase at night. The third variable addressed vehicle speed. Several studies also addressed the pedestrian waiting time before entering the intersection and crossing the street, with the idea that the lights would alert the drivers to the presence of pedestrians, enabling them to yield more quickly. The study found that pedestrians had an easier time crossing once the lights were in place.

*Staff Bergman* noted that Attachment 3 summarized the results of several agencies that installed the lights, and added that it was a more qualitative evaluation. The vast majority believed the devices were effective, although concerns were expressed that no guidelines were in place. He added that was measured before guidelines had been developed. The studies consistently concluded that the devices were positively received by the public.

*Staff Bergman* noted that a study in San Jose compared in-pavement lights with alternative devices, and added that they looked at an overhead flashing beacon, as described in Tables 5 and 6. The City has also used "Yield to Pedestrian" signs (or "paddles") in 29 locations, a less expensive device, which have been effective based on anecdotal evidence and feedback from the police. He noted that the in-pavement lights illuminated only when pedestrians were present, as opposed to the general warning about the presence of pedestrians provided by the paddles. He noted that the devices were 80-90% funded through grants, and that given the acceptability by the community and generally positive feedback received by staff, they anticipated continuing to pursue funding in this area.

In response to an inquiry by *Commissioner Krueger* regarding studies from other cities, *Staff Bergman* replied that there was a small amount of research, but there were no head-to-head comparisons. There were several studies regarding the effectiveness of the paddles; a study performed in Iowa found there was somewhat of an increase in yielding behavior, although it wasn't dramatic. Before the paddles were installed, 70% of drivers stopped for pedestrians, and after the installation, the percentage increased to 84%.

In response to an inquiry by *Chair Knox White* whether there had been any public education for drivers or pedestrians regarding the in-pavement lighting, *Staff Khan* replied that staff was looking into the creation of some in-house guidelines, as well as safe stopping distances,

visibility of lights, sun glare with respect to east-west orientation, and shadow of trees or buildings. He noted those were site-specific considerations, and added that the draft would be completed to be accepted by the Public Works Director.

### **Open public hearing.**

*Audrey Lord-Hausman*, Pedestrian Friendly Alameda, noted that the group had been a strong advocate for the in-pavement crosswalk lights, and was impressed that Alameda had 10 such crosswalks. She expressed concern about the false sense of security, and that such amenities were only as good as the education. She believed that was an area that needed a great deal more work. She noted they were very effective at night and in inclement weather, but that during a bright, sunny day, it was difficult for motorists to see them right away. She suggested that an education program be enacted, including the use of newspaper articles, pamphlets, and items on the City's website. She noted that because motorists' memories were short, and to address new residents coming into the City, that there be an ongoing education effort.

*Jon Spangler* agreed with the previous speaker's comments, and added that enforcement was at least as important as education. He noted that enforcement was very effective, and that it would also be remunerative to the City. He liked the effectiveness of the in-pavement lights during bad weather and nighttime hours, but that they were almost useless on a sunny day at Webster and Taylor. Shaded locations worked better than lighted locations. He noted that a Yield to Pedestrians sign would work well in conjunction with other measures, particularly at schools. He commended the funding method of using grants.

### **Close public hearing.**

*Commissioner McFarland* noted that he liked the in-pavement lights.

*Chair Knox White* noted that these devices had a time and a place, and added that they were very expensive. He echoed *Mr. Spangler's* comment about the grants used to pay for them, and added that the grants came from competitive money that could be used for other things. He did not believe that was a good rationale to install them just for that reason. He believed they should be used very sparingly. He was concerned that drivers disregarded measures to protect pedestrians. He suggested a special paint scheme such as those used in school zones that would indicate pedestrian crossings more clearly. He supported an education campaign as well.

*Staff Khan* noted that was a good point, and complimented *Staff Bergman* on the research and evaluation of the studies he performed in compiling the staff report. He noted that each study cautioned against overuse of these devices, which may render them ineffective. He hoped that safety committees or local committees at schools could be formed to increase education with respect to pedestrians and bicyclists.

*Commissioner Krueger* inquired about the maintenance costs of the lights versus the paddles. *Staff Khan* replied that the kind of device drove the maintenance costs. He noted that the pressure pads were expensive to replace, approximately \$6-7,000. The initial cost for the paddles was about \$400, although they are vulnerable to graffiti. He added that in some locations, they must be replaced every other month.

*Staff Bergman* noted that one maintenance issue for the hard-wired in-pavement lights is the increased cost when the street is resurfaced. He noted that the newer solar technology allowed for individual lights to be removed out for replacement, but that it was only appropriate for certain locations.

*Commissioner Krueger* suggested that those costs be considered when considering installations.

No action was taken.

#### 7C. Election of Transportation Commission Chair and Vice Chair

*Staff Bergman* noted that *Chair Knox White* had served as the Chair of the Transportation Commission since its inception in 2002, and noted that Vice Chair Ratto's seat must be filled since his departure from the Commission.

In response to an inquiry by *Chair Knox White* whether Commissioner Tam actually resigned, *Staff Bergman* replied that the term he was completing had ended.

*Chair Knox White* noted that until a full Commission was seated, the election could not take place.

#### 8. Staff Communications

*Staff Khan* noted that the City was moving forward with the Estuary Crossing Feasibility Study, and that it was on track. The Technical Advisory Committee meeting and Advisory Policy Committee meeting would be held in August. A public meeting would be held in September or October. At that time, more concrete alternatives would be presented, followed by a presentation before the Transportation Commission. It would be brought to City Council in early 2009.

*Staff Khan* noted that with respect to Broadway/Jackson, the operational analysis had been completed and forwarded to Caltrans, the City of Oakland and the City of Alameda. The Project Study Report will be delivered to Caltrans in the second week of August; an answer would be expected from them in approximately two months. The environmental phase would begin at the end of 2008 or early 2009.

*Staff Khan* noted that the monitoring of the intersection of Oak Street and Central Avenue was requested by City Council. The midpoint of the monitoring had been passed, and meetings were being held on a weekly basis to address concerns such as bicycle parking. He noted that signage to guide people would be needed, and the parking must be fully utilized before satisfying an additional need.

*Staff Khan* noted that staff was working with the theatre operator regarding any impacts resulting from queuing of pedestrians and loading/unloading of people from cars. They are examining how the operator can better manage the queuing in front of the theater. The 24-hour camera is currently pointed at the intersection for police to monitor.

*Staff Khan* noted that a joint meeting would be held between the Transportation Commission and the Planning Board, and that the agenda would address the TMP and the EIR, as well as parking reduction requirements for the Park Street and Webster Street business districts.

*Chair Knox White* encouraged the City to get the bike racks to be as fully utilized as possible. He noted that he would never park his own bike in the lower ramp, in the far reaches of the parking lot. He inquired whether a traffic count had been performed. *Staff Khan* replied that would occur when the traffic pattern has been established, and cited a 90-day timeline.

*Chair Knox White* noted that he did not often advocate midblock crossings, but that this might be an appropriate place for such a crossing. He requested that the option be considered. *Staff Khan* noted that suggestion had been made, and would be part of the final evaluation report.

*Chair Knox White* commented that the flier was nice, but that failure to yield to a pedestrian in an unmarked crosswalk was also a violation of California law. He believed there was a lot of good information, although it was hard to read. He suggested the City consider the message it wants to convey to drivers, bicyclists and pedestrians. He noted that unmarked crosswalks were legal crosswalks, and that it was important for people to realize that.

## **9. Commission Communications**

*Commissioner Schatmeier* noted that construction was well underway for the bike path along Fernside, and added that the Commission had previously discussed bicyclist behavior going southbound on Fernside.

*Staff Khan* noted that staff reviewed the sight distance, and there were concerns about visibility for motorists coming from the bridge. A small left-turn pocket had been created at Washington Court.

*Commissioner Krueger* thanked staff for red-curbing the bus stops on Encinal, and wondered whether the stop at Fernside and Versailles would be red curbed. *Staff Bergman* noted that he would meet with AC Transit the following day to discuss the locations around the City to be red curbed.

9. Adjournment: 9:06 p.m.