

# MINUTES OF TRAFFIC COMMISSION MEETING OF THE CITY OF LOS ALAMITOS

## REGULAR MEETING – April 14, 2021

### 1. CALL TO ORDER

The Traffic Commission met in Regular Session at 7:00 p.m. on Wednesday, April 14, 2021 in a video conference, Chair Mejia presiding. As a result of the State of Emergency in California due to the threat of COVID-19 and pursuant to Governor Newsom Executive Order N-25-20 issued on March 12, 2020, all members of the Traffic Commission attended telephonically.

### 2. ROLL CALL

**Present:** Commissioners: Chair Mejia,  
Vice Chair Randall Hill  
Patz, Murphy, Dean Hill, Salai, and Singer

**Present:** Staff: Chris Kelley, City Engineer  
Ron Noda, Acting Deputy City Manager  
Brent Malatesta, Sergeant  
Farhad Iranitalab, Traffic Engineer  
Maria Veronica Enciso, Department Secretary

### 3. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Commissioner Patz led the Pledge of Allegiance.

### 4. ORAL COMMUNICATION

Department Secretary Enciso confirmed no public comments were received by the 4:00 p.m. cut off.

### 5. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

#### A. Approve the Minutes for the Regular Meeting of March 10, 2021

Commissioner Patz mentioned he provided comments to Department Secretary Enciso.

Vice Chair R. Hill and members of the Traffic Commission discussed changes that would be made on the meeting minutes.

Motion/Second: Patz/R. Hill

Carried 6/0 (Salai abstained): The Traffic Commission approved the minutes of the regular meeting of March 10, 2021 with amendments given to Department Secretary Enciso.

### ROLL CALL VOTE

|                         |     |
|-------------------------|-----|
| Chair Mejia             | Aye |
| Vice Chair Randall Hill | Aye |
| Commissioner Patz       | Aye |
| Commissioner Dean Hill  | Aye |
| Commissioner Murphy     | Aye |

|                     |           |
|---------------------|-----------|
| Commissioner Salai  | Abstained |
| Commissioner Singer | Aye       |

## 6. STAFF REPORTS

### A. Consideration of a Speed Hump Policy - Revised

This report provides the Traffic Commission with information to consider a policy on speed humps.

Chair Mejia quickly reminded the Traffic Commission to allow the presenter to present the information before questions are asked and that the speed hump policy is not directed towards a specific area (neighborhood), but the City as a whole.

Acting Deputy City Manager Noda summarized the staff report.

Commissioner Murphy asked why line item 3 was included in the guidelines; Acting Deputy City Manager Noda clarified that the percentage was added per the direction of the Traffic Commission. The Traffic Commission further discussed this item. Commissioner Murphy commented that a 65 percentile going over the posted speed limit is an easier number to obtain than the 85 percentile going from 30 to 35 mph. Traffic Engineer Iranitalab clarified that generally, the speed limit is the 85 percentile and that is how the speed limit is set.

Commissioner Patz presented the following changes to the Speed Hump Policy:

- Process: six lines down change residence to residents
- Process: eight lines down, add "the" between make final
- Process: two lines before the end of the paragraph, add "the" between before petition
- Guidelines: Item 3, change travelled to travelling
- Installation Guidelines: Item 4, change between to with

Commissioner Singer asked when they talk about residents, if its people who live at the address or own the address. Acting Deputy City Manager confirmed its people who resides in the unit.

Vice Chair R. Hill presented the following changes to the Speed Hump Policy:

- Policy: second sentence, change recommendation to recommendations
- Process: first sentence, change household to households
- Process: second to last sentence, change street to streets

Vice Chair R. Hill asked if the guidelines were used with the Old Town West neighborhood, for example, then speed humps would not be installed because there is not a speeding issue per the traffic study. Traffic Engineer Iranitalab confirmed Vice Chair R. Hill's statement. Acting Deputy City Manager Noda stated that another traffic study would be made in the Old Town West neighborhood to make sure the information is current.

Commissioner Patz asked which of the guidelines would not fit Old Town West neighborhood. Acting Deputy City Manager Noda stated that it would be item 3 of the guidelines and Traffic Engineer Iranitalab confirmed this.

City Engineer Kelley asked if there is a designated emergency response route in the Old Town West neighborhood. Sergeant Malatesta clarified that there is no specific route as the entire area has to be accessible to the Police Department.

Acting Deputy City Manager Noda informed the Traffic Commission that he added the removal guidelines as requested by the Traffic Commission.

Vice Chair R. Hill asked about item 2 of the removal guidelines that it should clearly state that should someone request them to be removed, that they would pay for it.

- Acting Deputy City Manager read the item out loud
- Commissioner Patz commented that the item is specific and asked if the City Attorney has reviewed the policy. Acting Deputy City Manager Noda mentioned that it will be reviewed when the policy is recommended to the City Council.

Traffic Engineer Iranitalab shared the traffic study results that were conducted in February 2020 in the Old Town West neighborhood. The Traffic Commission quickly discussed the traffic study results in correlation to the speed hump policy.

Commissioner Patz stated that he does not think it is right to tailor a policy for a specific area and that the [policy] needs to fit Citywide.

Commissioner Murphy shared that in the first discussions of the Old Town West neighborhood, it was admitted that speed really was not as big of a problem according to the study. So even if the criteria is used throughout the City he thinks it'd be appropriate to turn them down and to see if the traffic calming measures would help.

Vice Chair R. Hill wanted to confirm that Commissioner Murphy was trying to say that the purpose of the guidelines is to not put in speed humps then it is great. Commissioner Murphy clarified that is not what he was saying.

Traffic Engineer Iranitalab shared his experience with other cities with a speed hump policy not wanting it to be too lenient because then there would be speed humps everywhere.

Acting Deputy City Manager Noda shared that when the guidelines were being made, they were in line with the other four cities [speed hump policy] guidelines.

Chair Mejia expanded on Acting Deputy City Manager Noda's statement saying that the City's guidelines were a little more lenient in comparison to the other four Cities (regarding the percentage, item 3 of the guidelines). He also shared that the first go around with this policy is going to be a trial to see how it works. He

also referenced the speed survey on Farquhar Avenue and how it could potentially meet the threshold [to have speed humps].

Commissioner Murphy asked Acting Deputy City Manager Noda a question, if the Traffic Commission stuck to a 65% (referring to the guidelines item 2) and the survey comes out at 63% could the Traffic Commission recommend speed humps or is it an absolute number. Acting Deputy City Manager Noda explained that staff sets a number, but Council can override the decision. He also mentioned that the Traffic Commission could override staff to make a recommendation to Council.

Commissioner Patz reiterated that the policy is more in terms of a guideline. He then asked Traffic Engineer Iranitalab what he thinks about the policy and if he considers it well written. Traffic Engineer Iranitalab confirmed that the policy is in line with other cities he has worked with and that Mr. Noda has done a great job with references.

Traffic Engineer Iranitalab shared what he thinks about speeding and the use of speed humps in residential streets.

Commissioner Patz stated that he is for the policy with the written corrections.

Commissioner Salai shared her concern with the flexibility that the Traffic Commission has and she understands that City Council and administration must follow the policy, but if the Traffic Commission starts allowing [certain things in one place and not in another] it would result in the question of why there is a need for a policy. Therefore, if the Traffic Commission has concerns over the percentage, footage, and/or speed, then the Traffic Commission should spend a little more time resolving these concerns.

City Engineer Kelley added that maybe a number like 67% is so specific that it can be held pretty hard to it [when it comes to the guidelines].

Commissioner Mejia shared another idea to add to item 3 in the guidelines that would state, and/or excessive or abundant calls of traffic incidents. That this would be the caveat to the 65% and it leaves some leeway in the policy for that flexibility.

Commissioner Salai stated she does not understand why the City is receiving an excessive amount of calls in that area (Old Town West neighborhood) presently. Chair Mejia clarified that he was not aiming what he said to anything and that if it were added to the sentence then an area that is getting police attention for speeding/collision/response that it would be another fact that could be added to the criteria other than just a 65%.

Commissioner Salai asked if the City currently has this issue (excessive amount of calls in an area). Sergeant Malatesta shared that typical traffic collisions are on the main arterials and typically collisions in residential areas morals were

involved or a person being intoxicated and that traffic collisions do occur but is not prevalent.

Commissioner Salai also stated that there is an extensive amount of stop signs in the City. Sergeant Malatesta confirmed that there are many stop signs in the City.

Commissioner Singer shared that he agrees with Chair Mejia's idea, except that the Traffic Commission would have to come up with a number including the number of reports in a week, a month, or six months so there is another number that can be played with or a hard number. So then, the Traffic Commission would be in the same situation – if there were more reports to use as a comparison, it can be a problem.

Chair Mejia shared that he did not see in the removal guidelines about a street/neighborhood successfully petitions and is awarded the installation of speed humps on their street and immediately wants them removed. He asked if there is a minimum time period between the installation and removal.

Commissioner Singer asked if it is a percentage of the residents who have to approve the installation of the speed humps and is the payment of the removal on one person or all of them. Acting Deputy City Manager Noda clarified that the petition in order to install, there would need to be 65% of the residents (head of households) on the street and adjacent streets and for the removal it would also be 65% on the fronting street and adjacent street. Acting Deputy City Manager Noda would need to do more research on the payment information.

Commissioner Murphy made a motion to accept [the policy] as written with the caveat of the removal guidelines that item 2 and Acting Deputy City Manager Noda will check as to how the payment mechanics would work.

Commissioner Singer mentioned that the Traffic Commission would be approving something that is not written out yet. Commissioner Murphy stated that Traffic Commission is approving to give to the policy to City Council and not to be put into effect.

Commissioner Patz and Salai shared they are not willing to approve a policy that is not complete.

Commissioner Murphy withdrew his motion.

Commissioner Patz made a motion to approve the speed control hump program with the minor edits mentioned as is.

Commissioner Singer asked which edits he is referring to. The Traffic Commission clarified they are the edits in the guidelines and grammatical changes.

The Traffic Commission and City Staff discussed the following regarding the payment for the speed humps:

- Majority of the area would need to agree to it and should someone be willing to pay for the removal then that is all that has needed.
- If resident does not pay for the remaining amount, it would go to collections.
- If 65% of the people agree on the removal then they would all also agree to the cost.
- The City would not begin the removal until the criteria is met.
- If it would make sense to add in the removal guidelines for item 2 to be from the lead petitioner/organizer.

Commissioner Salai asked and received confirmation from Chair Mejia that the City Attorney has not seen the payment program yet. Commissioner Patz added that it does exist in other Cities.

Commissioner D. Hill stated to add to the sentence until payment is received (item 2 of Removal Guidelines) and to not start both installation and removal. In addition, that after five years, if payment is still not made and there is still a 65% approval for removal of the speed humps that they are removed without payment.

Commissioner Singer asked what happens when the residents move and a couple people want the speed humps removed, do the current residents pay or the previous. Salai mentioned it would be whoever is petitioning to get it removed.

Commissioner D. Hill further explains that residents either wait five years or get 65% to agree and payment for the removal instead of waiting to get it removed for free.

Acting Deputy City Manager Noda clarified to look at item 7 of the removal guidelines and the cost being borne by the requesting residents and that statement be added to item 2 of the removal guidelines for consistency.

Commissioner D. Hill agreed to Mr. Noda's suggestion.

Commissioner Salai asked the cost to remove speed humps. Acting Deputy City Manager Noda clarified that the removal is of all the speed humps in the area and not just one and it can be pricey.

Commissioner Singer asked if there is something similar where there is a City service and individual homeowners pays instead. Acting Deputy City Manager Noda clarified that he is not aware of any. Traffic Engineer Iranitalab added no installation of a physical device on public streets by an individual private citizen are allowed.

Commissioner Singer and Acting Deputy City Manager discussed the City being liable should an accident occur due to a speed hump.

Commissioner Murphy noted that a motion could be made using the wordage from item 7 to item 2 of the removal guidelines.

Commissioner Patz withdrew his motion.

Commissioner Murphy made a motion to accept the guidelines as presented with a change in item 2 of the removal guidelines to include the wordage from item 7 starting at, "it shall be processed per the guidelines set forth above. The cost of removal (staff labor and hump removal) shall be borne by the requesting resident if said request is made"

Acting Deputy City Manager Noda clarified Commissioner Murphy's motion to state, "Petition shall be accompanied by 25% of funds that will be borne by the requesting residents to cover the cost of the removal as determined by the City Engineer. Full payment shall be borne by the requesting residents and is required within 45 days after the completion of the project."

Commissioner Singer asked if at some point after the installation of the speed humps and more than half of the residents have moved and the new residents do not want the speed hump, they would bear the cost of the removal. Noda clarified that the language is specific to the requesting resident so it is whoever signed the petition.

Commissioner D. Hill asked what if the petition has a whole bunch of signatures and they do not have to pay the 75% until it is done and nobody wants to pay. Noda clarified that it would go to collections and the city would do their due diligence.

Motion/Second: Murphy/Patz

Carried 6/1: The Traffic Commission approved the guidelines with changes and made a recommendation to City Council on the development and approval of a speed hump policy.

#### **ROLL CALL VOTE**

|                         |     |
|-------------------------|-----|
| Chair Mejia             | Aye |
| Vice Chair Randall Hill | Aye |
| Commissioner Dean Hill  | Aye |
| Commissioner Murphy     | Aye |
| Commissioner Patz       | Aye |
| Commissioner Salai      | Nay |
| Commissioner Singer     | Aye |

Acting Deputy City Manager Noda requested for a three-minute recess.

#### **B. Traffic Commission Status Log**

This is a tracking tool used by the Commission to track assignments and accomplishments.

## **7. ITEMS FROM THE DIRECTOR/CITY ENGINEER**

Traffic Engineer Iranitalab updated the Traffic Commission on the Old Town West Traffic Calming Project.

City Engineer Kelley updated the Traffic Commission of the following items:

- Continued meeting with Caltrans/OCTA for the I-605/Katella Avenue project.
- The CDBG Howard Avenue project from Reagan Street to Maple Street is projected to begin in early July.

Acting Deputy City Manager Noda updated the Traffic Commission on the following items:

- The City is doing a study of the Town Center Mixed Use area, which will also utilize the ATP.
- The Recreation and Community Services Departments Weekend of Art event is this week at the Community Center.
- Next Monday is a live in-person City Council meeting. The Traffic Commission will soon have a live meeting, possibly on June 9.

## **8. TRAFFIC COMMISSION INITIATED BUSINESS**

Commissioner Murphy asked about the following:

- Crosswalk on Los Alamitos Boulevard at Southland Credit Union. Acting Deputy City Manager Noda confirmed that the Public Works Division is taking the lead on this project.
- The intersection of Katella Avenue and Los Alamitos Boulevard red light camera. Sergeant Malatesta quickly discussed the citation process.

Commission Patz thanked Acting Deputy City Manager Noda for installing the stop sign on Reagan Street, near the Post Office.

Commission Singer asked about the following:

- The purpose of the ATP. Acting Deputy City Manager Noda explained.
- A new sign on Rossmoor Way on Los Alamitos Boulevard – “way” is spelled “wy”.
- A new Farquhar Avenue sign with an arrow point East on Los Alamitos Boulevard

Vice Chair R. Hill mentioned that he was approached by Wendy Grose that there is a cross walking issue on Los Alamitos Boulevard across from Mama's Restaurant.

Commissioner Singer made a comment on the following:

- On Bloomfield Street before and after the LAUSD office, if there is currently still a school there because there are signs of a school zone north and south side of the area. Acting Deputy City Manager Noda shared that there will be a citywide signage and street striping plan that will address this.
- Possible challenges at the new construction around the Los Alamitos Luxury Apartments and Olson projects, that the Traffic Commission may anticipate possible problems and solutions at a future meeting.

Chair Mejia refers to Commissioners Singer's issue regarding the school signs and that they are still up because there are still adult classes that take place there.

Commissioner D. Hill observed a pedestrian crossing unsafely on the southeast corner of Bradbury Road and Los Alamitos Boulevard. Vice Chair R. Hill added that there is also an issue at the northeast corner. Acting Deputy City Manager Noda will be requesting City Engineer Kelley to look into this, but the issue of the buddy pole, City staff is working with SCE about this.

Traffic Engineer Iranitalab clarified the definition of jaywalking.

Chair Mejia closed the meeting in honor of former Mayor of the City of Los Alamitos Ken Parker.

## 9. **ADJOURNMENT**

Motion/Second: Patz/Singer

Carried 7/0: The Traffic Commission unanimously voted to adjourn the meeting until May 12, 2021.

The Traffic Commission adjourned at 8:36 p.m.

Attest:

  
Javier Mejia, Chair



Ron Noda, Secretary

