**Minutes**

**Regular Meeting**

**Glendale Transportation & Parking Commission**

**June 26, 2023**

**Date:** Monday, June 26, 2023

**Time:** 6:00 p.m.

**Location:** Council Chambers

613 East Broadway. Glendale CA 91206

The regular meeting of the Glendale Transportation and Parking Commission (TPC) of Monday, June 26, 2023 was called to order at 6:01 p.m.

1. **Regular Business Agenda**
   1. Roll Call

Angelina took Roll call

Chairperson Bonstin: Yes

Commissioner Lester: Yes

Commissioner Ordubegian: Yes

Commissioner Avagyan: Yes

Commissioner Amirian: Yes

1. **Posting of the Agenda** 
   1. The Agenda for the Monday, June 26, 2023 regular meeting of the Glendale Transportation & Parking Commission was posted by June 22, 2023 before 5:00 p.m. on the bulletin board outside of City Hall
2. **Approval of Minutes**
   1. Approval of Minutes for the Regular Transportation and Parking Commission Meeting of February 27, 202, However due to the technical issues that arose at the previous meeting, no minutes were recorded.
3. **Presentations**
   1. There were no presentations for this meeting
4. **Consent Items**
   1. There were no consent items for this meeting.
5. **Action Items**
   1. Staff Respectfully recommends the Transportation and Parking Commission provide feedback and note and file the report regarding the Glenoaks Bicycle Facilities Study

Principal Traffic Engineer Pasto Casanova gave a presentation on the Glenoaks Bicycle Facilities Study. He asked for feedback for the 3 alternatives based on study recommendations.

**Speaker 1:** He says he choose active transportation such as walking or riding a bike. He thinks Glenoaks is not safe due to the speeding on the street and advocated for Alternative III for section 5 and Alternative II for sections 1-4.

**Speaker 2:** Her and her family cycle daily on Glenoaks and believes it would help businesses as well.

**Speaker 3:** He’s a recreational cyclist and crosses Glenoaks at Louise as a pedestrian on his work every day. He wants to feel safe as a driver, passenger, cyclist, and pedestrian in Glendale. He is against Alternative I and wants to see the commission recommend Alternatives II and Alternative III.

**Speaker 4:** He recommends Alternative III and II. He believes it would reduce speeding on Glenoaks. He wants to see as many protected bike lanes as possible to help make biking safe while promoting more biking

**Speaker 5:** He’s a recreational cyclist and a former board member and president of Los Angeles County Bicycle Coalition. He advocated for Alternative III.

**Speaker 6:** He recommended Alternative III

**Speaker 7:** He gave a presentation about the 2012 bike plan and how it included the bicycle lane on Glenoaks. He is in favor of Alternative III.

**Speaker 8:** She’s in favor of an alternative that promote safety and encourages more adults and kids to ride bicycles.

**Speaker 9:** She served on the Parks and Community Services Commission and said that she feels safer due to the adjusted pedestrian signals in Downtown Glendale. She is in full support of Alternative III.

**Speaker 10**: Resident frequently uses Glenoaks to go to Downtown Burbank but isn’t able to use Glenoaks Eastward of Central due to the lack of bike lanes. He is in favor of Alternative III.

**Speaker 11:** He’s a student at GCC and one of the commissioners on the Sustainability Commission. He is in favor of Alternative III.

**Speaker 12:** She has served as a safe route to school consultant working to improve street safety for pedestrians and bicyclists. She is in favor of Alternative III.

**Speaker 13:** She’s an avid cyclist who avoids Glenoaks due t the lack of safety and bikes lanes. She is in support of Alternative III.

**Speaker 14:** He believes Glenoaks is a barrier to biking in Glendale. He is in support of Alternative III.

**Caller 1:** He’s an avid biker and wishes to bike places like Trader Joe’s and Kaiser Permanente and other businesses and services on the main road. He wants to see as much as protected bike lanes as possible.

**Caller 2:** He’s in favor of Alternatives II and III and believes the sharrows no effect.

**Caller 3:** She started e-biking and it’s her preferred mode of transportation. She believes sharrows are too risky and is in favor of the protected bike lanes.

**Caller 4:** He said he did not receive any outreach in his neighborhood. He also is not in support of any alternative because he believes the bike lanes won’t encourage more people to biking and that the number of people who drive cars outnumber bicyclists.

**Caller 5:** He uses an e-bike to run all his errands and it is the mode of transportation he uses to get to work. He wants his family and other families to have the opportunity bike in a safe environment.

**Caller 6:** She is in support of Alternative III for safety and climate reasons.

Commissioner Ordubegian sought information regarding the impact of implementing Alternative III on cut-through traffic.

Pastor Casanova clarified that the study had evaluated the signalized intersections along the corridor and determined that the level of service, which reflects intersection performance, remained unchanged.

Commissioner Ordubegian inquired about the specifications of the buffers, including their height, space requirements, and composition. Concerned about potential accidents causing cars to roll over into neighboring properties, he wanted assurance against such incidents.

Mr. Casanova explained that the buffers' width can vary, and they consist of plastic traffic bollards that are securely affixed to the pavement. The selected buffers have been designed to withstand impacts of up to 65 miles per hour without being dislodged.

Commissioner Ordubegian questioned the continuity of bicycle lanes beyond the buffers.

Mr. Emrani, Director of Public Works, acknowledged that Glendale is an older city and integrating bike lanes is a relatively new concept. He mentioned that the Public Works Department has made significant progress, completing over 90% of the designs based on the 2012 Bicycle Transportation Plan (BTP) recommendations. However, a new comprehensive study by the Community Development Department is currently underway and will be completed in about a year. This study aims to assess all streets in Glendale and provide updated recommendations for various types of bicycle lanes, building upon the progress made in the 2012 plan. The availability of real estate will determine the extent to which protected bike lanes can be installed safely.

Commissioner Ordubegian wanted to know how the city will approach outreach methods to notify residents who will be impacted.

Mr. Emrani mentioned that the city would utilize mailers and various communication channels to spread the word about the project. They also emphasized the importance of community outreach, engaging stakeholders, and businesses.

Commissioner Ordubegian expressed dissatisfaction, stating that the response from ten people was inadequate and unacceptable.

In support of Alternative III, Commissioner Avagyan shared her concerns about feeling unsafe while biking due to the current infrastructure and speeding on Glenoaks. She emphasized the need for more bike lanes, promoting cyclist safety, and fostering sustainable development.

Commissioner Lester sought confirmation that the proposed changes would not significantly impact the level of service or impede vehicle movement.

Mr. Casanova assured him that the impact on levels of service would be minimal.

Commissioner Lester inquired about the feasibility of implementing parking-protected lanes east of Brand Boulevard based on road measurements.

Mr. Casanova explained that fitting curb running bike lanes would require a three-foot buffer between the bicycle lane and parked cars to protect against the door zone, making it unfeasible.

Commissioner Amirian sought clarification regarding the calculations and projections of traffic delay presented on slide 12.

Mr. Casanova explained that turning movement traffic counts are conducted at each signalized intersection during peak hours. This information is then entered into the Synchro traffic model, which calculates the delay equivalent level of service for each peak hour. He noted that despite reducing lanes, similar levels of service are maintained due to the integration of left turn channelization at intersections.

Commissioner Amirian raised a concern about the increase in traffic speed in the Rossmoyne neighborhood despite the intention to decrease the number of vehicle miles traveled in that area.

Mr. Casanova explained that these are high-level traffic models, and a reduction in vehicle miles traveled on Glenoaks Boulevard is anticipated, leading to an increase in other parts of the city with higher-capacity roadways such as freeways.

Additionally, Mr. Emrani mentioned that independent traffic calming measures, such as raising speed bump heights and potentially adding rumble strips, are being implemented in the Rossmoyne neighborhood.

Referring to slide 16, Commissioner Amirian asked how the level of traffic stress was determined and what metrics were used.

Mr. Casanova explained that determining the level of traffic stress for bicyclists is based on a review of the facilities they would use. It involves using engineering judgment to assess the comfort factor for bicyclists. The level of traffic stress is rated on a scale of 1-5, indicating different levels of comfort and traffic stress.

Commissioner Amirian inquired about the projection of 20 years of potential future collisions and how it is calculated without considering the increase in traffic.

Mr. Casanova clarified that the benefit-cost ratio analysis looks at collisions over a 20-year period. It extrapolates available collision data and assumes that the city will have similar collision patterns as observed in the past five years. Future traffic increases are not explicitly factored into this analysis.

Commissioner Lester raised concerns about the representativeness of the data collection term, noting that zero accidents were recorded during the three out of five years studied. He questioned the validity of the data when the continuous-term lane was not considered in the study.

Commissioner Ordubegian acknowledged the immediate impact on neighborhoods when removing a traffic lane. He emphasized the need to implement safety features quickly and asked about the fastest and least disruptive measures, suggesting the use of sharrows as a temporary solution until a decision on street modifications is made.

Commissioner Amirian sought clarification on the time implications of repurposing a lane compared to implementing enhanced sharrows or other alternative measures. He wanted to understand if repurposing a lane would require significantly more time.

Mr. Emrani explained that they are seeking feedback on which Alternative the Transportation and Parking Commission (TPC) supports. Once the final recommended Alternative is determined and taken to the council, they will need to consider financing, funding sources, and develop a project accordingly. While it is challenging to estimate the exact timeframe, he stated that it would not take ten years and, on average, could be completed within two to three years if funding is available.

Commissioner Bonstin expressed uncertainty about the need for additional data and emphasized the importance of addressing safety concerns promptly. She referred to the 2012 plan as a solution that was identified through a process and urged moving forward with its implementation.

Motion: The June 26, 2023 Transportation and Parking Commission Report regarding the Glenoaks Bicycle Facilities study is hereby received, noted, and filed.

*Moved:* Avagyan *Seconded*: Lester

1. **Oral Communications**

Discussion is limited to items Not a part of this agenda. Each speaker is allowed five minutes. The commission may question the speaker but there will be no debate or decision. There were no speakers for this item.

1. **Commission/Staff Comments/Updates**

The Commission welcomed the new Commissioner Zareh Amirian.

1. **Adjournment** 8:15 PM

*Moved:* Amirian  *Seconded:* Bonstin