

# TRAFFIC COMMISSION MEETING

## DECEMBER 18, 2019

IN ATTENDANCE: Chair Elena Proakis Ellis, Councilor Bob Boisselle, Jeff Parenti, Dan Krechmer, Thomas Rossi, Chief Mike Lyle, Sgt. Jon Goc – Advisor, Diane Ardizzoni – Clerk

Meeting opened 5:34 pm.

### I. Continued Business:

#### 1. Approve minutes from September 19 and October 22, 2019 meetings

Motion to approve minutes by Chief Lyle, Bob Boisselle seconds, all are in favor. Minutes approved.

#### 2. Finalize layout of public parking spaces in front of 449 Main Street (Mexico Lindo)

Chair Proakis Ellis described the item. The City had proposed to shift the spaces down in front of 449 Main Street. Originally the City wanted to potentially eliminate one space because we felt that the space on the northbound side was too close to the crosswalk and created an unsafe situation for pedestrians. When this item was originally proposed, we were looking to eliminate the space and create another in front of the alleyway between Mexico Lindo and Eastern Bank as the alley is not wide enough for a vehicle to use. At that time, it was brought to the Commission's attention that Chief Collina of the Melrose Fire Department had some concerns with blocking the alley with cars because of the need to access the alley in case of a potentially fire emergency. Since that time, Elena has had a phone call with Chief Collina and followed up with an email correspondence. In the phone call he had said that the width of the space between the buildings was sufficient for them being able to get ladder access if needed. They do not need access for any emergency vehicle and want to make sure that they can pull up in the road and carry their ladders and fire-fighting apparatus into the alley. He states, if possible, to mark the street in front of the alley with paint may also help identify the area as a no parking spot.

Motion to open public participation, all are in favor.

Finn McSweeney from the Bike Ped Advisory Committee is here to support this item. They appreciate the City working with Mexico Lindo and working to find a solution to this issue. He has provided a picture demonstrating that pedestrians who are waiting in the crosswalk cannot be seen by approaching vehicles until they are actually in the road and are not left with sufficient stopping distance before you would strike the pedestrian. This item was discussed at prior meetings and left unresolved based on the fact that the Fire Department had concerns. He would like to point out that the reconfiguration would bring things closer in line to that at the Starbucks's crosswalk. The hope is that an obstruction of some sort could be placed in front of this crosswalk to ensure that no one parks there illegally. Sgt. Goc does bring up why initially the City didn't do what is currently in front of Starbucks, as cars sometimes try to stop there.

Motion was made by Dan Krechmer to close public participation, Tom Rossi seconds, all are in favor.

Tom Rossi makes a motion to not allow parking on the northbound side of Main Street for at least an 8-foot section in front of the alley between Mexico Lindo and 441 Main Street and at least 5 feet from the crosswalk. Dan Krechmer seconds motion, all are in favor.

### **3. Update on stop sign request at Hawes Avenue and Hawley Road on the Wakefield/Melrose line**

Chair Proakis Ellis provided an update to inform the Committee that the Wakefield Traffic Commission has approved the Stop sign for Hawes Avenue and Hawley Road. This was requested four years ago and Rick Stinson and Chair Proakis Ellis presented recently again to the Traffic Advisory Committee in Wakefield and got approval. This will be installed as soon as the weather permits.

### **4. Resident request for 4-way stop at East Foster Street and Dell Avenue based on new consultant data**

Walt Woo, Traffic Engineer with Stantec, presented information from a study requested by the Traffic Commission at the intersection of E. Foster Street and Dell Avenue to determine whether or not an all way stop could be considered. Stantec collected new traffic data in October of 2019. They collected morning and afternoon data 7-9 am and 4-6 pm to get a sense of who was using the intersection during these peak periods as well as pedestrian and bicycle data at the intersection. Walt stated that from the looks of it there is a fair number of pedestrians using the intersection. There were 15 counted in the morning peak and 22 counted in the afternoon peak. There were relatively few bicyclists with only two during the morning and three counted in the afternoon hours. Stantec looked at the daily volume with roughly 3,000 – 3,500 vehicles a day on E. Foster Street which is not controlled by a stop sign at this time and around 1,000 – 1,300 vehicles on Dell Avenue which is currently under stop control. Stantec also collected speed data using the same equipment, and the measured speed on E. Foster Street was 28 mph (85<sup>th</sup> percentile). Stantec also contacted the Police Department and got crash reports for the intersection over a five-year period starting in 2014 to October 2019. During that period there were 14 crashes that were recorded. Two of the 14 crashes resulted in injury with no fatalities. None of the crashes involved bicyclists or pedestrians and in 6 of the 14 crashes the driver on Dell Avenue appeared to stop and then entered in the intersection and entered into the collision. Of those 6, 2 of the drivers were cited by the Melrose Police Department (MPD) and 7 of the 14 crashes the driver on Dell Avenue didn't stop at all before proceeding into the intersection and four of the drivers were cited by the MPD. Of the 14 crashes, there were 2 which witnesses or another driver cited speed as a factor in the crash. The next thing done was to look at the MUTCD (Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices) which is the Federal standard for the evaluation of traffic control devices and they do have criteria on whether or not an intersection qualifies for mounting an all way stop. The MUTCD calls for the Engineering study as part of the evaluation. Walt went through the 4-way stop criteria from MUTCD:

- If there were 5 or more crashes reported crashes in a 12-month period that are susceptible to correction by a multi way stop instillation.
  - This criterion was not satisfied. There were no 12 month periods in the 5-year period of crashes that were looked at that had 5 crashes that could have been corrected. There was, however, two 12-month periods where there were 4 crashes, so it came relatively close to satisfying the criterion but ultimately did not.
- Traffic volume entering the intersection:
  - Part I is that the main road volume should have at least 300 vehicles per hour for any 8 hours during the day. In both directions there need to be 8 hours where at least 300 vehicles are combined in both directions; only 2 hours of the day satisfied that criterion.
  - Part II of this criterion is the side street volumes having 200 users (vehicles, pedestrians & bikes) per hour, and it has to be the same 8 hours where you have the 300 vehicles an hour on the main road. In this case, there were no hours in the day which met the 200 users. This criterion was also not satisfied.
  - Part III of this criterion has an allowance for speed with the 70<sup>th</sup> percentile over 40 mph; in this study, the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile speed is 28 mph, so Stantec was not able to evaluate this because the speeds weren't high enough, so it didn't meet the speed threshold.
- If none of the previous criteria mentioned are satisfied but the crash criterion and the volume criterion are 80% met, then we can consider installing an all way stop. Here we came a little bit closer to satisfying the crash criterion.

- The side street traffic which the criterion is now 160 users per hour as opposed to 200 with the 80% threshold. We still did not at any hour meet 160 users per hour. Ultimately, to summarize, none of the numerical criteria of the MUTCD were met. However, in addition to the numerical criteria in the MUTCD, they also allow for consideration of other factors, one of which is site distance at the intersection. Basically the wording of the MUTCD is you can consider an all way stop and reads “locations where road user after stopping cannot see conflicting traffic and is not able to negotiate the intersection with conflicting cross traffic” may have an all-way stop. Stantec evaluated the site distance at the intersection meaning how much someone on the side street (Dell Ave.) that is currently stopped at the stop bar can see traffic on E. Foster street. There are 2 measures on site distance, one of which is called stopping site distance, meaning how much distance does someone on E. Foster Street have to react to seeing someone crossing from Dell Avenue. There is pretty good visibility for someone driving on E. Foster Street to see someone and have the ability to stop in time. We measured in excess of 500 feet in either direction and the minimum required based on the 28 mph 85<sup>th</sup> percentile speed was only 179 feet, so it does meet the site distance criterion in that sense. However, a second criterion is often applied and that is of someone sitting on the side street looking in either direction, are they able to see down the approach of the main street and have enough visibility to see before they pull out into the intersection. Stantec noticed that when someone is on Dell Avenue northbound and they are looking to the East, there is not a whole lot of site distance that was able to be measured. Someone could only see 100 feet down East Foster and that is because there is a residential home right on the corner that is pretty close to the roadway and restricts the visibility of someone sitting at a stop bar. Again, Stantec measured 100 feet and the desirable distance is 309 feet – well short of what we need there. It is not always possible in an urban area to have everyone see perfectly down the road so we looked at it again if the driver moves the vehicle just beyond the stop bar into the crosswalk, how much further could they see. Walt pulled his vehicle up to the edge of the road a bit into East Foster Street and could see a little further down, but there is still some vegetation and three trees right at the corner that somewhat line the roadway. It is still difficult to see down East Foster, so he pulled further into the roadway approximately 2-3 feet and finally I was able to see down E. Foster Street. It would take a lot for someone to be able to make a decision whether or not to enter the roadway looking in that direction. All the other directions the site visibility was very good. The only issue noticed was that northbound looking to the east direction. The other thing that was noticed on that approach looking northbound was there were parked vehicles on E. Foster Street which restricted visibility. Stantec recommended the following:
- Eliminate the trees to get a better view looking down E. Foster Street. It wouldn't be perfect as you would still need to eliminate parking but vehicles would be able to see without restriction into the roadway.
- Consider installing the stop signs on E. Foster Street which would create an all-way stop and basically allow the person exiting the northbound approach on Dell Avenue to be able to safely get into the roadway without needing the required site distance anymore and ultimately would mitigate the other crashes on both approaches.

Tom Rossi makes motion to open public participation, Jeff Parenti seconds, all are in favor.

Resident Janice Meckstroth of 83 E. Foster Street has lived there for over 30 years and has experienced a lot at this intersection. She actually lives in the house that is right on the street. She wants to thank the Commission for being very open to hearing their concerns and doing all the additional studies needed to help the residents living in this neighborhood. She does not want to see any of the trees removed. She feels that these trees have helped in preventing vehicles from hitting her house. She points out that none of the accidents reported specified that the trees were the problem. She states that before the city planted the tree in front of her house they did experience an accident that resulted in the car hitting their home and caused significant damage to the structure. She states that regarding the signs that the City has put up, “cross traffic does not stop,” she was not optimistic about those signs but she feels that they might actually be helping. Her recommendation is to allow a little bit more time to assess if these signs are

making a difference before putting up a 4-way stop sign. However if her neighbors really want this she does not want to stand in their way.

Phil Herman from 83 E. Foster Street states over 30 years ago he was a founding member of the Tree Committee for the City and received state and city money to purchase hundreds of trees that were put up all over the city. He is here to “speak for the trees” and would like to see that the trees remain, as they are helping to cut down air and noise pollution and to make it a more calming tranquil effect by having green around the city. The idea of having no parking on East Foster is an incentive for drivers to not have to apply their brakes from Main Street all the way to Lebanon and will cause faster speeding on East Foster St. He suggests that if banning parking is going to be considered his recommendation is to restrict parking with one house distance for each of the corners on Dell and East Foster Streets instead the whole of E. Foster Street.

Jim Taber has been a resident of 26 Dell Avenue for 14 years. He is in support the 4-way stop sign at that intersection. He states that most that are in support are for those who live directly on the corner who do not want a car to end up on their properties. He feels most of the other residents have “no material benefit to mitigation on that intersection.” One criterion, he feels, is the most important that the consultant couldn’t capture are near misses. He thinks he can speak for other people in that area that near misses, that couldn’t be quantified by the consultant, happen on a regular basis. He has seen over 14 years a lot of near misses. He isn’t quite sure what the downside of a 4-way stop is; he can only see the upside to it.

Rachel Bowling of 39 Dell Avenue would like to thank the commission and feels that we have been very open and communicative with all and appreciates receiving the results of the report. She does not have a whole lot to add because she has attended the previous meetings but tonight she just wants to mention that it is a busy time of year so many residents that could not be here. But she does have 9 residents who have provided their input and many have also attended previous meetings. They are all in favor of making this intersection safer.

Carrie Fellingner, resident of 50 E. Foster Street, has been in Melrose since 2006 and has witnessed two if not three fender benders. She wanted to come and verbally say that she is in favor of making the intersection safer. She also is not in favor of removing the trees.

Chair Proakis Ellis also reads emails for residents who could not attend who are in favor of the 4-way stop sign.

Jeff Parenti makes motion to close public participation, Tom Rossi seconds, all are in favor.

Elena wanted to address the resident’s question about what the downside would be. The federal warrants were put in place to ensure that certain regulatory conditions, stop signs, traffic signals, etc. are only put in place where they are most safe to put them. Elena explains that she has seen situations where a stop sign is placed in a random location to slow people down, which is not the appropriate use of a stop sign and in fact can be more dangerous if people weren’t expecting it. You may get people slamming on brakes and rear end accidents. The federal warrants have been developed based on studies to establish where the safest locations are. We use them as a guideline. Elena notes that the Commission does not normally entertain the same request twice in a short period of time. We took this on a second time because of the increased crash records. We also don’t normally spend several thousand dollars on a traffic study of stop signs if we have already voted them down. There should be no preconceived notions that because it does not strictly meet the warrants, the Commission will not approve it, since the consultant has provided additional information to consider.

Tom Rossi states that generally he has not been in favor of putting in stop signs where they are not warranted. Many of these have come up over the years. He feels there is a danger of having too many stop signs. He is glad we are revisiting this because there were more accidents and was a concern. Even though we don't meet the warrant of having 5 accidents in a year, if some of the accidents were shifted just a little bit we would have been really close, off by just a few weeks. If we were to have two more accidents before March 6<sup>th</sup> of next year, we will hit the warrants, so if we vote it down now we might actually need to revisit it again in the spring. We now have a professional engineering study that has a recommendation that is for a 4-way stop and at this point, there are certainly mitigating circumstances such as poor site distance. Tom feels that in this case it is a good idea to make this intersection a 4 way stop. As for the trees, the Traffic Commission does not have the authority to cut down trees, but he likes trees and is hoping they don't get removed.

Jeff Parenti points out that in the overhead view of that intersection, the crosswalk on East Foster is quite a distance away from the corner and it is not good practice to put a stop sign and stop bar downstream from (after) a crosswalk. The details on how we actually install the stop signs are very important. We have 3 choices: 1) we can either leave the crosswalk where it is and put the stop bar at the corner, 2) we can put the stop bar behind the crosswalk but will be too far from intersection, and 3) we could move or remove the crosswalk. These are not great choices so if we approve the installation of the stop signs tonight, follow up conversation probably not in this forum would be how to actually build it, and that is not an easy one. With that in mind Jeff runs through his list of possible consequences. He agrees with Elena that we will probably pick up some rear end crashes on E. Foster with the addition of these stop signs and probably trade some angle crashes for rear end crashes, which is not a terrible thing as rear end crashes are usually lower impact than angle crashes, though not always. Jeff thinks that in terms of the crash rate at the intersection, it is very close. He thinks the crash rate will probably change and be a different type of crash if we add stop signs. If you look at page one of one of Stantec's report, in the crash number table, as brought up by one of the speakers, many of these crashes mention the person ran the stop sign. His favorite is the one that occurred on May 2006, which said "did not stop due to sneezing;" this is what happens behind the wheel of the car sometimes. He wants to point out that the cure for people not stopping at stop signs is not to put in more stop signs; it doesn't help. Putting an all way stop is not a guarantee that everyone that will have to stop at the stop sign will actually do so. The compliance will probably be okay on E. Foster, but we will continue to see people run the stop signs. One last thing he would like to mention is one thing that interested him on the counts. He feels the side street counts are high, so entering the side streets during peak hours we have counts approaching 100, which he states is surprising since Dell Avenue is only two blocks long. That, to him, suggests that there is a lot of cross town traffic. Once we add stop signs to between Main Street and E. Foster, that will make Dell Avenue even more attractive as a cross street. He wants to make sure everyone understands the tradeoffs of taking this action. Finally, for the people who live right on the corner he would like to point out that they will see an increase in noise with people decelerating to the stop and accelerating back up to speed. He wants to make sure these issues are on the table and on record. Because we are right on the edge with both the site distances and with crashes and, as the report recommended, we have the choice between removing trees and installing an all way stop, he agrees that the trees should remain and so he will support this condition with the caveats that he mentions.

Tom Rossi mentions that when he is traveling in Melrose toward Saugus and he googles "what is my route," it takes him to E. Foster and left onto Dell, and he feels it is because Main Street is often slow.

Elena has reviewed the crash data and she finds it interesting that the crashes were always angle crashes and from all directions. There is not one clear way. The site lines are obviously an issue in that one direction. Three of the crashes from Dell northbound were with people coming from the Main Street direction, four crashes happened southbound with people coming from the Main Street direction, and five happened southbound with people going toward Main

Street on E Foster. We normally just look at the worst condition and how do we mitigate it with something else. Where this is an issue with cross traffic coming from all directions, it seems the all way stop is the most logical mitigation. Also, obviously there are conditions when there are times when people won't stop, but by having a 4-way stop, you create the condition that both people would have to mess up to hit each other. She states that the crosswalk issue she had not noticed. Looking at the aerial, we do have ramps for the crossing parallel to E. Foster, so we might be able to rework the crosswalk without having to change anything with those ramps. It solves the issue of where to place the stop sign as you cannot place a stop sign before the crosswalk and we can't place the stop sign where the current crosswalk is because it is so far back from the intersection, people won't be able to see cross traffic. If we do approve the 4-way stop, we could black out the old crosswalk and move it down. The ramp placement won't be ideal, but someday we can get back to that intersection to fix curb ramps and angle them better as needed. With regard to the trees and the parking, since only two crashes happened which would have been mitigated by the removal of the trees and parking, she does not support eliminating either of them.

Chief Lyle asks if the Fire Department was notified so that they would know what they would be facing. Elena did not reach out to the Fire Department and Chief Lyle comments that it is a direct route to Main Street for Engine 3 and for the residents. He asks how soon they will get these installed if the stop signs pass. Elena states within a month of when the weather permits, and the crosswalk relocation would be done at the same time as the stop signs.

Chief Lyle makes a motion to accept the all-way stop at East Foster and Dell, Bob Boisselle seconds, all are in favor. Motion passes.

## **II. New Business:**

### **5. Request from residents at October special meeting to clarify traffic code in relation to time restrictions on residential overnight parking permits.**

Chair Proakis Ellis explained that the version of the Traffic Code provided to the Commissioners for the purpose of the meeting is not the same as the outdated version that is online, because the Engineering Division has been working to update it from the last 10 years and is nearing completion in that process. It has been an arduous process. Elena calls attention to the residential overnight parking permit in the definitions section, which authorizes non-commercial motor vehicles to park in designated areas between the hours of 2:00 am and 6:00 am. Vehicles shall be moved from said area by 8:00 am. This is written that way because 2:00 to 6:00 is when the overnight parking restriction is in effect, and this waives that restriction. She suspects that 8:00 am was put in there at the time because we used to have a lot of 2-hour parking restrictions in the municipal lots. With the merchant parking program changes, we changed many lots to 3 hour parking, so she is not sure if 8 am is necessarily relevant anymore. The only thing in the code that says you need to remove your car is that one sentence that says vehicle removed from said area by 8:00 am, so that is the regulation. The practice we have been enforcing is 6:00 am, because the commuter lots have signs that state 6:00 am and some lots have signs that says 5:00 am. The police website says that all municipal lots begin time zone parking at 8:00 am with the exception of the three commuter rails lots, which begin at 6:00 am.

Councilor Boisselle would like to make a suggestion for the Police website as there is a "forms" section, but the Parking Exemption Request Form is not in that section. He states you have to do a search to pull out that form, and at a previous meeting, residents asked how they get an exemption. Chief Lyle states there is a portal that opens at 6:00 pm and Bob Boisselle states at 7:00 pm he could not get it. Chief Lyle will have that looked into. Sgt. Goc feels that in the municipal lots like Dills Court and Friends lot, it is not relevant when these cars are moved, as the parking officers go out on the day shift most days after 9:00 am. His question to the committee and the city is: do we want these lots to be

train lots in the morning or citizen parking, as they cannot be both and currently we allow them to be both if we pay. He points out that residents can pay \$80 per year and park overnight at the Highlands Depot, Wyoming Depot or Cedar Park and then buy a monthly pass each month and keep your car there 24/7 365 days per year for approximately \$600 a year. The police started in November on the midnight shift having an officer go at 6:30 am and left at 7:00 am on a few days, and the first day at Cedar Park, which has about 80 spots, there were 18 cars still parked at 7:00 am. That tells him that residents are leaving their cars. At Wyoming Depot there were four cars that didn't move, and other days when checked there may have been a few additional cars that didn't move, so clearly they are not moving because they were not tagging the vehicles. He would suggest going at 10:00 am ,and then you will know who is paying and who is not. The point is, do we want the lots to be used by commuters of Melrose and other towns who pull into a train station and have adequate parking to get into work? Oak Grove gets filled up at 6:30 am, but in Melrose we have residents who are still sleeping and are parked at the depot lots. The few residents who are frustrated and have received parking tickets, he has suggested to them to go that route.

Elena has a question, so when the police were counting the cars, roughly at 6:45 or 7:00 am, how full are the lots of commuters at those times? Sgt. Goc recalls there were 18 cars at Cedar Park at 7:00 am, then he drove through that lot at 8:30 am and he found 9 open spots, because said residents moved. He does not know how many cars drove by Cedar Park before 8:30 when he went through and didn't have parking spots. If we are okay with that, he just wants to be able to give the people who call him an explanation and say this is what we are going to do and why and this is what we decided. Elena feels that there is a reasonable time where 6 am seems too early but 8:00 am is too late because commuters who may not have been able to find a spot now had to drive further, losing some of the benefits of public transportation. She doesn't know where the sweet spot is; is it 7:00? Chief Lyle and Elena met with the Mayor the other day and the discussion was for the non-commuter rail lots, it makes sense that at 6:00 am, timed parking takes effect. So if you're in a 3-hour lot, you stay until 9. If you're in a 2-hour lot, you stay until 8. There is no reason in either of their minds to have this awkward vehicles shall be removed by 8:00 am. If you're in a 3-hour public lot, why wouldn't you be allowed to be there after timed parking starts at 6:00 am.

Dan Krechmer asks who sets that monthly rate. Chief Lyle says he sets the rate; he states that they tried to raise the overnight rate and there were a number of aldermen who didn't want change it from \$80/year. Chief Lyle believes that when they first started, a monthly pass for the commuter rail lot was \$30. The kiosks now allow people to buy five days at a shot. So \$15.00 for five days with that sticker on the dash. The 3-hour restriction for all the parking lots is 8:00 am – 6:00 pm. Elena mentions we could go in any direction with this but feels it is important to take a vote tonight to do something that provides clarification and so that we can update any city website or a folder of information that talks about this that can be handed to people when they get a parking permit, so they know what the rules are so if they were to get ticketed, it can't be fought based on a technicality.

Tom Rossi feels that 7:00 seems like a reasonable time for commuter lots. The other lots, unless we want to change a lot of signs, we have been letting them stay until 11:00 unless we think there is a problem before 11:00. He doesn't see it as a problem and worth ticketing.

Chief Lyle makes motion for 7:00 am for commuter lots. Tom Rossi seconds. All in favor, no one opposes.

**6. Resident request for rectangular rapid flashing beacon (push-button flashing lights) for crosswalk across West Wyoming Avenue at Berwick Street.**

Ryan Bagwell is the proponent for this and has written a letter of support.

Dan Krechmer moves to open public participation, Tom Rossi seconds, all are in favor.

Michael O'Brien, who owns Fade Away barber shop on W. Wyoming Avenue and has been in business a little over a year, states that daily he sees one incident where someone almost gets hit in that crosswalk or a skidding car coming from Berwick or coming down W. Wyoming. He states that cars are doing over the 25 mph speed limit. He claims to have witnessed 700 incidents in the 380 days he has been in business. He and his staff often go out and help people cross as no one ever stops for them trying to cross in this crosswalk. He states that the reason he owns the barber shop is because the previous owner got hit and killed in that crosswalk. He suggests either a raised speed bump or a button or something for pedestrians to use. He is in support of something being put there as he states cars are not stopping for the crossing guard as well.

Finn McSweeney would like to point out that the Bike Ped committee also supports the installation of the beacon at this location. He is a resident of W. Wyoming. He states it is an unpleasant intersection to walk around, very dense, numerous businesses and is the most trafficked road in Melrose. He feels a flashing beacon would be a step in the right direction to bring some order to that location. He would respectfully submit that as part of the Bike Ped committee north south bike route rehab. They have proposed a number of recommendations for this location. There is also a crosswalk about 20 feet behind this location at Waverly and both of these crosswalks could benefit from a traffic island which would provide a refuge for pedestrians trying to cross.

Tom Rossi makes a motion to close public participation, Bob Boisselle seconds, all are in favor.

Elena mentions that funding is an issue. The Traffic Commission is not authorized to fund these but we can recommend things. The Mayor's office has indicated that they would like to see a portion of the ride share money this year go toward putting a rapid flashing pushbutton beacon at this location. Based on the number of Uber and Lyft rides in Melrose, we get some payback, and the Mayor's office has communicated interest in doing something at this intersection as well as replacing faded signs. The way the Engineering Division normally handles these requests, because we do have them in other areas in town, is that we maintain a running list of places that people have requested RRFBs, solar speed feedback signs, and items that are advisory in nature but provide safety improvements. This location is already on the list.

Chief Lyle has some concern and would like the City Solicitor to bounce this off the MBTA, because the potential is of backup on the tracks. He is not opposed to this and we do have his support.

Jeff Parenti mentions that solar would be a great option.

Dan Krechmer moves to recommend installation of a rapid rectangular flashing beacon at the crosswalk on West Wyoming Avenue at Berwick Street. Tom Rossi seconds, all are in favor. Motion passes.

**7. Correct discrepancies in the traffic code regarding parking on the east side of Berwick Street from Foster to Grove, the north side of West Emerson Street between Main and Vinton, the north side of Everett Street, and Hillside Avenue between Emerson and Bellevue, to match signage currently in place.**

Chair Proakis Ellis states that last year, the Engineering Intern created a GIS layer that shows all regulations in the revised traffic code all over the city. The intern who created the layer identified a handful of locations where he had data in the GIS in the same location that said two different things. For instance, one place in the code it would say 2-hour parking for a particular location, and in another area in the code it would say 1-hour parking. Some have already been addressed. A couple of them are on lower Main Street, where we will be looking at that area in more detail in the current year and we will be restriping after the City paves, so she did not want to address them in tonight's meeting.



She has chosen the four locations mentioned below in the chart. In all four cases we just want to change the code to match whatever signs are in place, as noted in the table.

Name of Street	Side	Parking Regulation 1	Parking Regulation 1 Area	Parking Regulation 2	Parking Regulation 2 Area	Field Inspected - How to align with street signs
Berwick St.	East	Article 5 220-57 Three-Hour Parking	From Foster Street, West, to Grove Street	Article 5 220-53 One-Hour Parking (Sub Section E)	Between Grove Street and Foster Street	3 hr signs, get rid of 1 hour code
Emerson St. West	North	Article 5 220-54 Two-Hour Parking	From a point 125 feet west of Main Street westerly to Vinton Street	Article 5 220-53 One-Hour Parking	From the entrance to Cedar Park Station westerly to Vinton Street	two hour parking 6-8 M-Sa get rid of one hour code
Everett St.	North	Article 5 220-54 Two-Hour Parking Sub Section D)	Everett Street	Article 5 220-53 One-Hour Parking (Sub Section H)	From Pleasant Street to Crescent Avenue .	No signs on north side other than no parking at corners
Hillside Ave.	West and north	Article 5 220-54 Two-Hour Parking	Emerson Street, East, to Bellevue Street	Article 9 220-109 <b>Schedule III</b> Parking Prohibited on Certain Streets	From the point in the bend of the road near the Bellevue Avenue end of Hillside Avenue for a distance of 60 feet southerly and 60 feet easterly for a total distance of 120 feet	No parking on bend of the road, get rid of two hour parking code on this area

Sgt. Goc explains that on Everett Street, there is no parking on the south side; it restricts parking for drop off in the morning and pick up in the afternoon. They wanted to use that side of the street for parents for drop off and pick up.

Chief Lyle makes a motion as laid out under Item 7 that we accept changes to code to match the signage in place, as described in the table. Tom Rossi seconds, all are in favor.

Meeting adjourned at 7:59 pm.