

Approximately 12 people were in attendance. Philip Louie and Manito Velasco of MTA Traffic Calming were present.

**I. Presentation of Draft Traffic Calming Plan**

Philip reviewed the Traffic Calming material that was presented at the first community meeting. He then explained the details of the two proposed Traffic Calming plans that were presented. The attendees would help decide which option to move forward with.

Philip emphasized that our goals are to (1) reduce speeding from 32-35 MPH (85th percentile speed) down to 25-29 MPH (2) improve pedestrian conditions, especially along the west side of the street, and (3) provide landscaping opportunities.

**II. Feedback & Discussion**

Issues highlighted by residents:

ISSUES	DESCRIPTION
Fence/barrier between Interstate 280 and Circular Avenue. (Forwarded to DPW and CalTrans)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fence needs fixing.</li> <li>• Kids go through multiple holes in fence.</li> <li>• People see freeway and may be encouraged to speed.</li> <li>• CalTrans has no money for a sound wall.</li> </ul>
Option 1: Chicanes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chicanes better because of landscaping opportunities.</li> <li>• May take longer to install due to high costs.</li> <li>• Phasing of islands due to funding will likely mean constructing 1 or 2 islands or chicanes at a time.</li> <li>• Resident landscaper willing to volunteer time to design and maintain.</li> </ul>
Option 2: Speed Humps	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• They are cheaper and can be funded quicker.</li> <li>• Will they be effective?</li> <li>• Better for slowing down traffic going towards side sts</li> <li>• Speed humps and 1 or 2 channelizing islands can likely be done sooner than chicanes.</li> <li>• Could humps be installed first and then chicanes later?</li> <li>• Speed humps could be replaced later with chicanes when the street is repaved with additional funding.</li> </ul>
Option 1 and 2 common issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Large channelization islands would have ramps for ADA access. They should have enough room for one tree.</li> <li>• Driveway access still maintained for properties fronting islands.</li> <li>• STOP signs and crosswalks should be installed on the side streets intersecting Circular Avenue. MTA will follow through on this.</li> </ul>

Miscellaneous	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Congo Triangle needs to be improved – ugly. Extend sidewalk through triangle.</li><li>• Centerline down street may or may not be a good idea. Attendees seem divided on this.</li></ul>
City College of San Francisco	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• New extension has made traffic worse.</li><li>• Can City College subsidize the plan? Can this be a requirement as part of their expansion?</li></ul>

### III. Next Steps

Attendees reached consensus that the speed humps option is the preferred interim treatment until funds are secured for chicanes.

MTA staff will be submitting the Plan for adoption to the MTA Board in November or December.

Upon adoption, balloting will be done by proximity to traffic calming device. In general, a traffic calming device will be voted on by each household within one block of the device.

MTA requires at least 20% return rate and a 50%+1 “yes” vote is needed for approval of a traffic calming device. In addition, the front property owner must agree to have the traffic calming device in front of their house.

Speed humps would be installed first and the islands second. Construction would start in early 2007.