

**City of Salem  
Traffic and Parking Commission  
Meeting Minutes  
Thursday, March 18, 2021**

A meeting of the Salem Traffic and Parking Commission was held remotely on Thursday, March 18, 2021 at 6:00pm, pursuant to Governor Baker's March 12, 2020 Order Suspending Certain Provisions of the Open Meeting Law, G.L. c. 30A, §20, and the Governor's March 15, 2020 Order imposing strict limitation on the number of people that may gather in one place.

**Present:** Commission Chair Tanya Shallop, Commission Vice-Chair Eric Papetti, Commissioner Robin Seidel, Commissioner Jeff Swartz, Commission Lt. David Tucker, Director of Traffic and Parking David Kucharsky, Assistant Director Nick Downing, City Electrician John Giardi, and VHB consultants Laura Castelli and Elsa Chan **Absent:** None

**CALL OF MEETING**

The meeting was called to order at 6:03pm by Chair Shallop. Chair Shallop explains how members of the public may participate during the remote meeting. Chair Shallop also introduces the newest Commissioner, Jeff Swartz.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS**

Heather Famico of 195 Essex Street #2B introduces herself. Ms. Famico informs the Commission that the agenda for tonight's meeting indicates it starts at 6:00PM, but the calendar on the City of Salem website listed 7:00PM. Chair Shallop thanks Ms. Famico for bringing this to the Commission's attention.

**NEW/OLD BUSINESS**

**North/Summer/Essex Intersection (VHB consultants)**

Mr. Kucharsky explains that Laura Castelli and Elsa Chan, consultants from VHB, were hired pursuant to meeting with City electrician John Giardi and Councilor Madore to evaluate the North/Summer/Essex Street intersection and determine if concurrent pedestrian phasing is appropriate.

Ms. Castelli introduces herself and presents slides regarding the study and findings. The purpose of the study was to determine if concurrent pedestrian phasing is appropriate, and examine potential alternative treatments to balance the level of traffic volumes and pedestrian activities. Nearby intersections at Summer, Chestnut, North, and Broad Street were examined to see if they would be affected in a negative way as well. Ms. Castelli explains that a reduced Leading Pedestrian Interval ("LPI") with concurrent pedestrian phasing and exclusive pedestrian phasing were examined. Ms. Castelli indicates that currently at the intersection there is concurrent pedestrian phasing with LPI.

Ms. Castelli discusses MassDOT crash as well as traffic volumes in the area. The traffic data was a blend of multiple counts that are not reflective of today's conditions, but rather represent general congestions prior to the pandemic.

Ms. Castelli explains the differences between concurrent and exclusive pedestrian phasing. She notes that an exclusive pedestrian phase provides full protection for those crossing, but that to do so the traffic cycle would need to be increased (total time to run through an entire sequence) or the green light time would need to be decreased. Ms. Castelli adds that with the exclusive option pedestrians would wait a bit longer for a walk sign, which could result in a decrease in compliance. Ms. Castelli explains that with concurrent phasing there are conflicts between cars and pedestrians as they are both allowed to proceed, but that the cycles are shorter so drivers and pedestrians wait less overall. Ms. Castelli notes that there are no specific guidelines on exclusive pedestrian phasing implementation, but that the Boston Complete Street Design Guidelines recommends them when there are conflicting turning vehicle volumes greater than 250 per hour, and the Boston Regional MPO recommends them for reductions in collisions when pedestrian volumes are greater than 1,200 per day, in locations with concentrations of the elderly, disabled, or very young, and in complex intersection.

Ms. Castelli states that the findings of the study concluded that either option would be acceptable for the intersection. The study found poor traffic operations along the corridor generally, with queues that extend beyond Gedney Street. The existing LPI is long enough that it is not very different from an exclusive phase according to Ms. Castelli. Ms. Castelli explains that two scenarios were examined: Scenario 1 included a reduced LPI with concurrent pedestrian phasing, and resulted in reduced cycle length while also reducing delays and queues, while allowing sufficient time for pedestrians to cross; Scenario 2 used an exclusive pedestrian phase and resulted in slightly increased wait times, but offered full protection for pedestrians. Because the existing LPI is so long, the impact on traffic queues would be minimal. Ms. Castelli states the recommendation would be to modify the current LPI to make it more standard and see what happens. In the longer term, she suggests collecting post-pandemic traffic data to determine the magnitude of turning volumes. If volumes approach or exceed 250 per hour during peak hours, the exclusive pedestrian phase could be considered.

Vice Chair Papetti indicates he has an issue with the analysis and presentation. Mr. Papetti states he has heard something completely disconnected from the comments provided by the public regarding the intersection. Regarding the data used, Mr. Papetti suggests it is noisy and only suitable for making general decisions, and problematic to analyze a specific intersection. He also states the projections made using pre-pandemic traffic levels is a value judgment that he is not comfortable with. Mr. Papetti suggests that any traffic analysis should seriously engage with the comments and concerns received to date.

Ms. Castelli explains that the use of pre-pandemic data was to reflect a worst case scenario. She agrees that while no community wants to return to pre-pandemic traffic levels, she defends the use of the data as a conservative approach. Vice Chair Papetti thanks Ms.

Castelli for the useful information, but suggests that we can either plan now for the future we want or end up overwhelmed with traffic again.

Chair Shallop comments that it has taken far too many months to even get to this point, and that based on the earlier conclusion that the existing condition is not very different from an exclusive pedestrian phase, it would be best to go with an exclusive phase as that is what the public has been requesting. Ms. Shallop explains that it is a unique intersection with lots of drivers and walkers, exacerbated during tourist season, and that if the existing LPI is twelve seconds it makes sense to just give pedestrians the whole time to allow for safety. Ms. Shallop also expresses disappointment in the results of the study and lack of alternatives presented.

Commissioner Swartz asks follow up questions regarding the data, and refers to the City of Boston standard of 250 cars turning. Mr. Swartz asks if the 240 to 245 turns mentioned for this intersection were just left hand turns, or both left and right hand turns. Ms. Castelli indicates the count was for both left and right turns combined.

Commissioner Seidel asks when the light was switched to a concurrent phase from an exclusive pedestrian phase originally. Mr. Giardi indicates the change occurred six months ago. Ms. Seidel states this reflects another issue with the data, as the existing condition did not exist pre-pandemic. Whether traffic returns to pre-pandemic levels or not, there are residents who are fearful of the current situation, and an increase will just make it more problematic. Commissioner Seidel suggests the signal return to an exclusive pedestrian phase until it can be studied more.

Mr. Giardi explains that he attempted to work with the concurrent signaling to make it work for everyone, noting that the roads are shared by pedestrians, bikes, and cars. Regarding the LPI, Mr. Giardi indicates he started with seven seconds, and that while he liked the way it worked, some elderly people were having difficulty crossing in that time. He adds that as long as there is enough time to get half way through the intersection it should be fine as the pedestrian would be in front of traffic so motorists would know to stop or slow down. Mr. Giardi states he changed the LPI to ten seconds, and after additional feedback and concerns regarding safety he changed it to 12 seconds. Mr. Giardi states that he would not consider going longer than 12 seconds, and that he is not in favor of an LPI that long in general because it is counter productive to what we are trying to do. Chair Shallop asks Mr. Giardi what exactly that is, and Mr. Giardi responds the goal is to harmonize traffic from downtown Salem to the North Street corridor and to make the signals concurrent to School and Orne Street. He references pre-pandemic traffic as being out of control. Chair Shallop asks if pedestrians are being considered. Mr. Giardi states that no one respects safety more than he does, but that we all have places to go and things to do. He states no one wants to sit at the traffic light, including bikers and pedestrians.

Chair Shallop thanks Mr. Giardi for his input and states her objective is to help all modes of transportation. Ms. Shallop suggests this intersection needs special attention and perhaps cannot be treated like others, and that while she is in favor of moving toward this type of crossing in the City and other places, the uniqueness of this high tourist traffic intersection

requires special attention. She references the safety concerns raised by the public and notes that the consultants indicated that an exclusive light would be appropriate for the intersection. Chair Shallop acknowledges that at times there may be an impact on traffic, but the analysis presented suggests it would be minimal.

Ms. Castelli offers additional information, stating that with concurrent phases the time to cross is 42 seconds whereas with an exclusive phase there is 24 seconds to cross. Chair Shallop indicates that before the pandemic there was an exclusive phase for years so people should be familiar with the time.

Vice Chair Papetti states he is not opposed to concurrent crossing generally, and notes it can work in many intersections, but that this crossing is fairly unique. Based on the amount of public feedback, Mr. Papetti suggests the burden of proof should be on those who want the concurrent phase to remain and thus far he has not heard a compelling reason.

Mr. Giardi states that while he understands the Commissioner's concerns, this location is a key intersection and if concurrent phasing cannot be done there, there is no reason to do it farther along the corridor. Mr. Giardi indicates that the next phase would be adaptive smart signals that communicate with one another.

Vice Chair Papetti indicates he has asked for three years for information regarding the smart signal plans and that he has never received a single update. Mr. Papetti suggests Mr. Giardi return before the Commission with a presentation on the adaptive signal program and why it is important for the City. Mr. Giardi contends he was never asked to present to the Commission, and Mr. Papetti offers to forward all of the email requests he had previously sent. Mr. Giardi apologizes.

Chair Shallop extends an invitation for Mr. Giardi to return in the next month or two to present specifically on the adaptive signal program. She adds that right now the Commission is dealing with this particular intersection, which was changed without notice to the Commission, and that the public has been vocal about.

Commissioner Seidel suggests that if this one intersection having an exclusive pedestrian phase renders the smart signal program unworkable then maybe the program needs to be reevaluated. Ms. Seidel explains that she does not feel concurrent works at this location, and further states she does not feel comfortable generalizing that every person should be able bodied enough to cross within the LPI of 12 seconds at a dangerous intersection. She notes that many tourists driving in the area may not know they need to yield to pedestrians. Commissioner Seidel indicates only two options were presented, and that there were no options that somehow allowed for concurrent phasing but made it safer. If the only options are exclusive or concurrent, Ms. Seidel states she wants people to feel safer.

Commissioner Swartz suggests in the future it may be helpful to look at more data regarding traffic.

Commission Lt. Tucker states that pedestrian and cyclist safety is paramount, but that the Commission must also give some attention to motorists, and that it does not have to be one or the other. Lt. Tucker explains that some people drive and do now walk or bike, and that they need to be able to get through the City as well. Lt. Tucker states that he has observed the intersection a few times and that while it seems to be working, some people certainly do not feel safe. He states he is not sure any concurrent phase will feel safe, or if there is a learning curve, but that it was something that had to be tried. Regarding any future evaluation, Lt. Tucker suggests against using any October data as it is not standard for the rest of the year. Commissioner Swartz adds that it would be helpful if any future data distinguishes right hand turns from left hand turns at the intersection. Ms. Castelli indicates data can be provided on left versus right turns.

Chair Shallop opens the floor to public comment.

Steve Kapantais of 23 Wysteria Street introduces himself and explains that he met with Lt. Tucker, Mr. Giardi, and other local residents at the intersection, and that during a 30 minute period there were three near misses of pedestrians and two traffic violations. Regarding the data, Mr. Kapantais notes that the intersection is approaching the 250 number referenced. As a compromise Mr. Kapantais suggests looking at concurrent and exclusive at different times of the year or day depending on how busy it is. He asks about the measurement of the crossing, noting that 55 feet seems short and asks if it excludes the island. Mr. Kapantais adds that since the signal was changed and had an LPI of zero he has been in contact with Mr. Giardi and that he has been responsive and respectful throughout the process. Ms. Castelli clarifies that each crosswalk is measured individually, so the measurements are for the crossings on either side of the island. She also cautions against alternating between concurrent and exclusive as it can dangerous conditions due to unpredictability.

Lori Hart of 114 Federal Street introduces herself and states she appreciations all the Commissioner comments tonight as she feels her concerns have been heard. Ms. Hart notes that the vehicle traffic data for the intersection appears to come from 2006, and the light changed in June 2020. Regarding comments about concurrent phases having a learning curve, she disagrees and indicates it is an issue of car versus person at a busy intersection. Ms. Hart also thanks Ms. Castilla for her comments about changing between the two options periodically, as she knows someone who was in a serious accident as a result of similar conditions. Ms. Hart asks for clarification regarding the recommendation that more standard timing (decreased LPI) could help existing conditions, and asks how “existing conditions” is being defined. She adds that this would not help any of the over 63 people who have complained and signed a letter voicing concerns about the intersection. Ms. Hart also indicates that prior to the change when the pedestrian signal was exclusive you had to call for the signal and that it was automatic. She asks if the report and analysis took that into consideration, as traffic could continue unimpeded until pedestrians came and called for it.

Ms. Castelli explains that the baseline data came from 2006 but was adjusted with more recent data from other intersections. She adds that those counts were higher than

conditions today. Ms. Castelli indicates the report did not examine the pre-existing exclusive pedestrian crossing, and that the exclusive phase in the analysis assumed pedestrians did not have to call for a signal.

Jane Arlander of 93 Federal Street introduces herself and indicates she walks through the intersection multiple times a day. As the VHB study shows that both concurrent and exclusive phasing are acceptable, she suggests it is more important to prioritize pedestrian safety. Ms. Arlander also notes that the 2006 data is prior to the court house redevelopment which resulted in major changes to the exit ramps going from North to Bridge Street, along with other changes along the corridor and nearby area. Ms. Arlander states she sees parents walking with their children back and forth all day due to the nearby YMCA and that children do not walk quickly. Contrary to Mr. Giardi's suggestion Ms. Arlander contends it is not just the elderly who have trouble crossing quickly enough. She adds that many of the signatures are from concerned parents, and that the report does not even acknowledge that the area is a school zone. Ms. Arlander suggests that if we want to provide better safety for pedestrians, we should make safer conditions and encourage people to walk rather than drive.

Constance Arlander introduces herself and states she appreciates the meeting and that comments are being heard. Ms. Arlander says she appreciates a study was done, but wishes the intersection had been studied prior to any initial change, as pedestrians were caught by surprise. Ms. Arlander states she has almost been hit twice in the intersection, and asks that it be returned to an exclusive phase so that pedestrians have a chance to cross without worry of being hit.

Chair Shallop asks who is responsible for making the decision ultimately, and Mr. Giardi states he is responsible for all City lights through the direction of the Mayor. Mr. Giardi suggests before abandoning the whole project that the signal be left as is to see how it works with more normal traffic after the pandemic. He suggests abandoning it now would be a mistake because it will impact the whole smart signal program for North Street, and that the goal is to ultimately have intersections talking to each other. Chair Shallop states she would love to know more about the adaptive smart signals and plan, but that she would also entertain a motion to recommend that Mr. Giardi and Mayor Driscoll return the intersection to an exclusive walk light, with the possibility of revisiting the issue when more data can be gathered and a presentation on smart signaling can be provided.

Lt. Tucker asks what the next step would be if the recommendation is made and the Mayor agrees. Chair Shallop indicates she is open to hearing information and seeing more data that could convince her otherwise, but that currently the compelling evidence is the concerns of the public. Given that the study has found either option is appropriate, Chair Shallop states she is in favor of returning to exclusive phasing.

Lt. Tucker asks Mr. Giardi if the smart signal program could still proceed if this intersection returned to exclusive phasing. Mr. Giardi states that if the recommendation is made and the Mayor chooses to proceed, he will change intersection back to an exclusive phase. He

indicates it would not be the end of the world, it would just make it a bit harder to work around and complete the smart signal corridor.

Mr. Kucharsky suggests if the recommendation is made and the Mayor agrees, other intersections can be worked on and whenever appropriate additional counts of both pedestrians and traffic can be conducted. He adds that Mr. Giardi can also provide an overview of the plan to provide a better understanding of the long term goals of the program.

Commissioner Seidel suggests that when the consultants return they provide more than two options if possible given the uniqueness of the intersection.

**Motion and Vote:** Vice Chair Papetti motions to recommend that the signal at the North/Summer/Essex Street intersection return to an exclusive pedestrian phase. Commissioner Shallop seconds the motion. The vote is three (3) in favor (Eric Papetti, Robin, Seidel, Tonya Shallop), one (1) opposed (Lt. Tucker), and one (1) abstaining (Jeff Swartz). **The motion passes.**

### **Valley Street Traffic Calming**

Mr. Kucharsky explains that staff worked with Neighbor Ways Design consultants and that plans were provided to Commissioners and Councilor Flynn. Abutters and residents surround Valley Street were also given copies of the proposal. Mr. Kucharsky states the intent is to get feedback from both the Commission and the general public so that any necessary adjustments can be made to the proposal. Mr. Kucharsky indicates there have been concerns about the area for some time with respect to high speeding, with over 50 percent of traffic above the speed limit. Traffic data and counts were obtained by staff working with Lt. Tucker.

Mr. Kucharsky presents the plan design, noting it would be a tactical implementation utilizing striping and signage. The proposal considers speed cushions in various locations, with flex posts as another option. Mr. Kucharsky explains that beginning at Gallows Hill Road there will be new striping that gives motorists the perception they should be slowing down, as well as areas where there are turns on and off Valley Street. The first speed cushion or flex post would be approaching Cauldron Court. Crosswalks in the area would get better signage (many currently have none). Certain intersections would also be narrowed under the proposal with pain to encourage slowing down. Mr. Kucharsky discusses the wide Y-shaped intersection with Parlee Street which will include flex posts or tactical striping to make the intersection more perpendicular. He adds that residents have requested to add a convex mirror on the other side of the intersection as well. Mr. Kucharsky notes that the proposed speed cushions will not interfere with any driveways. For the straightaway area of the street there will be two speed humps and additional infrastructure that can be removed in winter, as well as signage to alert motorists to slow down. Additionally, DPS will install radar feedback signs in the area. Mr. Kucharsky states

there will be additional flex posts or speed cushions past Cherry Hill Avenue and approaching Highland Avenue.

Vice Chair Papetti states the plan looks nice overall. Mr. Papetti asks if there was any consideration of experimenting with center line removal, noting that Somerville has experimented with removing the double yellow line on some streets and found improved safety and speeding. Chair Shallop asks if there is an established theory for when a center line is used or needed. Mr. Kucharsky states he believes it is based on traffic volumes.

Commissioner Seidel asks about texture or rumble strips for slowing traffic rather than actual speed bumps, and if there is a difference in cost or application. Mr. Kucharsky indicates he can look into it further.

Commissioner Swartz indicates he is unaware of the original concerns, and asks if it was primarily velocity. Mr. Kucharsky and Lt. Tucker explain there have been many complaints over the years regarding speeding and safety concerns.

Chair Shallop opens the floor to public comment.

Salem acting Fire Chief Alan Dionne introduces himself. Mr. Dionne indicates speed cushions are of great concern to the fire department, as the large fire trucks do not fare well with traffic calming measures that raise the road level. Mr. Dionne notes that the speed bumps at Salem High School have really beaten their trucks up. The trucks carry lots of water in addition to the vehicle weight, and as such the speed bumps can cause damage. Mr. Dionne also states as a resident of Witchcraft Heights he does not want cars stopping for bumps and causing additional traffic. Mr. Dionne says he prefers flex posts, and that he is in favor of the improvements to the Parlee Street intersection. He is also in favor of the crosswalk and signage improvements. Mr. Parlee suggests there are stretches of Valley Street without sidewalks, and that perhaps that could be an addition to help with safety and encouraging walking.

Scott Hamford of 43 Valley Street introduces himself, and states that as a 25 year resident of Salem speeding has definitely become a big issue. Mr. Hamford indicates he is in favor of alternatives to speed bumps. Mr. Hamford notes that most speeding comes from Highland Avenue, and that drivers cut through to avoid downtown traffic and go very fast. He maintains that drivers often come around the corner at Cherry Hill and quickly accelerate. Mr. Hamford states there is a speed monitor past his house but that he believes it is facing the wrong direction, as most speeding does not come from Gallows Hill, but rather Highland Avenue. With respect to speed bumps, Mr. Hamford also expresses concern that they would exacerbate existing drainage issues at the bottom of the hill near his driveway.

Eric Keating of 6 Cauldron Court introduces himself and thanks the Commission and staff for addressing this issue. Mr. Keating explains he moved to the neighborhood in 2013 and that he has young children. He indicates he liked to walk often with his children in the residential neighborhood, but that it eventually became frightening due to the speeding. Mr. Keating disagrees with Mr. Hamford that speeding is not an issue coming from Gallows



Hill, and suggests the most dangerous point is coming from Witch Way to Gallows Hill and then to Valley. He states that two turn segment has people flying through regularly. Mr. Keating also suggests installing a stop sign at Gallows Hill where it intersects on Valley, as that corner can be problematic. Regarding the striping on Cauldron Court, he is not opposed but expresses that it is a non-issue as it is a cul-de-sac with infrequent traffic.

Jana Gauthier of 56 Valley Street introduces herself, and notes she grew up next door at 54 Valley Street. Ms. Gauthier explains that there are many young families all up and down Valley Street, with children approaching elementary school age where they like to play out in front yards and along the street. Ms. Gauthier states it has become very scary to let children play outside as some cars come down the street at 70 miles per hour. Ms. Gauthier states she was excited to hear that the issue was being addressed, and she welcomes all efforts to quell the speeding. Ms. Gauthier also expresses concerns regarding cars turning left out of Valley onto Highland Avenue

Carolyn Zeerie of 18 Parlee Street introduces herself and states the traffic calming measure seem great. As a resident of Parlee Street, Ms. Zeerie states she is primarily concerned with drivers coming down Parlee and turning left onto Valley to get to Boston and then the highway. She indicates that visibility has been a problem for a while. Ms. Zeerie states she filed a report on SeeClickFix two and half years ago requesting a mirror be put on the tree or post to increase visibility of oncoming traffic, and that it would be a simple improvement.

Mr. Kucharsky indicates they will be looking into installing a mirror there, and that staff will work with Lt. Tucker to obtain counts and determine if an additional stop sign is warranted.

Chair Shallop asks Mr. Kucharsky to speak a bit more about the speed cushions versus flex posts. Mr. Kucharsky states they can start with flex posts, which are easier to install and less expensive, as well as striping, and then collect additional data and feedback from residents. If those measures are effective, they can remain, and if not staff can investigate other options including the speed cushions.

Vice Chair Papetti indicates he likes the idea of a stop sign or mini roundabout at Gallows Hill. Mr. Papetti also suggests chicanes might be a useful feature where the roadway is being narrowed, similar to what is being proposed on North Street.

Lt. Tucker notes a second radar feedback will be installed to address traffic from Highland Avenue, and that he will be looking into the idea of no left turns out of Valley onto Highland, as there was a fatal accident at that location. Regarding speed cushions, Lt. Tucker acknowledges the Fire Chief's concerns and suggests examining the alternatives more.

Commissioner Swartz agrees with Lt. Tucker and states he is in favor of starting incrementally with low cost solutions like the flex posts and determining if further intervention is necessary.

## **Request for Traffic Ordinance Recommendation**

### **Stop Sign on Dodge Street at Lafayette**

Mr. Kucharsky explains that staff conducted a study and volume count in the area, as there has been a request for a stop sign on Dodge Street at the intersection of Lafayette Street. Mr. Downing presents a map of the area. Currently no stop sign exists at the location.

Mr. Kucharsky notes that stop signs are recommended where a prevailing roadway has over 6,000 vehicles per day. Concurrent counts on Lafayette and Dodge Street found over 8,400 cars per day on Lafayette Street and 568 Eastbound on Dodge approaching the intersection. Based on these findings, Mr. Kucharsky states that staff recommends the stop sign be installed.

Mr. Downing presents a draft of the ordinance language for review.

Chair Shallop opens the floor to public comment.

Heather Famico of 195 Essex Street introduces herself. Ms. Famico states that she walks in the area quite a bit and notices that people cut through the intersection and do not stop. She adds that several streets along Lafayette also do not have stops, and perhaps the Commission could look into those as well. Ms. Famico also suggests the crosswalk on Dodge Street be repainted as well.

**Motion and Vote:** Commissioner Seidel motions to recommend the proposed ordinance language regarding the installation of a stop sign at the intersection of Dodge Street and Lafayette Street to City Council. Vice Chair Papetti seconds the motion. The vote is five (5) in favor and none (0) opposed. **The motion passes.**

### **OTHER BUSINESS THAT MAY LEGALLY COME BEFORE THE COMMISSION**

None.

### **UPCOMING MEETINGS SCHEDULE**

The next meeting is scheduled for April 15, 2021 at 6:00PM.

### **MEETING MINUTES APPROVAL**

January 21, 2021  
February 25, 2021

**Motion and Vote:** Commissioner Lt. Tucker motions to approve the January 21, 2021 and February 25, 2021 meeting minutes of the Traffic and Parking Commission. Commissioner Seidel seconds the motion. The vote is all in favor. **The motion passes.**

## **ADJOURNMENT**

*On a motion duly made by Commissioner Papetti and seconded by Commissioner Seidel the Traffic and Parking Commission meeting was adjourned at 7:56 PM.*