

CITY OF CORONADO

TRAFFIC OPERATIONS COMMITTEE MINUTES

Thursday, April 27, 2006

The regular meeting of the Traffic Operations Committee (T.O.C.) was held on Thursday, April 27, 2006, at 2:00 p.m. in the Council Chambers. Present were Scott Huth, Paul Crook, Tony Peña and Ed Walton. Rick Sitta represented the absent Kim Raddatz.

1. Minutes of the February 23, 2006 Meeting – Mr. Peña moved to approve the minutes and Mr. Sitta seconded the motion. The motion passed with Mr. Walton abstaining.

2. Oral Communications – Lee MacDonald, 901 First Street, recommends that the City Council pass an ordinance that prohibits the use of jake brakes or engine brakes within City limits for noise reduction purposes. There are cities in the United States that have those kinds of ordinances; two examples are Santa Fe, New Mexico and Eugene, Oregon. Jake brakes are a terrible annoyance; they bother him in front of his house. He was sitting at one of the downtown restaurants and the boom of jake brakes ruined the atmosphere. It's very noisy.

3. Recommendation Regarding the Request for Removal of Stop Signs on First Street at the Intersection with I Avenue – Mr. Johnson said that in March 2003 the City Council approved installation of stop signs on First Street at E and I Avenues to make those intersections three-way stops. At that time the approval was based on residents' concern for safe crossings to the parks and to a lesser degree, wanting to use the stop signs as traffic calming mechanisms to slow speeds on First Street. The City has warrants of analysis for installing stop signs; these are criteria considered for applicability of stop signs. The criteria considered are traffic volumes, accident histories and sight distance. There is the ability to look at other circumstances that may not fit those categories where traffic control devices may be used to increase a safety situation. This was one of those areas. Subsequent to the stop signs' installation some area residents found that there are some less desirable attributes of those stop signs such as increased noise and increased amount of vehicle emissions. Another thing that can occur when you put stop signs in a location that isn't necessarily warranted is that you get driver disregard for the signs and that can cause a dangerous situation with drivers rolling through the stops. What the City doesn't have is a warrant system for removal of traffic controls once they go in. Typically, you put them in because you have a condition that's prevailing and unless something drastic changes, that prevailing condition usually stays the same or increases in intensity.

Mr. Johnson wanted to make it clear that when staff received a petition to look specifically at the removal of the stop signs at First Street at I Avenue, E Avenue was not included in that petition. Staff felt that because they went in concurrently, E Avenue could be discussed by the Committee in a similar fashion to the I Avenue discussion. The way staff approached this request, since there is not a warrant for removal, was to

look at the warrant for installation of stop signs and whether or not the stop signs meet the warrant. A stop is warranted where any of the following conditions exist:

(1) *Total vehicular volume entering all approaches of the intersection averages 300 vehicles per hour for any eight hours and the vehicular volume on the minor, or side, street must average at least a third of that volume for those same eight hours.* Traffic counts on First Street, very similar to the first time this was analyzed, meet the volume criteria on First Street, but the traffic volumes on I and E Avenues are much lower, on the order of two or three percent of the total volume on First Street. Therefore, these two intersections do not meet the criteria for volume.

(2) *Accidents – Six or more accidents in a year that would be correctable by installing stop signs.* Luckily, this situation is not present at these two intersections. Prior to the installation of the stop signs there were no reported collisions; after the stop signs went in there were no reported collisions at E Avenue, but there were at least two rear-end type accidents at I Avenue and rear ends are typical of the type of accidents you'll find at stop-controlled intersections.

(3) *Visibility – If the sight distance on one of the approaches to the intersection is less than 160' it may be warranted for stop signs.* These two intersections intersect at right angles and except for parked cars and some vegetation that can make it seem like visibility is reduced, drivers have greater than 160' of sight distance on all approaches. Therefore, stop signs are not warranted for the visibility criterion.

(4) *In residential areas you can reduce traffic volumes from 300 to 180.* This doesn't have any effect on the analysis since the side street volumes are so low that it still doesn't meet the one-third criterion.

These intersections don't meet the warrants for installation of stop signs, but the original reasons they were installed were for pedestrian safety and to give residents better access to the parks since the stop-controlled intersections at Orange and Alameda are quite a way from the mid-block location of this street.

Mr. Johnson noted that the petition asking that the stop signs on First at I Avenue be removed also requested pedestrian warning signs. The *Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices*, a national publication that all agencies use for implementation of traffic controls, states that you can put in pedestrian warning signs where drivers might see unexpected entries into the roadway. Staff is not recommending those signs because the pedestrian counts are very low. Pedestrian counts were taken during the week; on the weekends there may be higher volumes. No more than four pedestrians were seen crossing at either of these intersections at the assumed peak hours (12:00-1:00 p.m. and 3:00-4:00 p.m.). Overall, at those intersections a total of 13 pedestrians was seen to be crossing during those two hours. That doesn't suggest that there is a large number of pedestrians crossing that would warrant the need for a crossing sign; therefore, the recommendation is to not install a pedestrian warning sign. Based on the stop warrant analysis, the recommendation would be to remove the stop signs at I Avenue. E Avenue was mentioned only because it was put in concurrently with I Avenue, but staff is not making a recommendation one way or the other for the E Avenue stop sign.

Mr. Huth asked if the rear-end accidents at I Avenue occurred immediately after the installation of the stop signs and Mr. Johnson said that it was after the signs were put in, but he's not sure if it was immediately after.

Shirley Kriet, 100 I Avenue, sees the good in having stop signs at First and I; that is not the problem. The problem is the noise and pollution and all those times when there are no pedestrians present, mostly at night and early morning, the commute hour. The noise is outrageous. Although the gate is closed, trucks go down First Street both ways in the middle of the night. People are already ignoring the stop signs so there's no way they would see pedestrian warning signs. She pleads for a pedestrian-activated stop system, but she is against stop lights. She's seen two such systems, one in New Zealand where you step on a plate at the intersection and it activates a stop. It's a busy intersection, just like I at First. It stops traffic all ways so that you can cross at either direction. She was having trouble even making a left-turn in her automobile into her garage on the northwest side because no one would stop and she was afraid of being hit from the rear by people who are looking at the park and not paying any attention. It's much easier now.

Patricia Corey, 900 First Street, on the corner of First and E, would love to see the signs removed at First and E. She sits in her office which is in the front of the house facing the stop signs and she probably sees at least 30 cars a day run the stop signs. The police occasionally catch them, but people are oblivious. More than that, it's the noise. The noise is tenfold compared to what it was before the stop signs were put in because of the cars coming to a full stop, revving their engines and taking off. The noise is incredible and she doesn't feel the traffic on E warrants stop signs. She'd like to see E included in the consideration of removal. She can get up a petition if necessary.

Cindy Sanders, 816 First Street, is opposed to removal of the E Avenue stop signs. It was put in for traffic calming, allowing people to cross the street to get to the park and allowing a little better protection getting in and out of the frontage street and any of the alleys along there. Granted, it's not patrolled; people do blow through the stop signs, but taking them away is only going to make it more of a racetrack; that's what it was and it will tend to be again. She thinks yes, there's a noise factor, but within a year the Third Street Gate is supposed to be open and trucks are supposed to no longer be an issue. The City Council has in its minutes that once the Third Street Gate goes in, it will designate First Street, a residential street, as a truck route. They promised. We have more noise, but we have safety and safety trumps noise. She can cross the street as can people with dogs. She feels the timeline for looking at pedestrian traffic should have been from 4:00-6:00 p.m. when people are home from work. She has asked and it's people from all over town, not just First, Second and Third Streets. She thinks the accidents are underreported. The stop signs have made a considerable difference and it's going in the right direction of stopping First from being such a raceway between Alameda and Orange.

Lu Ann Smith, 142 I Avenue, is for keeping the stop signs at I Avenue. She uses that park and goes across there at least two times a day at different times, so she sees people trying to cross and the traffic. There is no sidewalk on the park side of the street so everyone that uses that park has to cross somewhere. They'd either cross without a stop

sign and you know what that traffic is like (and the trucks) – if they see you they stop. This is a police problem and she never sees anyone there. The drivers know that and that's why they don't stop. If they were there giving tickets out she feels the word would get out and it would be a lot safer, stop sign or no stop sign. Children use that park and they have to cross somewhere. They use the stop sign because that's what it's there for. There are visitors all the time and they have to park on the other side of street and cross. She feels sorry for the people who live there and hopefully those trucks that make most of noise will use Third once the gate is open and there will be a win-win situation. There will still be some problems, but at least you'll have a safe crossing for pedestrians. There are people with walkers and she knows a man that uses that park twice a day who would never be able to get across without stop signs there. It's more of a pedestrian safety issue than the amount of traffic that goes by or an accident accounting.

Wendy Miller, 101 I Avenue, said that a lot of people signed petitions that are not able to attend today. A lot of the residents in that area are out of town and she has emails from several of them that are highly supportive of removing the stop signs. The residents at 160 I said "Please remove the stop signs; they're terrible. Thanks for your help and efforts." Larry and Penny Gunning, 505 First Street, says they're very much in favor of removing the stop signs at First and I Avenue. Brian and Tori Henselman are also in favor of removing the stop signs. These are people who live in the immediate area who are affected negatively by the stop signs. Ms. Miller distributed a sketch entitled "First Street/I Avenue Proposed Change to Traffic Signage" which she said shows that this didn't meet the warrants when they requested it and unfortunately, the City, by packaging the I Avenue request with the E Avenue request, has opened a can of worms. The E Avenue residents are very happy with their stop sign, obviously not all of them, but she thinks in general they would be. Her sketch perhaps depicts why they are happier with theirs vice the residents at I Avenue. She pointed out that E Avenue has a fairly large open area with a grassy area next to it with a driveway between, so there's a lot more of an opportunity for noise to dissipate as opposed to the area at I Avenue. If you look at I Avenue and the park, the houses are right up against the street and the trees and foliage in the park keep the noise from going somewhere. What happens with all of the traffic is that it comes up and reverberates back and forth. She was there prior to the stop signs going in and she appreciates every comment about crossing of the street because she was standing right where she is now saying the same thing: "We can't cross the street; we need a stop sign." She's here again saying "Please forgive my errors. I didn't know what I was asking for; it really has been a nightmare." She has a petition in which almost every resident in the immediate area of that stop sign has asked that the stop signs be removed. Does this mean that they are not worried about crossing the street? Absolutely not. Mayor Smisek said when he voted yes for the stop signs, even though they didn't meet the warrants originally, that this would hopefully be a traffic calming measure. That is all the First Street residents have ever really wanted – a way to slow the traffic down. That is why they asked the City to put in the signs that perhaps don't meet the warrants, but you could put in signs saying "Pedestrian Crossing." Remember, before we got the stop signs, they didn't even have a crosswalk there. They now have a crosswalk. By all means she supports Shirley Kriet's recommendation; the residents originally came to the City Council and said can we have embedded lights? That technology wasn't available or wasn't evaluated at the time, so we put a stop sign in and within six months they put embedded lights in at Ocean Boulevard. She would like a first choice recommendation to

be that perhaps embedded lights be looked at with pedestrian-activated stop signs. She wants the Committee to understand that although she's standing before them as a single person she does represent a number of people who signed a petition and have emailed her. The object here for the quiet enjoyment of the people who live in that area is to have the stop signs removed. They did not originally meet the warrants and she wants another look at perhaps another traffic calming measure for slowing the traffic down. Her sketch notes that the speed limit signs were put pretty much where they were originally, so you need to go all the way down to the stop sign before you see a speed limit sign. Perhaps putting the speed limit signs farther up and using another traffic calming measure sign like "Pedestrian Crossing Ahead" is the answer. She thinks that without a doubt, the answer that everyone who lives there would agree on is the noise is not the answer. They've kind of thrown the baby out with the bathwater here, so whatever they can do to help she would greatly appreciate it. One last thing about the accidents, both of them occurred within the last year. What's happening at that stop sign is that there are two trees growing out into the road. People driving toward the base do not see the stop sign until the last minute. She can't tell the number of times they've witnessed cars barreling through it or a truck realizing at the last minute that there's a stop sign there and screeching all the way through the intersection. So instead of making it safer, she believes the stop signs have increased the risk of being hit. As Jim Benson mentioned originally in the other meeting, when you have a crosswalk you feel safer. Now people are going out into the crosswalk, but they're not necessarily safer.

Steve Nystul, 116 E Avenue, is in favor of keeping the stop signs. He lives one house away from First Street and appreciates that there's more noise when the trucks stop. His neighbors have stressed the fact that they appreciate safety over the noise. To him, if 13 people cross at the time it was looked at, he's sure that could be multiplied by 10 for the pedestrians who cross from 6:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. He uses it many times during the day as do his neighbors and he agrees that people come from all over town to get to the park at First and E as he's sure they do down on I. He thinks the City owes it to the residents, pedestrians and bicyclists to make it safe for them to do that. That should be a priority. He's also sure it's a priority for the City to keep the traffic going slower, not faster, and he sees no reason to take down the stop signs to encourage the cars to go faster. He's heard his neighbors say over and over again that they could not turn into their garages or the alley prior to having the stop signs and they're able to do that now. He thinks just having crosswalks doesn't work; there are crosswalks all over town and you can stand on the sidewalk for a long period of time and the cars won't stop for you, so stop signs are necessary. Possibly putting some forewarning signs on the street saying "Stop Ahead" might help. Again, he's definitely for keeping the stop signs and it would be a real loss to remove them. Mr. Peña asked Mr. Nystul if he is opposed to removing the stop signs at only E or at E and I and Mr. Nystul responded that he would like to keep the stop signs at both places. All the reasons that they should be able to get to the E Avenue park are the same reasons to get to the even more beautiful park at I Avenue.

Langdon Smith lives at 800 First Street, one block away from E Avenue. He summarized an email he had sent: "We strongly believe that removing the stop signs is not a good thing. I'm for keeping the stop signs where they are. I think the engineers and the traffic commission did a good study when they installed them and I congratulate them for considering principally the safety aspects of putting the stop signs in." He went on to say

that the speed limit was changed from 30 mph to 25 mph and that is a traffic calming action. Granted, maybe the cars don't always go exactly at 25 mph, but 25 plus a couple of miles on top of that is a little bit different than 30 mph with a few miles on top of that. He thinks the stop signs, coupled with the reduction in the speed limit, are definitely calming aspects and contribute to the safety of the residents, visitors to the park and anybody else who happens to be on First Street. First Street has a lot of traffic that enters and exits the Naval Air Station and they've put up with that for quite a while and they are all looking forward to the installation of the Third Street Gate which will take a huge amount of the heavy traffic off First Street. That will reduce the noise, but he really would like to comment that the reduction in the speed limit and the stop signs work together to slow down the traffic. If you take the stop signs away there's a long stretch between Orange Avenue and Alameda and the tendency of drivers, if there's no one in front of them, could be to go 35 or 40 mph, even with the speed limit at 25 mph, down an unobstructed street. The stop signs help to slow them down. The stop signs and the speed limit reduction are synergistic and they complement each other to help the safety of the area. Please don't take them away.

Lee MacDonald, 901 First Street said he lives directly across from E Avenue. He'd like to encourage the T.O.C. to include the E Avenue stop sign in the decision to remove the stop sign at I Avenue. He'd also like the T.O.C. to not base their decision on testimonials and more on the engineering studies which point out that stop signs are not warranted based on the volume of traffic compared to the volume of pedestrian traffic. He leaves his house many times a day and it's very, very rare that you see the need for a car to stop because there's a pedestrian. You can make that between 4:00-6:00 p.m. and you can surely make it between 4:30-7:30 a.m. when the majority of the traffic is going toward the base. He can no longer leave his bedroom windows open because the traffic starts at 4:30. A large truck with Jake brakes and a large transmission can go through six gears before it gets through the other side of the intersection. There are cars with echo boxes for mufflers, cars with echo boxes for radios and big diesel trucks with 10 gears and automatic transmissions that make a lot of noise. He suggests that if you don't believe the engineering studies, if you go down there and stand for a while, you'll see there's absolutely no justification unless you want to make sure 1,000% that someone will stop for a pedestrian. It's just not warranted for protection of pedestrians.

Richard Sanders, 816 First Street, says there are obviously some differences in opinion here. He would like to make sure to keep the stop signs at E and First. It is so nice to be able to go across the street and visit the neighbor. It is so nice to be able to go across the street and visit the park, which you could not do prior to the stop signs. It was a very, very dangerous situation. It is a long stretch, almost a mile, from Orange Avenue to Alameda and in that space, when you have an open throughway, the cars tend to go 30-40 and more mph. This is definitely a traffic calming measure. If you know what a California roll is, where cars slow down and stop, but never come to a complete stop, that happens all the time, but they do make the effort and if there isn't a police patrol officer there 24 hours a day, seven days a week, the stop signs provide a "free officer." People tend to speed without police around, but by and large, if they see a stop sign, they will stop or at least make a California roll. That's what it's doing; it's calming, slowing down the traffic.

Ricardo Johnson lives at 822 First Street, right at the corner of First and E. He feels uniquely qualified to talk about stop signs before and after they were put in because he's been living there for about nine years. The lady before said the E Avenue residents are happy with the signs but he doesn't think anybody is happy with the signs. Certainly the thousands of commuters driving through every day going to the Navy base are not very happy stopping there. He hates them because there is a lot of noise and pollution, so he doesn't think anyone is happy, but the residents fought for them for 12 years. Finally, after 12 years of crying to the City to do something about the traffic on First Street, particularly truck traffic, the only thing they got were stop signs. It's what they got, not what they wanted to get. They asked first for de-designation of the truck route, which was approved unanimously by the City Council in 1996 just before Mayor Smisek was elected; once he took over, that was forgotten. No action was ever taken. Later, they went many, many times to the City Council to complain and ask that something be done about trucks and traffic. Nothing was ever done. When the EIRs were prepared for the new carriers that came to Coronado, as well as for the expansion of the commissary and exchange, First Street was not even considered, as though nothing was there. As a result, traffic has tripled since he bought his house in 1996 and double since the stop signs were put in. Again, they don't like the stop signs, but they need them. He read something his wife said in 1992 when the signs were first being discussed: "Cecilia Johnson, 822 First Street. We live in constant fear for the safety of our children, aged five, eight and 12, because of the excessive speeds and the difficulty and danger in crossing the street. They visit their best friends who live across the street, the Andersons, as well as take the dog to the park at least three to four times a day. At 20 mph it takes a car 69' to stop; at 30 mph a car takes 120' to stop; trucks take twice that distance. This will help to reduce the speed and give the cars a chance to stop in case they see a child trying to cross the street. I am sure that as parents and grandparents the Council will agree with me and will share my concerns for the safety of the kids in Coronado. These are public parks. I trust that the Council is ready to take this step." Mr. Johnson went on to say that yesterday the City of Carlsbad approved five to one not to remove barricades because cars were being diverted through streets where children were crossing. No statistic or engineering study will ever warrant the endangerment or life of a child. He is extremely concerned for the lives of our children. The only thing everyone seems to agree on here, the E Street and the I Street residents, is noise and traffic. This is the only thing that pulled them together to get the stop signs in the first place. The City should do something about traffic on First Street, in particular, trucks. They should no longer avoid that responsibility and should do something about traffic. Noise, pollution and nuisance are only a result of traffic. Let's solve the problem from the root, not by giving more aspirins. Finally, as to noise, he lived there before the signs were put in and noise is exponentially proportional to the speed of cars. It was much noisier before than it is now. Not that it is pleasant to sleep there or try to sleep there at 5:00 a.m. when they're awakened every day, but it was worse before.

Nancy Reynolds, T.O.C. recording secretary, reported that she had received another petition right before the meeting, so the T.O.C. had not had a chance to see it yet. She counted 24 signatures in support of retaining stop signs on First Street.

Mr. Huth asked the T.O.C. member for comments. Mr. Walton felt that both sides presented equally compelling cases. He understands the noise issue and thinks when this

was originally brought up that was one of the things discussed – that there will be noise associated with stop signs; there are adverse impacts of noise and air pollution with people stopping. When this was looked at from a technical engineering standpoint it did not meet the warrants, but he thinks there was some justification and validity in the recommendation to put them in because of the issue of crossing to the parks, safety and making those two intersections more visible. The stop signs do that. He feels this is a no-win situation but if he's going to err, he will err on the side of safety.

Mr. Peña asked if there are technical reports indicating what the impact on First Street will be in terms of reduction of both volume and type of traffic, such as removal of trucks, when the Third Street Gate is open. Mr. Walton said there is not a detailed study stating that X number of vehicles will be removed. The Third Street Gate is going to have the truck processing area so trucks going to North Island that need to be screened for security reasons will be entering through Third Street. Whether that will take all the trucks off First Street he can't say. The gate may be open around August 2007. Mr. Peña said changes are often made based on changes in the environment; right now there's been no change in the environment. The traffic volume is still high and the reasons the signs were put in still exist today. Even though the opinions have changed, the conditions are similar. He thinks a lot of people want to keep the signs because they are serving a purpose. This may be a situation where removal would be more appropriate after the Third Street Gate is implemented. Mr. Huth asked if there was a commitment for de-designation of the truck route after the new gate is opened and Mr. Walton said it was discussed at the Council level but he doesn't recall if there was an actual vote that committed to that.

Mr. Sitta sympathizes with the residents about noise. He actually moved from a residence because of noise. [Mr. Sitta's other comments were inaudible.]

Chief Crook said he wished he had the ability to put someone on First Street full-time, but obviously he doesn't. He has to take the few officers he has and spread them around town and hit First sporadically. Any time the City has the ability to do something that involves safety, from his aspect, that's the way to go. He agrees that it would probably become a little quieter if the two signs at the park were removed, but this does give people an opportunity to cross the street and he's inclined to vote on the side of safety.

Mr. Peña is sympathetic to that position; even though it's controversial now, the people who wanted the signs got what they wanted and for some people it's working and for some people it's not, but for the people who say it's working, it's working on the side of safety which he supports. He thinks at the appropriate time the signs could be reconsidered for removal, for example, once the Third Street Gate project is completed. At the present time he thinks it should remain status quo.

Mr. Walton liked that thought and said that once it's realized what traffic patterns develop after the Third Street Gate is open and people are using it, if there's a reduction on First Street of 20% of traffic he thinks that would be significant enough to want to look at this again. Mr. Huth said he shared some of the same observations and another issue is that the I Avenue park hasn't been heavily used because special events haven't been allowed since they started doing some modifications there in the fall. The schedule

for completing the modifications is June and he suspects that, as before, there were a lot of small weddings and that park will ramp up again with activities and it will probably be used a little more than it is today. With that being said, he thinks everyone on the Committee feels for the impacts of putting the stop signs in. He recalls that the T.O.C. was very specific about knowing that those impacts were going to be there. He very clearly remembers that the T.O.C. indicated knowing that there would be some associated negative effects with the stop sign installation. It doesn't surprise him to hear today's comments; that's the situation all through town with stop signs. He leans toward what has been suggested to see what the impact of the Third Street Gate will be. There may be some other factors that come out of that; the City may actually be looking at the designation of First Street as a truck route.

Mr. Peña made a motion to keep the status quo and review the item once the effects of the Third Street Gate installation are realized and Chief Crook seconded it. The motion passed unanimously.

4. Recommendation Regarding the Engineering and Traffic Study for Pomona Avenue – Chief Crook moved to approve this on consent; it was seconded by Mr. Walton and passed unanimously.

5. Recommendation Regarding the Engineering and Traffic Study for Tenth Street – Chief Crook moved to approve this on consent; it was seconded by Mr. Walton and passed unanimously.

6. Recommendation Regarding the Engineering and Traffic Study for Glorietta Boulevard – Chief Crook moved to approve this on consent; it was seconded by Mr. Walton and passed unanimously.

7. Recommendation Regarding the Posting of City Alleyways with 15-MPH Signage – Mr. Johnson related that in December an issue to install speed humps on the 300 blocks of A, B and C Avenues went to the City Council. During the Council discussion there was a comment about speeds in the alleys because the petition originally asked for speed humps on the alleys also. At the time it was mentioned that there is an existing 15-mph speed limit sign on one of the alleys between B and C Avenues and Council asked that the T.O.C. look at installing speed limit signs in the alleys because there was a perception that people aren't aware that the prima facie speed limit on an alley is 15 mph. The Engineering Department polled some other cities and asked them how they handle this and much like most cities, including Coronado, when dealing with prima facie speed limits they don't post them. That's one of the things when you get a driver's license that you're supposed to be aware of. Therefore, based on what other cities are doing, not as a rule posting that prima facie speed limit, it's the staff recommendation that we don't post the prima facie 15 mph speed limit on alleys. There are some alternatives because there may be some areas in the City where 15-mph signs may be useful. One of those areas is where commercial uses are separated from residential, such as the Orange/D and Orange/C alleys where there is residential on the lettered street and commercial on Orange. Those alleys are more heavily traveled by people who may not realize that there is a 15-mph speed limit. One alternative would be to post only those alleys that get a lot of use, particularly in the central business district.

Another alternative could be to post them all; that would require at least two signs per alley and with over 100 alleys in the City it would be tens of thousands of dollars to do that. Another alternative would be to maintain the status quo and not post any of the alleys.

Mr. Peña said this issue did not come out of a widespread need because there are people racing up and down alleys, but from another related topic at a Council meeting when someone indicated they had a 15-mph sign in the alley behind their home. It was questioned why this alley had a sign and others didn't. He supports the staff recommendation not to do anything. Chief Crook concurs with Mr. Peña's recommendation; the problem is that if you put signs up in the commercial areas someone will come in and say their area is more traveled and they need signs. He suggests staying where we are.

Chief Crook moved to support the staff recommendation to not post the alleys with 15-mph signage; Mr. Sitta seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 3:05 p.m.