

CITY OF CORONADO

TRAFFIC OPERATIONS COMMITTEE MINUTES

Thursday, January 26, 2006

The regular meeting of the Traffic Operations Committee (T.O.C.) was held on Thursday, January 26, 2006, at 2:00 p.m. in the Council Chambers. Present were Paul Crook, Ed Walton and Tony Peña. Rick Sitta represented the absent Kim Raddatz and Scott Huth was absent and unrepresented. Also present was Dave Johnson, Assistant Engineer.

1. Minutes of the October 27, 2005 Special Meeting – The minutes were unanimously approved.

2. Oral Communications – None.

3. Recommendation Regarding a Request for a 12-Minute Parking Zone at 1113 Tenth Street – Mr. Johnson said a request had been received from a business owner of a tailoring establishment at 1113 Tenth Street to install a 12-minute limited time parking zone. The owner is concerned that the two-hour parking meters in the area don't facilitate the necessary turnover for parking in the area. This business is located right on the alley between Orange and C Avenues facing Tenth Street. The business next door is a Mexican take-out restaurant that also has a need for frequent turnover. Currently, there is a 25' yellow commercial loading zone directly opposite this location. Yellow zones are used for commercial and passenger loading and unloading for a time not to exceed 20 minutes. The rest of the parking in this location is all two-hour metered parking. The T.O.C. has in the past granted 12-minute limited time curb zones for businesses that need the frequent turnover. Examples are at 1015 Isabella and 1109 Ninth Street. Based on the need here and the fact that parking is impacted by the two-hour meters and there is not the availability of quick turnover parking, it's the staff recommendation to convert one two-hour metered space to a 12-minute metered parking space.

Mr. Walton moved approval of the staff recommendation, Mr. Peña seconded it and it passed unanimously.

4. Recommendation Regarding a Request to Re-Paint the Crosswalks at the Intersections of Orange Avenue with B and C Avenues – Mr. Johnson said that a resident, Jon Ryan, stated a concern about the ability for pedestrians to cross Orange Avenue safely at B and C Avenues and asked that the crosswalks that used to be painted there be reinstalled. By way of background, Orange Avenue is controlled by Caltrans, so ultimately any traffic control devices that are installed there are done by Caltrans. Also, Caltrans has adopted a policy over the years of not installing marked crosswalks at uncontrolled intersections. Their policy is to encourage pedestrian crossings at controlled locations like signals or stop signs. The *Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices* states that you can paint marked crosswalks at uncontrolled intersections after you've done an analysis of certain criteria. The City has a warrant for installation of marked crosswalks at uncontrolled intersections, so he collected data to see how these locations

held up to the City's warrants. Six criteria have to be evaluated and all six must be met. In the case of these two crosswalks it appears that all criteria are met except the fifth, which is intersection visibility. Due to landscaping in the median, it limits the sight distance for drivers approaching the intersection to less than 200' which doesn't meet the criteria. Therefore, a positive recommendation for a marked crosswalk cannot be given at this location. It should be noted that it does miss only one criterion. Typically, pedestrians feel it's their right to step out in a crosswalk and they are not necessarily as cognizant of oncoming traffic as they should be. This location is one where he feels personally it would be dangerous to put in marked crosswalks to encourage pedestrians to cross at these areas because of the reduced sight distances for drivers. This issue came up to the T.O.C. about four or five months ago and we discussed speed in the business area and that there is a perceived speeding problem in the area. It has been documented that speed has been a primary factor in some accidents. One of the things we're working on is to install some additional 25 mph speed limit signs in the business district, particularly around B and C Avenues. Vehicle speeds are somewhat high, visibility is somewhat reduced in this area and there's a lot going on; if drivers aren't paying attention it could be a precarious situation for a pedestrian in a crosswalk who feels that a driver will stop for him because of those markings. To sum it up, the areas meet all of the warrants except for visibility; therefore, staff is not making a positive recommendation for installation of crosswalks at these locations. But there is an issue out there because a lot of pedestrians cross at this location.

Mr. Peña noted that this all comes down to the 200' visibility criterion and asked how far below that are those locations? Mr. Johnson responded that there are four separate approaches; the range is 100' to about 170'. Mr. Peña recalled a resident complaining that one of these intersections was dangerous at a previous meeting and it was difficult even for vehicles trying to cross; he would think that if the traffic speed is lowered that will help balance the fact that there is reduced visibility. Mr. Johnson believes that a cautious pedestrian is a safe pedestrian; he has seen pedestrians crossing in marked crosswalks and they just don't look. They feel that any car approaching is going to stop for them when they're in a crosswalk; it seems like pedestrians' attitudes are a little different at non-marked crosswalks because they actually look both ways to make sure no cars are coming and these would be some of those areas.

Mr. Walton said he's observed pedestrians crossing from the median at mid-block. That is a dangerous situation because vehicles are not expecting someone to be standing on the curb in the middle of the median and they're much more expecting them to be at least at the end of the median in the concrete area, so that's another issue with having pedestrians cross at these locations.

Jon Ryan, 716 Margarita Avenue, says that back in the 1960s Orange Avenue was 25 mph and there was a crosswalk on every single intersecting street. Today, the longest stretch of Orange Avenue is between Tenth to the Hotel Del. And yet we have the "Molly Trolley," the major section of the business district and tourists here. He works in the Wendy's building and when he goes to the newspaper office it's murder to get across that street. You're not going to change human behavior to walk down to Tenth or up to the Del, especially if people are tourists. If you're talking about 200' maybe you could justify a crosswalk at C Avenue because you can see 200' or more. Granted, the one by Bistro d'Asia you can't see; however, on the other side, if you're over by the Bank of Coronado you can see them and they can see you. You could think about a half-crosswalk just to get people halfway over so they have a chance to make it the rest of the

way. He's asking the committee how we can solve this problem and do what's right for the residents.

Mr. Crook asked about painting a crosswalk on one side of the street where the visibility for drivers is better and Mr. Johnson said crosswalks are used to guide pedestrians and when they're expecting to be guided by a crosswalk if it ends on the other side of the street, even though it seems intuitive, it's one of those inconsistencies in marking. He would be uncomfortable with that.

Mr. Walton said he has concerns about C Avenue because there is no intersection on the west side, so in essence that's a mid-block crossing for people on that side and he doesn't think that drivers necessarily expect people to cross there. This is a tough issue, though, because of the number of pedestrians and he doesn't know if crosswalks are the solution. In all the studies he's read, crosswalks give pedestrians a false sense of security and they assume the right-of-way, which they have by law, but if the vehicle doesn't stop, whether they're in the right or wrong they're going to get hit and that paint's not going to stop them. He is a little uncomfortable about recommending crosswalks.

Toni Gaylord, executive director of Coronado MainStreet Association, says that pedestrian safety is one of the most important parts of MainStreet's job and if we didn't have pedestrians we wouldn't have a downtown. She would like to thank the committee for the installation of 25 mph in the downtown; with a little more enforcement (and she's seen some good enforcement going on), she thinks it has made a big difference in the downtown as far as being safe. She asked which landscaping is causing the visibility problem; if it's part of their median garden project they will be happy to trim it back. Mr. Johnson said at one intersection it's the large fir tree and Ms. Gaylord said that's not hers, but perhaps in the interest of safety that could be trimmed back. She asked about the blinking crosswalk on Ocean Boulevard; could that be used here? Mr. Johnson said they seem best suited for night-time crossings and while there probably are quite a few night-time crossings here, they found the overall effectiveness didn't justify the maintenance and installation costs involved. Ms. Gaylord isn't sure that crosswalks work either, but she thinks something needs to be done to guarantee that pedestrians have some security in crossing the street.

Mr. Peña says there's a general Caltrans policy about crosswalks and that's probably why they were taken off Orange Avenue. The data they have indicate that they actually create unsafe, hazardous situations; their conclusion was that people have a false sense of security when crossing between marked lines and he believes there's some scientific proof for that. The unusual thing in Coronado, though, is the wide, grassy median that people have lunch on and where people cross mid-block all the time; you have to watch for people crossing the street at almost any location. It seems that this type of situation lends itself to some kind of assisted crossing to make it safer. People are walking haphazardly all over right now, so a little channeling might be beneficial; maybe a pedestrian light could be considered. Mr. Crook suggested trying something on a trial basis, either some controls or putting a crosswalk back in, at one of the two intersections to see how it does. Mr. Peña brought up the lighted crosswalk; he had not been in favor of the one on Ocean, but it was in a far corner of the City with a low pedestrian count. This situation might lend itself to that because of the high pedestrian count and a large gap between the lighted intersections. It might neutralize the fact that you don't have 200' of visibility. Mr. Walton also feels more comfortable with something more than paint. Whatever the committee and Council decide, it will still be just a recommendation to Caltrans because they are in control of Orange Avenue and they may say "no thanks."

It does give more credibility if the City makes the recommendation to Caltrans rather than a citizen.

Mr. Ryan said he recently visited New Zealand and there are some interesting traffic things the City might want to take a look at. They use Bots dots in front of crosswalks and also paint long letters on the road that say "Crosswalk Ahead." It's a warning system that's in front of the driver. It seemed to be very effective.

Mr. Crook suggested putting this item on hold to try to come up with some ideas. Mr. Peña said the committee heard this issue from a driver's point of view in the past and now they're hearing it from the pedestrians' point of view. Obviously, there is smoke here.

Mr. Crook moved to send this back and try to come up with something. Mr. Walton said the motion should include bringing Caltrans in at this stage to see what they would and would not be willing to do and he seconded it. It passed unanimously.

5. Recommendation Regarding a Request to Install Pavement Markings at the Intersections of Eighth and Tenth Streets with Orange Avenue – Mr. Johnson said a resident feels that the intersection could be made more efficient by placing individual pavement markings that would show drivers a through lane and a right-turn lane. The resident believes there is sufficient room for vehicles queued on Eighth or Tenth Streets at the stoplights going straight or left to move far enough over to the left to maintain room for a vehicle wanting to turn right to pass on the right. The *Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices* (MUTCD) gives standards for the use of pavement markings and states that only when a lane movement is mandatory shall it have a pavement marking; for instance, on Third and Fourth Streets at Orange Avenue where the lanes are left-turn only, there is a left-turn arrow. One of the problems at Eighth and Tenth Streets is the limited width of the streets; because we want to maintain curbside parking there, it doesn't leave sufficient width to delineate separate lanes. Due to the constraints of the MUTCD we shouldn't put more than one type of marking on the street. The staff recommendation is to not install any additional pavement markings because of the insufficient room on the pavement for what essentially would become two separate lanes.

Mr. Walton moved approval of the staff recommendation; Mr. Sitta seconded it and it passed unanimously.

6. Recommendation Regarding the Engineering & Traffic Surveys for Alameda Boulevard and First Street – Mr. Johnson said that for the September T.O.C. meeting a public notification was made regarding the new Caltrans engineering and traffic surveys for Third and Fourth Streets. The reason the traffic surveys were re-done was that with Caltrans' adoption of the new national standard *Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices* (MUTCD), they were able to use criteria not available in the previous traffic manual to look at other aspects of the roadway when doing traffic surveys and ultimately setting speed zones. That criterion is residential density and it addresses a certain number of dwelling units facing the roadway within a defined length. At the September meeting, the T.O.C. wanted City staff to look into that as well. Staff was directed ultimately by Council to study streets with speed zones over 25 mph and to, if we could, look at applying the residential density criterion to those streets. The initial streets to be looked at were First Street between Alameda Boulevard and Orange Avenue and Alameda Boulevard between Ocean Boulevard and Fourth Street. The current 30-mph speed limit is based on the old Caltrans traffic manual way of implementing speed zones by looking

at prevailing speeds, accident history and conditions not apparent to drivers. When using the Caltrans way of speed zoning, we look at the 85th percentile speed (the speed at which 85% of drivers are driving at least that speed). For First Street we clocked an 85th percentile speed of 31 mph eastbound and 32 westbound. Based on the previous speed zoning criteria, we would lower that to the next lowest five-mph increment or 30 mph and that would be where the speed limit was set. But now we can look at things such as residential density criteria and First Street has at least 13 dwelling units on one side of the roadway within a quarter of a mile segment; this can be used to lower the speed limit an additional five mph below the existing 30. Based on that and the fact that there are quite a few pedestrians crossing to the parks at E and I Avenues, the staff recommendation is to lower the speed limit to 25 mph. This would be enforceable by radar based on the new traffic and engineering survey.

John Steele, 724 First Street, says what he's heard is very encouraging. He'd like to add a couple of other things. One of the questions on the driver's license test he just took was "What is the speed limit in a residential area?" The answer is 25 mph. He also pointed out that the two state highways two blocks from First Street are now 25 mph. He thinks from a risk management point of view it doesn't make sense to have highways at 25 mph and a residential street with no businesses at 30 mph.

Richard Sanders, 816 First Street, thanked the committee for reviewing this. He's in favor of the recommendation. This is a very residential area and yet there are 6,000 that go up it every day; calming the traffic and keeping it at a lower speed, much like has been allowed to happen on Third and Fourth, is very desirable. He has friends who live on Third and Fourth and they have said it's livable for the first time. That decrease in five mph makes that much difference and he's looking forward to it on First Street. Some unforeseen conditions are that some residents have to back in or drive out at a 90° angle and also, First Street is the only street in town that is posted from one end to the other at 30 mph. Orange and Alameda are 30 and 25, so this is kind of odd since First is a residential area. It's also a scenic route which we advocate and promote in town. There are parking lanes and bike lanes and just two lanes left for vehicles traveling toward each other at 30 mph; this is obviously a concern. It's wonderful that we are taking our city back. We are a tourist town, a residential town connected to a military town and we enjoy having lots of folks here, but we want it done in a safe manner. Taking our streets back on Third and Fourth was a great beginning. He would hope that the Council could consider making all of Coronado 25 mph. This has been done in many tourist towns; he thinks it's 20 mph in Balboa. It's confusing to have different speed limits on the same street. He'd like to see a sign as you enter Coronado: "Traffic Laws Strictly Enforced."

Mr. Peña moved approval of the staff recommendation; Mr. Walton seconded it and it passed unanimously.

Mr. Crook clarified for the audience that this would not go into immediate effect. It will be brought to Council and they will have final approval.

7. Discussion Item Regarding the Proposed Right-of-Way Improvements along Sixth Street as Part of Coronado Unified School District's Early Childhood Development Center – Mr. Johnson said this item is on the agenda to provide a forum for comment and discussion. The School District (CUSD) is building an Early Childhood Development Center along Sixth Street between Balboa and Coronado Avenues. As part of that project, in an agreement with the City, they proposed to provide some additional parking

in the form of diagonal parking partially within the public right-of-way and part on private property. He displayed a preliminary design drawing of the proposed improvements. Essentially, the proposal is to provide additional diagonal parking to the east and west of Balboa Avenue and a small turn-around area for loading and unloading of students and passengers. The existing cul-de-sac bulb-out is where the Early Childhood Development Center will be located while the east side of the campus will be the District offices. The only area where he has some concern is on Sixth Street near Coronado Avenue where the entrance to the turn-around is – there is currently parallel parking on the south curb between Coronado and Balboa and with vehicles parked there it reduces the width of the pavement to about 30'. While a standard travel lane is 12' and here there would be 15', with turning movements it will be a little tighter, it wouldn't go below any design minimums.

Mr. Walton noted that if CUSD plans to have bus service there will be a bus loading and unloading zone directly across Balboa.

Mr. Peña said the City had met with CUSD representatives and he thought the City had requested that a portion of all of the spaces be located on school property and it looks like those on the west are all located in the public right-of-way. That was to indicate that the school district was providing parking spaces on their site and only a portion would be in the right-of-way. He wonders what happened to that. Mr. Walton recalls a little differently; he thought it was just those to the east side and they are pushing into the school property. That is for their faculty parking and would also be shared with the school district office building once it's constructed. Mr. Peña suggested verifying that.

Mr. Sitta asked how the parking spaces would hinder emergency traffic flow with vehicles parked on the street and also diagonally as presented in the plan. Will the turn-outs accommodate the necessary drop-offs so that there aren't also vehicles dropping off kids behind those parking spaces? Mr. Johnson said he can't predict the amount of queuing that might occur here. It's very possible during a peak time when everyone is being dropped off that cars might queue along Sixth Street and could hinder vehicles parked diagonally from getting out. If they're queued up on Sixth Street that would impact any emergency vehicle coming down the street, but he would imagine that would be something that would occur a very small amount of time.

Felipe Ricketts, 13686 Mira Montana Drive, Del Mar, is the architect working with CUSD on this street improvement project, the Early Childhood Development Center and the district offices which will be on the same site toward the east. He believes the additional on-site parking Mr. Peña was referring to is parking that is part of the district office project. That project originally had about 15 on-site parking stalls; as part of the conversation with the community and the City, an additional 15 were added, so it's not only what you can see on the plan, but is coming in a future project, and is completely on school property, so it would not come up to this committee for review. Still, it's part of the conversation the City and the community had with CUSD to provide appropriate parking. CUSD is attempting to satisfy community needs.

Kevin Reilly, 628 Cabrillo, said when he first saw the plans for the Early Childhood Development Center he realized that CUSD had given no thought to any traffic planning whatsoever. CUSD moved ahead with their mitigated negative declaration and approved it despite the community's concerns with the routing of traffic. This is a band-aid solution, not really an engineered solution. It's like "this is the best we could do because we didn't want to take the time to design it right to begin with or to

modify the design appropriately.” He questioned how many students the facility will be serving and what time frame will they arrive? He guesses it’s a few hundred and they will probably arrive within about 15 minutes; he thinks the start time is around 8:30 a.m. now. Moms generally arrive about 8:15 to 8:25 and it’s a whole lot of students and cars that all have to converge on one spot at one time. So, in terms of coming up with the best design for getting all those small children out of their cars with their parents, because the parents typically want to walk them to the gate, how do you get that many people out of their cars and to the specified entrance in a 10 or 15-minute time frame? There are a couple of dozen parking spots there, so that’s a couple of dozen students and if they turn over once in the time that they’re there, which he thinks is optimistic, maybe you could get up to 50, but now you still have maybe 200 or more that still have to get there at the same time. Is there a more efficient way to design a drop-off area so that you could enable more students to be dropped off safely in a shorter period of time rather than just putting in a lot of diagonal parking spots? Perhaps the entire area on the west where there are about a dozen parking spaces should be drop-off, perhaps with an island so students could be dropped off on the island as well as next to the curb with two rows of cars moving in there and no parking. You’d drop students off and they’d be met by someone with the school to take them so the mothers don’t have to get out of the cars. This plan is better than what was there before, but is it adequate to meet the needs? He’s not sure.

Edith Flynn, 601 Cabrillo, thinks that the west diagonal parking is mostly for staff, so that’s an important reason to leave it there. The parking on the east side would be for people coming and going. The administration building will be over there so that would add to the available parking for that. She thinks this is the best CUSD could come up given the area they have to work with. She thinks it’s a pretty good plan.

Roy Mantz, 600 Cabrillo, feels this is vastly improved over the initial design and he thinks it will work. In respect to something Mr. Reilly said, it’s his understanding that the school has agreed that they were going to set up a program where they would have school staff meet cars at the curb at the turn-around so parents don’t have to park, but can simply let children out of the car to be picked up by a school administrator and delivered to their class. The traffic in the bulb turn-around would not have to park and the parents would not have to get out of the cars. It should work. If Kevin’s problem materializes, and you need more drop-off space, perhaps you could consider using part or all of the westernmost diagonal parking stalls, but for right now, he suggests going with this plan and see if it works. If it works, fine, if it doesn’t and you need more drop-off area, then you can convert the diagonal parking back into a drop-off zone.

Mick Herring, 600 Coronado Avenue, remembers from the second school board meeting after the “irate mob” presented its views on the parking problems that their solution was what has been alluded to, but his reading of that solution is that they were going to have delineated two lanes in the turn-around and both lanes would be for purely drop-off, not parking, and they would provide aides that would meet and take the students into the Child Development Center. He doesn’t know if the turn-out area in the bulb is wide enough to allow two lanes. He asked if the “kidney-shaped thing” is a concrete island and Mr. Johnson said that it is. He asked if the westernmost parking spaces were designed to be short-term, two-hour, all-day or does anybody care? Mr. Johnson recalled hearing a concern that there will be parents who will want to walk their children to class no matter what and the westernmost diagonal places would be where they would park, in an ideal world. Mr. Herring observed that there will be two conflicting modes with

people trying to get in and then get back out of those spaces while the queue is there trying to get into the drop-off. He was also concerned about the blocking of an existing storm/sewer opening. Mr. Johnson said the inlet will be moved to another location and the hydrology will not be changed – there will be no drainage area added to this project.

Mr. Crook agrees that this is a vast improvement. If we find that there are queuing problems for the west side in the morning, the hours could always be restricted in time for diagonal parking, similar to what's done by Sacred Heart School and Village Elementary. Cars could then queue up there if they need to.

Mr. Walton said he was in some initial meetings with CUSD when they were talking about this and he recalls that the westernmost diagonal parking was going to have signage indicating "Loading/Unloading" during drop-off and pick-up times. So those are for quick turn-over and during non-drop-off and pick-up times it would be open parking. The school was going to direct their staff to park on the east side so parking on the west side would be available for parents and students to use. He'd like to talk about signage and some of the construction materials, street trees and those kinds of issues, but first of all he'd like to focus on whether this concept is acceptable to the committee.

Mr. Reilly said when this was brought up the last time with the school board they realized there was no drop-off at all. He took pictures and gave them to all the school board members and they realized what a nightmare it was and kind of went "we have to do something." So they painted the curb green which made it a temporary area and the effect of that was that now there was a drop-off point, but all the cars that used to park there now park on the City streets, so the residents have cars parked in front of their homes all the time. It's not a huge problem, but it's definitely a departure – when Coronado had four elementary schools they were geographically separated so there really was no traffic associated with them. Kids could pretty much walk or ride their bikes to school, but now that we have one elementary school serving the entire village and the pre-school is on the other end, everybody has to drive, so the school board has created a big traffic nightmare in the center of town and now another one at this end. From a resident's point of view, he'd rather not have cars parked in front of his house all day every day. So when you identify those diagonal parking areas on the west as 12 minutes, the teachers aren't going to park there and will be loading up the City streets. He thinks the Mayor sent a letter to the school board when they were considering this saying "you don't meet the City's regulations for parking with your new facility and from an environmental point of view it's not right." But of course the school board went ahead and did it anyway. When you're considering how you time those spaces on the west, if you make them short duration then you load up the residents' homes with cars that might not otherwise be there and those spaces will be vacant most of the day.

Jack Sloan, 620 Balboa, thinks the plans are great. The biggest thing is you have to have protection of the Police Department. That's the full solution. You've got mothers down there that triple park, you can't get in or out of Balboa Avenue and you can't get up Sixth Street. The traffic plan won't work unless you have police down there to move these people. It's a dangerous situation – little kids run out between the cars. All the automobiles jam up in one corner.

Mr. Peña said the reason this came to the City is because the City Council was concerned that the school district was not providing enough required parking on their site for the facility. Through compromise and negotiation this is the general plan that resulted. He thinks it will work; it will require good behavior on the part of parents dropping off children, as well as local traffic. If you have really slow speeds and cautious

people he thinks it will work; if you don't have that, no plan will work. Regarding the parking on the west, he thinks that was necessary to get the numbers up to meet the City's requirement for this type of facility, so he would not be in favor of reducing any spaces unless they could be made up in another area to serve the site.

Mr. Sitta said he was part of some of the preliminary meetings and they talked about making the westernmost diagonal parking spaces temporary or limited parking, but there was also a concern that this would encourage the constant backing out of vehicles and it was a safety concern with all the children present. It was discussed that the additional western spaces were in place to accommodate the needs of the City.

Mr. Reilly asked if this meets the City's parking requirements and Mr. Peña replied that it does. Mr. Reilly believes there is a 250-seat auditorium for pre-school productions. He said the City's parking requirement doesn't address drop-off rates – it says “How many people work here? This is how many spaces you need.” It doesn't go into details such as if you have to drop 200 people off inside of 15 minutes; that's not addressed. Mr. Peña said he believed there was an initial study done for the project which may have addressed the traffic issues; he doesn't have the information in front of him now. Mr. Reilly said there wasn't and that's the reason for the concern. There are so many children who have to get out of so many cars in such a short time that it's a nightmare now and he doesn't know how that can be changed without some very clever and thoughtful engineering, more than just putting in parking spaces. Mr. Johnson responded that a traffic impact study was performed for this project. What it doesn't look at is how many children are going to be unloaded in that short duration. It looks more at cars during the assumed peak hours. This is a standard format for a traffic impact analyses but it doesn't take into account a five to ten-minute demand that impact can have in the short-term. Mr. Reilly said the travesty of it is that they have three and half acres to work with, the size of Spreckels Park, and they didn't consider traffic at all.

This was a discussion item only so no vote was taken. A report to City Council will be prepared saying that the committee is comfortable with the preliminary design. Mr. Crook told the members of the public that spoke that their comments will be forwarded to the Council.

8. Recommendation Regarding Revisions to the City's Speed Hump Policy – Mr. Johnson said that a few months ago the T.O.C. heard an issue about speed humps on City streets and that issue went to Council. Council felt that staff should look at the policy and edit it in such a way so it conforms to the way the rest of the cities in the County with speed hump policies are implementing their speed humps. Staff took a look at other municipalities in the County to see what they use for criteria when installing speed humps. Coronado is very similar to other cities, but it was felt there were a couple of key criteria that were probably necessary to include in our speed hump policy. First was to clarify what a “demonstrated speeding problem” is, so we've included specific language to state that a demonstrated speeding problem is defined as: In a residential zone, the critical speed (85th percentile) must exceed 33 mph. A second change was to add that the subject street segment shall have a quarter of a mile or 1,320 feet that is uninterrupted by stop signs or traffic signals. Adding these criteria gives the City the flexibility of installing speed humps on segments of streets where drivers could realistically get up to and maintain high speeds. There was also a change regarding speed hump removal. The percent of traffic diversion that would call for removal of a speed hump was changed

from five percent to 10 percent. Now, instead of being called a Speed Hump Policy, it is a Speed Hump Warrant.

Mr. Crook asked whether in light of the revised street length criterion there are any places in the City where speed humps would need to be removed. Mr. Walton said there's one on Sixth Street that doesn't meet the new warrant, but it wouldn't be pulled out because it's an existing condition.

Mr. Walton moved the staff recommendation to approve the new warrant and take it to Council for adoption. Mr. Peña seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 3:23 p.m.