

# CITY OF CORONADO

## TRAFFIC OPERATIONS COMMITTEE MINUTES

Thursday, July 27, 2006

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

1. Minutes of the May 25, 2006 Meeting – Mr. Peña moved to approve the minutes and Mr. Crook seconded the motion. The motion passed with Mr. Raddatz abstaining.

2. Oral Communications – None.

3. Recommendation Regarding the Request to Install Signs Prohibiting the Use of Skateboards, Bicycles and Roller Skates along First Street between Orange Avenue and A Avenue and on C Avenue between First and Second Streets – Mr. Johnson said that Ms. Paige Tigert requested that the City install signs giving notice of the City's prohibition of skateboards and roller skates on public sidewalks. She feels that skateboarders have a general disregard for pedestrians in the area and have not been cooperative when asked to slow their speeds or get off the sidewalks. The area in this vicinity has undergone a lot of changes in the last few years. Some multi-use developments that host residential and commercial uses have gone in recently, so there are a lot more pedestrians in the area; a café has gone in between Orange and C; and there are also the Albertson's supermarket and the Ferry Landing which attract a lot of pedestrians.

Coronado Municipal Code Section 56.28.010 prohibits skateboarding in certain locations when signs are erected; in particular, Section C says "upon any public sidewalk, walkway, path, ramp, bridge, plaza, mall . . ." skateboarding is prohibited when signs prohibiting such activity are displayed. Therefore, due to the amount of pedestrian traffic in this area and the City's desire to provide pedestrian safety, it's the staff recommendation to install signs giving notice of the prohibition of skateboarding on these sidewalks.

Gene Kemp, 736 F Avenue, is here to support the letter Ms. Tigert wrote and he wants to thank Mr. Johnson for the effort he put into this. He noticed that the map showing strategic locations is beyond just the block, clear down to Orange Avenue on both sides of the street, down to the Public Services Department, which is probably a good idea and supports the law. He presented some pictures showing skateboarding damage to the building at 1222 First Street. The damage will be fixed, but the far more important issue is safety. There's hardly a day that skateboarders are not going up and down the street.

Mr. Peña asked whether the skateboarders are in transit to the skateboard park or are they just hanging out? Paige Tigert, representative for the Village at Coronado owners association, 1222 First Street, responded that she's not sure where they're going, but they're using the very desirable sidewalk. Mr. Peña said that if they're in transit

normally there shouldn't be a problem because they'll be in front of you for five seconds and then down the street. He's concerned about transplanting skateboarders to Second or other streets so they can get to where they're going. It might make a displacement situation. Mr. Kemp said that they don't think the signs will stop every skateboarder, but it will be more efficient for the police to do their job.

Mr. Crook said he is supportive of the staff recommendation. He's concerned about signs being in the middle of the block; his preference would be to have signs at the intersections so that they're seen before skateboarders get mid-block. Mr. Peña asked if signs are effective and Mr. Crook said it gives the police a tool to work; without the signs they're not doing any enforcement. From what he's seen, it curtails some of the skateboarders.

Discussion ensued about sign placement. Mr. Crook wondered if the signs could be placed on the street signs so no new poles are added. Mr. Johnson said that typically, signs are mounted at a minimum height which is seven feet. Mr. Huth said he'd rather lift the street sign up 18" and put it on that pole. Mr. Johnson replied that wouldn't be a problem as long as there's enough pole to move it up 18". Typically they're sized so the sign fits at the minimum seven-foot height and then there's not any excess pole sticking up above. Mr. Huth said the existing poles could be removed and new ones placed; his department is talking about new poles anyway. Mr. Crook said he's seen a cap device on other street signs which is bolted onto the top and the sign is put directly above the street sign; that wouldn't require changing poles.

Mr. Huth moved to approve the recommendation and modify some of the placement based on today's comments and look at opportunities to consolidate signs. He thinks C Avenue will have some challenges and maybe it would be better placed back by Second on C than it is mid-block because skaters will see the other signs if they're coming the other way. Mr. Johnson said he would work with the Police Department to place the signs in areas they think would be most effective. Mr. Raddatz seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

4. Recommendation Regarding the Request to Make Changes to Existing Signage along the Glorietta Boulevard Frontage Road – Mr. Johnson said a resident, Mr. Bob Geilenfeldt, requested that the City make some changes to the existing signage at this location. The resident is concerned about the unnecessary traffic that turns around in the frontage road cul-de-sac, the lack of parking on the frontage road for residents and non-resident speeding problems. At this particular location, in the 300 block of Glorietta Boulevard, some houses do not have direct access from Glorietta Boulevard, but are accessed by the frontage road accessed off of Glorietta Place. This was due to the reconfiguration of the Third Street and Glorietta Boulevard intersection with the building of Tideland Park. As such, there's some interesting signage that's required there because there is a median situation and a no-outlet cul-de-sac that drivers who are not familiar with the area may not be aware of. Mr. Geilenfeldt made some suggestions about increasing the amount of signage to make drivers aware of this situation so that the number of unnecessary turn-arounds can be cut down in the cul-de-sac.

Mr. Geilenfeldt's suggestions (in italics) and the staff recommendations are as follows:

*Change the existing double arrow sign on the median to a large one-way arrow sign directing traffic toward Third Street.* The City follows the *Manual on Uniform Traffic*

*Control Devices (MUTCD)* which is a national publication that guides municipalities in placement of traffic control signs in the public right-of-way. This results in uniform traffic signage throughout the country so that drivers, no matter where they're driving, are familiar with the standard signage. Section 2C.09 of the *MUTCD* states that the one direction arrow sign "shall not be used where there is no alignment change in the direction of travel, such as the beginning and ends of medians or center piers" and this double arrow sign is on the end of a median to display that travel can be accommodated on either side of the median. To change this to a one-way arrow would be inconsistent with the *MUTCD*'s recommendation, so the first request is not recommended by staff.

*Change the existing "Not a Through Street" sign to a sign that reads "Dead End" and lower the signage to eye level. Also provide a cross-strip on the street with a bear left directional arrow.* Again, Mr. Johnson looked to the *MUTCD* for guidance and it states that the "Dead End" sign may be used at the entrance of a single road that terminates in a dead end or a cul-de-sac, so this street does meet this criterion. Before Caltrans adopted the *MUTCD* they had the *Traffic Manual* which had the standard signage saying "Not a Through Street," but since they adopted the *MUTCD* the new standard signage is "Dead End." Therefore, it is recommended that we do accommodate that sign change. Again, the *MUTCD* tells us how high signs can be placed and at what location away from the roadside they should be placed. The minimum height of a sign in the public right-of-way where there are pedestrian or parking movements is seven feet and that is a standard that the City follows, so an eye level sign is not being recommended, neither does he feel it would be any more effective than the standard sign placement at seven feet. Lastly, pavement markings are typically used to reinforce signage that is in the right-of-way. Mr. Geilenfeldt requested a cross strip with the wording "bear left" and this is not a standard marking. It would be used to supplement an existing sign and since we're not able, per the *MUTCD*, to direct traffic away from the cul-de-sac it is not recommended to put in that particular pavement marking.

*Change the existing Type N signs at the end of the cul-de-sac to reflective materials, also reading "Wrong Way – Turn Around" and repaint all the existing red curb within the cul-de-sac with a reflective material.* Type N signs are used to notify drivers that a roadway is terminating. Per the *MUTCD*, signs should have a minimum amount of reflectivity so that they can be seen at night. The City performs a night-time sign survey every year and checks the reflectivity of the signs to make sure they can be seen under normal night-time driving conditions. This Type N sign can be replaced with new signs that have embedded reflective markers. The staff recommendation, therefore, is to replace the existing Type N signs which are red. The *MUTCD* says that either red or yellow warning signs can be used; Mr. Johnson recommends that they be replaced with yellow reflective markers. The *MUTCD* does not recommend any type of wording on these Type N signs, as requested by Mr. Geilenfeldt. Mr. Geilenfeldt also requested that the red curb within the cul-de-sac be repainted with a reflective material. The City can repaint it and enhance the paint with glass beads so it is more reflective at night.

*Use pavement markings on Glorietta Place reading "Slow Down – Children Playing."* This is a sign that is requested in just about every jurisdiction and studies have shown that it is not effective on driver behavior and beside that, it almost gives a go-ahead for children to play in the street which the City does not want to encourage. It is not a

standard sign that is recognized by the *MUTCD*, so staff recommends that signage not be installed.

*Provide resident permit parking on Glorietta Place and the cul-de-sac.* The City does have a residential parking permit program. It has been implemented near North Island because during the day Navy personnel could take up a lot of residential spots. It is regulated by the Coastal Commission. It's been difficult to implement and the Coastal Commission has big reservations about allowing resident-only parking permit programs.

Mr. Johnson summed up the staff recommendation. It is to replace the existing "Not a Through Street" sign with the standard "Dead End" signage, to replace the existing Type N signs at the end of the cul-de-sac with reflective markings and to repaint the red curbs in the cul-de-sac and add glass beading to increase reflectivity.

Bob Geilenfeldt, 354 Glorietta, said this has been an on-going problem for many years. He distributed some photographs showing the existing signage. This is a unique result of the Glorietta realignment which occurred when they built Tidelands Park. The cul-de-sac creates a bottleneck for unfamiliar non-residents seeking access to Tidelands Park and the Marriott Hotel. Many non-residents miss the first turn coming off the bridge onto Glorietta to get to Tidelands Park, so they take the next turn which is Glorietta Place. Then they go down to Glorietta Place; when you get to the end there is kind of a median. When you go to the right, you go onto the cul-de-sac, Glorietta Place. When you go left you go onto Third Street. The problem is people are going down the cul-de-sac thinking it's a shortcut to Tidelands Park or the Marriott. This can be a problem like this morning when there was a huge truck going to Tidelands Park that got stuck in the cul-de-sac and could not turn around, so it backed into Mr. Geilenfeldt's driveway. There have been cases where movie sets have gone in, cannot get out and have to have tow trucks pull them out backwards. Large SUVs come through at night and they jump the curb and don't bother to turn around. Obviously, that causes damage to the grass in the park median. These are the results you get when you have people in hurry who are trying to get from point A to point B. He understands Mr. Johnson's concern about recognizing the *MUTCD* and he certainly recommends the dead end signage in place of the "Not a Through Street" sign. Reflective curbing and the Type N signs of a reflective nature are also highly recommended. But he's also recommending painting a broad white cross strip on the pavement of the cul-de-sac entrance with an arrow bearing left. He noticed that this has been done at A Avenue where the new Animal Care Facility is going to be. There is a turn sign indicating that it's not proper to go on down First Street because it's a dead end. This is a similar scenario. What he'd like is to not get vehicles into the cul-de-sac in the first place. Mr. Johnson's suggestions are fine after they're already into the cul-de-sac. The main goal is to prevent non-residents from using the cul-de-sac unnecessarily. With this white strip we could also include an additional "Park Beach Access" sign. There is a "Park Beach Access" sign on Third Street, but when you're going down the cul-de-sac it's visible on the cul-de-sac which further compounds the confusion. People see that and think it's the way to the beach or park. If that type of sign could be incorporated into the signs that are already there to show people that they should bear left to get to the beach and park, he thinks that would be most beneficial. Incorporating both of these additional ideas into what Mr. Johnson has come up with would really improve the neighborhood ambiance, safety and tranquility.

Mr. Huth agrees with Mr. Johnson's suggestions and wondered if the things he recommended could be put in now and maybe there could be some other thoughts about how to channel this traffic to the other side. He thinks the location of the beach access sign is not helping the situation and that could probably be relocated. Mr. Peña feels some adjustments beyond the staff recommendation need to be made to have any effect. Mr. Crook agrees that the area is really confusing and the beach access sign is confusing when you're coming down the street. He agrees with the dead end sign and repainting the curbs with glass beads. He also thinks that an arrow pointing left before you get into the cul-de-sac would be beneficial, but doesn't think a stripe across the street is needed. That might take care of most of the problem.

Mr. Johnson thought that the beach access sign could have some lettering added to it saying "Beach Access via Third Street" rather than just "Beach Access" which is kind of ambiguous. If most of the traffic is coming off Third Street and turning onto Glorietta Place it may be prudent to add a straight arrow pavement marking with a "Through" to direct traffic to Third Street.

Mr. Raddatz agreed that it is confusing just looking at the double arrow sign. Knowing what's on First Street, he thinks an arrow on the street at this location would be a good thing. Mr. Crook felt that the double arrow sign is very deceiving and should come out. If we put an arrow on the ground the sign should have just a left arrow. Mr. Raddatz agreed and said he felt the double arrow sign is the most confusing thing on that street. Mr. Johnson said he'd look into the applicability of that. The *MUTCD* states that you cannot use the left arrow at the end of a median; the double arrow is to indicate that you can drive on either side of a median.

Mr. Raddatz made a motion to accept staff's recommendation and, in addition, he recommended that the double arrow sign come down if it's appropriate. He'd also recommend having an arrow painted on the roadway indicating to go through to Third. Mr. Peña seconded the motion and it passed unanimously. Mr. Huth said if the double arrow sign is removed maybe it should be replaced with a chevron sign to keep people from jumping the curb.

Mr. Huth wondered if this needed to be forwarded to the City Council or whether it could be handled as a work order. Mr. Johnson said that since nothing restrictive is being added it can be handled as a work order.

Mr. Crook said that obviously, all the misdirected traffic won't be stopped by these measures, and he asked Mr. Geilenfeldt to keep a watch on the situation and if problems continue to come back for the Committee for a second look.

5. Discussion Item Regarding the Use of Modern Roundabouts in Coronado – Mr. Johnson said there has been a lot interest in San Diego in general on the use of roundabouts. There are several agencies that recently implemented roundabouts as a form of traffic control. A roundabout is a geometry improvement whereby you don't physically stop traffic by means of stop intersections or signals, but they can be used in places that are warranted for four-way stop intersections or signals. The benefit of a roundabout is that you keep traffic moving in one direction, typically counterclockwise. Also, roundabouts reduce the number of conflict points in an intersection which can reduce the number of collisions between vehicles, pedestrians and bicyclists. A good roundabout design places high priority on speed reduction and speed consistency. These designs require that vehicles negotiate a roundabout through a series of turning movements at low speeds, generally less than 20 mph. Speed consistency refers to the

objective of slowing vehicles to a desired negotiating speed to be consistent with what drivers are expecting to see. Speed control is primarily achieved through the geometric features and not necessarily traffic controls, although there is a yield control on the entrance to roundabouts. However, in Coronado we have a lot of yield signs and they don't necessarily reduce speeds. A well-designed roundabout will lower vehicle speeds and can provide the following safety benefits:

- Reduce crash severity for pedestrians and bicyclists;
- Provide more time for drivers to judge and adjust speed and enter a gap in circulating traffic;
- Allow safer merges into circulating traffic;
- Provide more time for users to detect and correct their mistakes or the mistakes of others;
- Make collisions less frequent and less severe; and
- Make the intersection safer for novice users.

Roundabouts have fewer conflict points in comparison to conventional intersections. The potential for hazardous conflicts such as right-angle and left-turn head-on crashes is eliminated with a roundabout. The single lane approach produces greater safety benefits than multi-lane approaches due to fewer potential conflicts with road users because pedestrian crossing distances are short. The low speeds associated with roundabouts allow drivers more time to react to potential conflicts and they also help improve the safety performance of roundabouts. Since most users travel at a similar speed through a roundabout, the crash severity can be reduced compared to traditionally-controlled intersections. Also, pedestrians need to cross only one direction of traffic at a time at each approach as they traverse the roundabout versus an unsignalized intersection where they're looking at both directions of traffic. There are many benefits to modern roundabouts, but they are not a solution to every traffic problem. Intersections must be analyzed and roundabouts designed on an individual basis to make sure they're applicable. There are several complex intersections in Coronado which may benefit from modern roundabouts. They include the Seventh/Adella/Pomona intersection; Olive/E/Eighth Avenues; Palm/E/Fifth; and possibility Glorietta Boulevard at the tennis courts. Design and construction of a roundabout would constitute a Capital Project and there was a Planning Commission recommendation to look at a roundabout at the Seventh/Adella/Pomona intersection, but it was not funded in the most recent Capital Improvement Program.

Mr. Peña said he's seen roundabouts in La Jolla. He wondered if that was driven by a high accident rate or because it was an innovative test. Mr. Johnson said that the roundabouts in the Birdrock area of La Jolla were driven by more by delays than anything else. He said those series of roundabouts in Birdrock are a perfect application of roundabouts because there are perpendicular intersecting streets with nearly equal traffic volumes on all legs. They had been stop-controlled intersections and during the vehicle peak hours there were horrendous delays for drivers. The safety benefit was secondary; he thinks they were mainly installed because of the traffic delays at the stop-controlled intersections.

Mr. Peña asked if there are formal warrants for roundabouts and Mr. Johnson responded there are not; there are criteria that can be looked at for placement of roundabouts, but they are not hard and fast criteria. You look at significant thresholds

like we do for stop sign placement. Mr. Peña said with a lack of warrants he thinks the problem trying to be solved should be clear; if it's accidents it's one thing, if it's traffic stacking up or slowing down, in a lot of areas the residents want that slowing down, rather than expediting traffic movement. Mr. Johnson said the FHWA printed guidelines for roundabout design and construction and one of the sections they spent a lot of time on is roundabouts used for traffic calming purposes. They say roundabouts aren't necessarily a great thing for traffic calming because there are other issues that can come up aside from traffic calming benefits. They are typically used in high collision locations or where there are a lot of vehicle driver delays and traffic calming is not the best criteria to use a roundabout for. Mr. Huth observed that the ones in the Birdrock area actually funnel two lanes in one direction down to one, put it through the roundabout, then you go into the next roundabout and then it breaks back out to two. It allows traffic to flow and it's going a lot slower. He thinks it was a good calming measure because it keeps traffic moving, but not at a high rate of speed.

Dale St. Denis, 710 Adella, has first-hand knowledge of this intersection. Some studies were done in 1997 about slowing traffic on Pomona. That was partially implemented by narrowing down part of the street near the park, but not all of the plan was implemented; the other part was a finger at the end of the park which is probably a benefit at this point. Study of a roundabout here would great improve the through traffic. Traffic has slowed in this area because the police have been monitoring it. People come off the bridge and use Pomona as a corridor to get to and from points farther south or, depending on the time of day, farther north. He feels that this particular location warrants further study also because of pedestrian traffic there. It's a confusing intersection and in watching pedestrians he sees them crossing diagonally from Pomona to Seventh. There is a crosswalk designated there, but hardly anyone follows that. Cars coming down Adella Avenue very seldom stop at the designated stop sign; they travel diagonally over to Pomona which puts them out in the middle of the intersection. It a confusing intersection and because of what has been going on in other communities near us, this would be a good opportunity to look at a roundabout there. It came before Council from the Planning Commission and Council put it on the Capital Projects list; however, he doesn't think there was time to fund it at that time.

At this point it appears as if the public microphone was switched off and the comments of two additional speakers, Jennifer Luther, 640 Pomona, and Bernie Schmidt, 1607 Sixth, were not recorded. For the record, they both strongly supported roundabouts.

Mr. Peña wondered if any of the locations that have been discussed stand out as safety issue/high accident areas. He knows that some of the more confusing intersections actually have lower accident rates. Mr. Johnson agreed and said that the majority of the high-incident intersections are on the state highways. Pomona does have a fair amount of traffic, but sometimes drivers who are unfamiliar with complex intersections are more cautious and it doesn't reflect in an accident history. In fact, the three-year accident history for the Pomona/Adella/Seventh intersection shows only one accident at that location. It is, however, a complex intersection and confusing to people; he sees all kinds of driver behavior there, from kids on bikes coming down the hill on Seventh and just blowing through it to people going northbound on Adella trying to outrun cars going northbound on Pomona. The geometry currently causes some difficulty. However, in his research about roundabouts he found that the best location for them is at perpendicular intersecting streets with equal traffic volumes on all four legs where there is a balance of driver delay and possibly accident history as well.

Mr. Peña said he is pretty supportive of roundabouts. With this situation and the Capital Improvement Program, the issue is that there's no major safety issue and this would be competing with landscaped medians along Olive and Palm. There are also issues with parks and it's a big pot with projects competing for money. Mr. Johnson said he agreed with Mr. Schmidt that Star Park Circle would be a good location to convert to a true roundabout because a lot of the geometry is there; all that would need to be done is to take out the stops on the approach and to put in yields and some painted islands. That would be a good location to get people familiar with what roundabouts do, but it doesn't have the huge traffic volumes that you like to see for roundabout locations. Also the travel lanes on Star Park are quite a bit wider than what you would design for a true roundabout; you would narrow that travel way and use geometry deflection to slow vehicles. He also said that parking is typically not designed for the outside of the circle in true roundabouts and Star Park does have parking there now.

Mr. Crook said the T.O.C. keeps having this issue come back and sooner or later we'll have to pick an intersection somewhere and try it. His recommendation is to find a place we think can accommodate this and unfortunately it would probably be done with plastic cones. We wouldn't want to do cones on a permanent basis, but he wouldn't pick an intersection and do all the flower beds and other things; he'd prefer to do something temporarily for a period of time to see how it works. The fire chief has a valid point; we have to make sure we can get his equipment through a roundabout and there is other truck traffic that needs to go through.

Mr. Peña said that in Coronado each roundabout would need to be custom designed for unique situations, so putting one in won't necessarily give us any information about how the others may perform. However, you need to start somewhere. Mr. Crook agreed; each would need to be uniquely designed and it probably wouldn't work in a lot of intersections – you need to have enough turning radius to go through. And there are some odd ones; he doesn't know how one would be designed to work at the Five Points intersection. Seventh and Pomona is also odd, but he can see how it could work. Mr. Peña said the ones in La Jolla are tiny. He doesn't know how a fire engine could negotiate them. Mr. Johnson said there is a mountable curb so that when there's a large truck the inside tires can actually mount the concrete circle. There are about five different designs, depending on the size of the intersection, that you can design for. Some can accommodate two lanes of traffic.

Mr. Huth feels positively about roundabouts if used in an appropriate manner. He's struggling with how the City would use roundabouts; you may be able to move more traffic more efficiently which could then compound the issue on Pomona because you may encourage people to use that direction more. He asked if the T.O.C. is trying to put together a recommendation to Council to say "this is worth looking at; let's study a couple of intersections" or is the T.O.C. talking philosophically here? Mr. Johnson said that at this point it's more philosophical. The Planning Commission had the issue come before them and they asked the T.O.C. to discuss the concept of roundabouts. Because there is not any money for the installation of one as a Capital Improvement Project, it would only be a study at this point, probably to determine which intersection would be best to look at. Mr. Huth said another concern, not just for roundabouts, but for any other traffic calming measure, is the side effects to other streets. He likes the idea of slowing traffic, making it easier for other people to get into the intersection and there's a lot of merit in trying to accommodate people because if they wait for a long period of time they

get agitated and start doing unique things in their vehicles that usually aren't safe, but will this have any effects on other streets? Will we start seeing cut-through traffic?

Mr. Huth suggested looking at what the potential warrants for roundabouts would be and where they should be placed, what criteria would be used, what different design features are out there, etc. Then we could get feedback from Council as to whether they want the T.O.C. to explore it more. He would recommend that this is worth exploring; the T.O.C.'s step would be to start exploring design features for what would work in a general sense, understanding that each intersection is unique, and then wait for Council to give direction. He doesn't feel we need to go to Council to start looking at criteria. Mr. Johnson says he doesn't know that the T.O.C. has been asked to make a recommendation to Council; it is being discussed at the T.O.C. level because it was brought up by the Planning Commission. Unfortunately, we don't have any means at this time to put anything into the ground. Mr. Peña suggested discussing this with the Director of Engineering & Project Development because he controls the workload. He agrees with what Mr. Huth has said and suggests the T.O.C. pursue this to the extent possible. Mr. Huth said he feels this is a good tool for the tool chest for traffic calming.

The meeting adjourned at 3:34 p.m.