

CITY OF CORONADO
TRAFFIC OPERATIONS COMMITTEE
MINUTES
Thursday, May 27, 2004

The regular meeting of the Traffic Operations Committee (T.O.C.) was held on Thursday, May 27, 2004, at 2:00 p.m. in the Police Facility Emergency Operations Center. Present were Robert Hutton, Kim Raddatz and Ed Walton. Ed Kleeman represented the absent Tony Peña and Kim Godby represented the absent Scott Huth. Also present were Dave Johnson, Assistant Engineer and Sgt. Elizabeth Brett.

1. Minutes of the April 22, 2004 Meeting – The minutes were approved, with Mr. Walton, Mr. Kleeman and Ms. Godby abstaining because they were not present at that meeting.
2. Oral Communications – None.
3. Recommendation Regarding the Application for Speed Humps on Palm Avenue between Third Street and Alameda Boulevard – Mr. Johnson said that resident Jeanne Fox had requested that conditions on Palm Avenue in the 100 to 300 blocks be evaluated to determine if speed humps are warranted. He reviewed the criteria for speed humps and it appears that they could be warranted based on the critical speed recorded. At the last T.O.C. meeting the Committee approved sending a project consisting of candlestick delineator corner treatments to the City Council. He anticipates that Council will approve this and would like to see how the delineators affect speeds before recommending the installation of speed humps. It's a fact that drivers can maintain their speed around this corner and if delineators can slow the speeds, speed humps may not be needed. Sgt. Brett said that 115 tickets were written for turn violations at this location in a two-day period.

Mr. Hutton said there can be disadvantages to speed humps. When the bulk of the traffic is gone (like at 1:00 a.m.), you hear thump thump all night long. He is hearing that speeds are up again on Glorietta; vehicles go slow over the humps and then accelerate.

Mr. Walton felt it would be prudent to see what Council does because if delineators lower the speeds, the earlier speed survey that met the warrant for installing speed humps would be invalidated.

Jeanne Fox, 230 Palm Avenue, feels there really isn't much reason to wait. She has letters going back to 1988 about traffic on Palm Avenue and they really haven't seen any improvements since then. The speed hump issue ties in with the corner redesign and stop signs. The expectation is that there will be speeding after they turn the corner. There's nothing there to mitigate speed. The street is still wide open and drivers already have their driving patterns established. This is not residential traffic; it's industrial traffic. There's high speed illegal passing and high speed donuts. It's dangerous, reckless driving; the problem is not just the volume, but the speeds. The neighborhood is really at

a breaking point. There is a neighborhood with children who can't cross the street to get to a park right across the street. She got sign-offs from neighbors that they do want speed humps and stop signs. Since speed humps meet the warrant for installation, she sees no reason to wait.

Mr. Hutton said he is not sure if affected residents would include I Avenue on either side. This was addressed with Ms. Fox's request for a four-way stop and a couple of I Avenue residents came to the last T.O.C. meeting and protested this. Ms. Fox said those men said they have a nice quiet street; why shouldn't Palm be the same? There should be parity of street design.

Mr. Hutton said the Committee cannot consider this now because of the lack of a petition. Mr. Kleeman said that one advantage of a petition is that everyone is looking at the same thing. You cannot accurately gauge support unless you have them read something and sign their name to it. He said you have to be careful how wide an area you cover because areas that are not just your street could be affected. Mr. Hutton wants to evaluate the effectiveness of the first project; he compared it to doing two surgeries at the same time. You might want to wait to see how the first surgery goes before doing a second.

Joe Zaller, 249 Palm, cannot even let his children over to the park. He feels that putting candlesticks in will make turns even sharper. People do not obey the turn restriction and the police do not show up until too late. The problem is really between 5:00-8:00 a.m. It's frightening to walk to that park (which has equipment designed for small children). He encouraged the Committee to help the residents create a petition to meet the City's guidelines. His concern as a resident and parent is the safety of children and enjoyment of life. Mr. Hutton said that Mr. Johnson could help identify what might be considered the affected area.

Mr. Raddatz moved the staff recommendation to not install speed humps at this time. Mr. Walton seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

4. Recommendation Regarding the Request for an All-Way Stop at the Intersection of Sixth Street and Cabrillo Avenue – Mr. Johnson said that a request had been made via Councilmember Monroe to install stop signs at the intersection of Sixth Street and Cabrillo.

He reviewed the warrant for stop signs. Any one of three conditions must be met. The conditions are:

Volume: Total vehicular volume entering the intersection from all approaches averages 300 vehicles per hour for any eight hours of an average day; and the vehicular volume entering the intersection from the minor street for the same eight hours averages at least one-third of the total volume entering the intersection. The volume entering the intersection averages 77 vehicles per hour for the highest eight hours of an average day; the vehicular volume entering the intersection from the minor street for the same eight hours is approximately 17% of the total intersection hourly average, which is less than

the required one-third of the total volume entering the intersection. This condition was not met.

Accidents: Six or more types of accidents susceptible of correction by stop signs within a 12-month period. There have been no reported accidents at this intersection in the preceding 12 months, so stop signs are not warranted per the accident condition.

Visibility: Sight distance (straight line) on at least one of the approaches of the principal street for vehicles or pedestrians crossing the intersection is less than 160 feet. There is great sight visibility at this location; there are no geometrical changes that would reduce visibility. This condition was not met.

Special Conditions for Residential Areas: In residential areas the minimum volume indicated in Paragraph 2 may be reduced to sixty percent (60%) of the stated values provided all of the following conditions exist: a) *Both streets have residential frontage with existing 25 miles per hour speed limits.* This condition is met as the speed limit on both Sixth Street and Cabrillo Avenue is 25 mph; b) *Neither street is a designated “through” street.* This condition is met; Sixth Street and Cabrillo Avenue are not “through” streets; c) *Neither street exceeds 48 feet of curb to curb roadway width.* This condition is met as Sixth Street and Cabrillo Avenue have a roadway width of 48 feet; d) *No existing stop sign or signal is located on the principal street within a distance of 800 feet.* This condition is not met. There is an existing stop sign at the intersection of Sixth Street and Alameda Boulevard, which is less than 800 feet from the subject intersection; e) *Streets from at least three legs extend 800 feet or more away from the intersection.* This condition is met; and f) *Installation of a four-way or three-way stop is compatible with overall traffic circulation requirements for the area.* This condition is met. All special conditions must be met to qualify for a reduction in traffic volume; since Condition “d” was not met, the Special Conditions reduction cannot be applied.

Mr. Johnson said he observed that the subject area is a typical school zone – there are a lot of parents driving or walking kids to school. In his observations, he didn’t see an inherently dangerous condition and doesn’t think the situation would be improved with stop signs.

Brad Willis, 757 C Avenue, feels strongly and a little bit emotional about this issue. He takes his six-year-old son to school here. Sometimes they ride bikes and sometimes they go in a car. “At the risk of being dramatic,” he passed out photos of his son and other children. This is what this issue is about. To address the report, as far as volume, at around 8:00-9:00 a.m. there are numerous vehicles and he believes most of this is around a 10-15 minute time frame. Concerning accidents, it will be a dead child and how tragic that will be. His son will be done at this school and in elementary school next year, but he’s thinking about other children to come. As far as visibility, there are parents in double-parked SUV’s which detracts from visibility at the drop-off time. Children are small; they scurry right across the street. He thinks the visibility problem is a very serious issue. For the special conditions, all but one is met – what difference does it make if a stop sign at Alameda is more or less than 800' from the intersection? G and F

Avenues at the schools are three-way T-stops. Stop signs should be approved not because they meet the warrants or conditions, but because of safety. He has spoken to many other parents and they feel the same way. He learned about this meeting late or he could have packed this room, but he doesn't feel he needs to be that dramatic. He asked the Committee not to accept the staff recommendation, but to override it. He doesn't think any residents would object to this. Does anyone here feel it would be less safe to put stop signs here or more safe? Stop signs would make everyone take notice.

Mr. Hutton asked if the Engineering Department had heard from the school and Mr. Johnson said he's never been approached by the school district. He has a concern that the area of Alameda and Coronado is a non-decal parking zone. He observed when drivers of vehicles (presumably military) come back to their cars in the afternoon they tend to move in what he believes is a careless fashion, particularly in a school zone. Other than that, he didn't see anything that looked inherently unsafe. Maybe there could be a way of regulating the parking a little better.

Mr. Hutton recalls some time ago everything between Cabrillo and Coronado was yellow for buses. Now buses don't deliver children; parents do. Maybe something like an early morning restriction could be considered. Mr. Willis said there is a red zone and a handicap zone in front of the school and they're usually filled by parents dropping off children. There has been more than one instance when he and his child have been almost hit. He could bring a petition signed by almost every parent there and teachers too.

Mr. Raddatz said that most elementary schools have crossing guards. He wondered if Village Elementary School staff walks children across the street. He doesn't know to what degree the school district wants something done. Mr. Kleeman observed that since these children are all elementary or preschool age they almost always have someone with them. He then related a story of a child at Grant Elementary School in Mission Hills where a child was killed. The child was usually picked up by his mother, but when he saw his father coming to pick him up, he was so excited he ran into the street and was struck. This possibility could exist at almost every school.

Mr. Johnson noted that the majority of intersections at the Middle, High and Elementary Schools have stop signs and Mr. Hutton observed that there are even stop signs at Sacred Heart. He doesn't know if every one met the warrants. Staff at Sacred Heart School cones the area to control traffic and this has worked pretty well, but there are stop signs too. He is torn that there is a possible risk, but concerned that we're not seeing a request from the school. It might be important to have comments from the school and the immediate neighbors. Mr. Raddatz said his initial thought was "why was this one ignored?" He would like to have something from the school and wonders why the school is not taking any responsibility for this. He's somewhat surprised that the school is not making an effort. Mr. Willis replied that maybe the school dropped the ball; this would be an opportunity for the City to pick it up.

Joe Zaller, 249 Palm, is a father with three daughters. He always wondered why there are no stop signs there. It is very confusing in that area. Mr. Hutton said the parking issue

seems to impact this area and wondered if the Committee could look at this and maybe a coning pattern. He'd like to find if there an interest from the school district. Mr. Willis said he doesn't think coning would work because parents tend to walk children into class.

Jeanne Fox, 230 Palm Avenue, asked if this would qualify for a Safe Routes to School (SR2S) category and Mr. Johnson said SR2S requests are initiated by the school district with assistance from the local municipality. As far as being a school zone, all signage is in place and marked properly.

Mr. Hutton said there's a possibility that some of the neighbors, and maybe the school, would object to stop signs, so it's difficult to jump on the bandwagon without knowing that the bandwagon is full. He is hearing a lot of willingness from the Committee, however. Mr. Walton said that Mr. Johnson approached this request from an engineering standpoint and took the emotion out. To deviate from the stop sign warrant is difficult for Mr. Walton. He has observed that it's "a mess" in the morning. Parents and children are not crossing at the crosswalks. They cross at angles or wherever they've parked. He's more inclined to go with some kind of guides.

Mr. Willis suggested the school could put out a letter to parents telling them to be cautious and asking them to tell their children to use the crosswalks. Mr. Hutton said it would be helpful to have a letter from the school district. No evaluation of installation of stop signs has been done and he's wondering what the impacts might be as far as queuing, etc. Would there be back-ups? The City Council has made exceptions in the past for intersections not meeting warrants for stop signs. Mr. Walton said it might not change the engineering recommendation, but the Committee and the Council might be swayed by a letter from the school district. Mr. Willis suggested checking Sixth and F against the warrant, which is exactly the same situation.

Mr. Hutton made a motion for this report to come back with more information as to the school's interest and an evaluation of the impacts of stop signs if they were to be installed and to give residents an opportunity to comment. Mr. Raddatz seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 3:20 p.m.