

## CITY OF CORONADO

### TRAFFIC OPERATIONS COMMITTEE MINUTES

**Thursday, October 27, 2005**

The regular meeting of the Traffic Operations Committee (T.O.C.) was held on Thursday, October 27, 2005, at 2:00 p.m. in the Council Chambers. Present were Scott Huth, Ed Walton, Tony Peña and Paul Crook. Rick Sitta represented the absent Kim Raddatz and Laszlo Waczek represented Paul Crook for Items 1, 3, 5, 6 and 8. Also present were Dave Johnson, Assistant Engineer and Peter Fait, Associate Planner.

1. Minutes of the September 29, 2005 Special Meeting – The minutes were unanimously approved.

2. Oral Communications – None.

3. Recommendation Regarding the Request to Install Traffic Control Measures at the Intersection of Isabella Avenue and E Avenue – Mr. Johnson said that at the September 1 meeting the issue to consider additional traffic controls at this intersection was heard. At that time the three controls that were discussed were an additional yield sign, a marked crosswalk and a height limitation for vehicles parked in the diagonal parking median at the westernmost end of that diagonal parking median. The Committee decided to recommend to the City Council the marked crosswalk and the height restriction for vehicles parked in those diagonal spots. Staff let the Committee know that they needed to get the City Attorney's opinion on the height restriction and whether it could be done at less than a six-foot height level which is what the California Vehicle Code states. Subsequently, the City Attorney provided the opinion that anything below six feet would not be enforceable and therefore the item was pulled from the Council agenda. The initiator of this item, Heinz Steiner, was requested to come back and do a PowerPoint presentation to inform the Committee what other controls he feels, in addition to the marked crosswalk, would be necessary to increase the visibility at this intersection. The staff recommendation is to consider the engineering analysis of those traffic controls along with the presentation and then Committee can agree on any traffic controls that they'd like to forward to Council.

Mr. Steiner, 1007 Flora Avenue, has been before the Committee before and he has amended some of the issues, first, the parking. He concedes that the yield sign is not in accordance with the California Vehicle Code and they'll take that off the table. The objective is to reduce the confusion at the intersection; people pull up to the middle of the intersection to await traffic that's coming down from westbound Isabella. It leads to screeches and near misses almost daily. The residents would like to improve the visibility at this intersection. At the last meeting Mr. Steiner proposed installing two disabled parking spaces in lieu of something ambiguous and non-enforceable that would not meet the City Attorney's criteria. A marked crosswalk was also requested and if that's also like it was before it can be skipped. The options after the ruling from the City Attorney are either to convert four of the spaces into two disabled parking spaces or to

eliminate the westerly three spaces to give visibility across the intersection. The first provides for much needed disabled parking spaces and the second option would just eliminate two or three parking spaces without giving any other benefits except for the visibility. Mr. Johnson told him the van accessible disabled spaces have a five-foot landing and it would be beneficial to have loading zones on each side on the eastbound lane to keep the westernmost space open; that would improve visibility greatly. There are two disabled parking spaces on the median at Isabella and two on Ocean on either side of the crosswalk. There are two more at Sunset Park. Within access to the beach there are four existing spaces; he's not counting the ones at the east end that are for the business district. To add two disabled parking spaces at the closest spot to the beach in the median would definitely benefit and bring the City a little closer to fulfilling ADA requirements for disabled parking. He hopes the Committee will consider the visibility issue and provide two disabled parking spaces to improve the visibility at this intersection.

John Nichols, 1026 Flora, asked the Committee to visualize him driving north on Flora up to this intersection. The car that's going toward the ocean has the right-of-way and his problem is that he cannot see over the cars that are parked there. The average eye level in a car is about four-and-a-half feet. A Coronado policeman could not see over. Mr. Nichols needs to see if a car coming from his right is there and does not have enough room to stop at 25 mph. He needs to look far enough to the right to see any traffic that can't stop before he crosses and avoids collision. The contour there, because of the shape and curve, is such that you really have to go out and look to see what's necessary in order to get a clear view. You don't have to move all the cars out but you have to leave enough space between some of them so that he can get a clear view to get a warning that a car is coming while that car and his have a chance to avoid collision. He thinks the extra space for handicap parking could help with a clear view.

Ward Boston, 1001 Flora, agrees with everything that Capt. Nichols and Mr. Steiner said before. He lives on the corner of Flora and Isabella and cars come down Isabella, heading for the ocean; you can hear them speed up. It's amazing how fast they're going at 5:30 a.m. There's no way in the world if someone's at that corner that they're not in danger. He thinks the answer is to put two handicap spaces on each side and at those times that they're occupied he thinks they could live with them. Leaving his house and crossing Isabella to go down E, which he does frequently, he creeps, looking to the left, because cars coming from the beach have a tendency to speed and then you still have E and Tolita traffic coming in. This really makes driving at this corner hazardous and it's an accident that's going to cause some fatalities one day. He's seen two or three skateboarders almost run over. He supports everything heard before.

Susan Heavilin, 1144 Isabella, said this is a hazardous corner. There are skateboarders on it who are constantly in the road and there is no way to see those people. If you're coming down Isabella toward the ocean you can't see anything. If you are making a left-hand turn off Flora you can't see anything. We need some sort of a gap in there. It's a huge liability for the City. Someone's going to get killed. She lives on Isabella so she knows to stop there. When her kids learned to drive she taught them to stop there. Anyone else coming down that street doesn't know that. You've got a totally blind corner, no yield or stop, and it's an accident waiting to happen. She hopes this will be carefully considered.

Beth Dahill, 1068 Isabella, supports Heinz' idea about handicap parking. This idea is brilliant because even if there is a handicap van seven or eight feet high there will

be space in between to see a vehicle if you're on Flora coming across and waiting to see if someone's coming up Isabella. This corner has been assessed several times, once for speed humps, when it was assessed in the middle of January on a Monday morning when everyone's at work. It would be nice if this could be assessed during the high traffic time. There is a yield sign on Flora, but they can't even see who they're going to yield to.

Wayne London (? partially indecipherable) with Paralyzed Veterans was asked to come down and ask about the extra parking places. He comes to Coronado often but a couple of guys in the Paralyzed Veterans asked him to come down and speak for them. There's always a hard time finding parking spaces here. Please add their support for having two extra van-accessible parking spaces.

Mr. Huth recounted what transpired earlier. Staff found out there is a problem trying to restrict the height of vehicles. What he's hearing from the public comment is an interest in maintaining the approval already given for the crosswalk and proposing to install handicap parking. He sat out there before the meeting and he didn't conclude the same for the parking on the south (Flora) side. What about putting them right next to each other so there is actually the same number but they're on the other side? This would give a little better visibility when you're in the center of the intersection. The issue he saw from Flora is that cars come to the center trying to peer down Isabella back toward Orange. He's wondering if the real issue is on the westbound side. Mr. Johnson responded that he thought the issue was having the spaces on the opposite sides of the diagonal parking to create a view corridor so that you can see through the vehicles, whereas if you have two parking spaces right together you still may have high-profile vehicles parked on the south side that would block your view until you actually got into the middle of the intersection.

Mr. Walton did not support the crosswalk when it was considered before and he does not want to reopen that issue, but he thinks that was based on there being visibility there because one of the criteria in the warrant is to have adequate visibility. He is a little concerned about the concept of putting handicap parking there because if there is a visibility problem, which he feels there is, it's possible with two vans parked there that you'll still have that same visibility problem. He's more inclined to go with prohibited parking for three spaces (two westbound and the first space eastbound) rather than to allow the handicap parking.

Mr. Peña tends to agree with Mr. Walton. He thinks that if disabled parking is to serve the commercial area it should be located closer to the commercial zone and if it's to serve the beach, it should be located closer to the beach. Where they're located as proposed there's still quite a distance to cover to get to those two attractions, so he doesn't think the main purpose is to provide for the handicapped. For safety purposes, the spaces should be kept for no parking to assist with visibility. Handicap spaces should be located closer to the activities.

Mr. Huth agrees that there is a visibility issue and he thought the handicap parking was a creative way of doing it, but with accessible parking the goal is to get people with access issues to the closest front door as you can and this isn't really being accommodated here by putting them 500-600' away from the beach. When he was out there today the entire area was inundated with parking and people are using it a lot more than he envisioned on a weekday. He can support eliminating two spaces on one side and one on the other.

Mr. Walton made a motion to recommend to the City Council a prohibition of parking in the three westerly parking stalls, two on the westbound side, and one on the eastbound side. Mr. Peña seconded the motion and it passed unanimously. Mr. Huth reiterated that staff will still move forward with the previously approved crosswalk and try to get these recommendations to the City Council's November 15 meeting. Mr. Walton reiterated that there will be no stop or yield sign on Isabella recommended and that the requestor has dropped the request for a yield sign. Mr. Steiner agreed.

4. Report Regarding the Request for Speed Humps on A, B and C Avenues between Third and Fourth Streets – Mr. Johnson said that the Engineering Department received a letter from Bonnie Clarey requesting that speed humps be evaluated in the 300 blocks of A, B and C Avenues and the alleys under the City's current speed hump policy. In March 2003 a similar request was received, but due to the semi-diverter installation and subsequent low traffic volumes it was decided to defer consideration of the speed humps until the diverters were removed. The diverters were removed in January 2005 by a vote of the public so there has been some time for traffic patterns to re-establish themselves to allow staff to study the impacts after the removal of the diverters. The City adopted a Speed Hump Policy in March 1998 and there are several criteria used to determine whether or not speed humps are applicable. They are: A demonstrated speeding problem; the type of street; the street grade; the available sight distance; whether or not the street is a truck/transit route; and the impact to emergency response vehicles. A, B and C Avenues are residential streets with one lane in each direction and parallel parking allowed on both sides. As designated in the Circulation Element, A and C Avenues are local streets and B Avenue is a collector street. A Avenue is approximately 210' in length, whereas B and C Avenues are about 500' in length and they have no appreciable amount of grade. Also, because there are no horizontal or vertical curves on these streets, the sight distances are adequate. Lastly, these are not designated truck or transit routes.

Traffic counts were taken in December 2001 before the diverters were installed and the counts showed volumes of 1,700, 2,200 and 1,800 average daily traffic on A, B and C respectively. In January 2003, while the diverters were still in, traffic counts were appreciably lower: 86, 244 and 276 vehicles on A, B and C Avenues respectively. In October 2005, as a result of Ms. Clarey's request, traffic counts were taken again. A Avenue had a volume of 2,700 vehicles, B Avenue 2,000 and C Avenue 1,100. These are residential streets and have a prima facie speed limit of 25 mph per the California Vehicle Code. Radar speed surveys show that on B and C Avenues there is an 85% speed of 32 mph and 31 mph respectively. A Avenue had an 85% speed of 23 mph, mainly due to its short distance; vehicles don't have enough distance to get up to really high speeds. On the other hand, A Avenue handles the majority of traffic among those three streets. A Avenue has had no reported accidents along its length over the last three years; B Avenue had one; and C Avenue had none. These would be mid-block accidents; within the intersections of Third and Fourth Streets at A, B and C Avenues there are much higher accident occurrences. Vehicles use the 300 blocks of A, B and C Avenues as alternate routes to Orange Avenue and they have historically carried a significant amount of traffic headed for the southern parts of the City.

Based on this data collected, it is recommended to submit a positive recommendation to Council that speed humps be installed on the 300 blocks of B and C Avenues due to the fact that speed surveys show an 85% speed that is consistent with a 30 mph zone rather than a 25 mph zone. At this time the 300 block of A Avenue is not

recommended for humps due to an 85% speed of only 23 mph, but the Committee should consider the fact that if a speed hump isn't installed on A Avenue it will obviously become a magnet for vehicles to turn down to avoid the humps on B and C Avenues. Speed humps are not recommended for the alleys due to their usage for trash pick-up, heavy vehicles and emergency response for access to the rear of residences. Also, there's a much lower volume of vehicles on the alleys.

Mr. Huth said he noticed that the speed survey was done prior to the change in the speed limit on Third and Fourth Streets. He asked Mr. Johnson if there might a change in the speed survey now that there is a 25 mph speed limit on Third and Fourth and Mr. Johnson said he didn't think so because of the nature of the traffic observed on B and C Avenues; typically, this is traffic coming off Third Street southbound onto B and C Avenues. It appears that once vehicles get off Third Street they see a wide open residential street and it's easy for them to step on the gas to get to the next stop sign. He doesn't know if there will be a correlation between the lowering of the speed limit on Third and Fourth Streets that will carry over to B and C, but based on the speed surveys, it doesn't appear that way. Mr. Walton noted that the speed survey on page 29 was done on October 19, after the implementation of the 25 mph zone and it showed a 32 mph critical speed.

Mr. Huth asked if there was any background on speed humps diverting cars to other streets and Mr. Johnson responded that when speed humps were put on Pomona and Glorietta some measuring of traffic volumes was done and a threshold of a five percent diversion was set. There are a lot of factors that influence traffic volumes, but he couldn't make a correlation between higher volumes on one street versus another due to the speed humps.

Mr. Peña commented that he is a little uncomfortable with speed humps as recommended. He's not sure what the effect is going to be other than maybe making A, B and C a little safer. He's not sure where the cars are going to go. There may not be a correlation between A, B and C and D, E and F, but he doesn't know that. He's heard some good things about speed coming down on Third and Fourth and you'd think there'd be some spill-over mentality that drivers are getting the word to slow down in Coronado, but he still has a question about traffic displacement and whether the condition is dynamic enough to where the problem will be resolved without speed humps.

Mr. Crook asked how many humps per block are envisioned and Mr. Johnson said that would have to be determined. On Glorietta and Pomona they're placed approximately 500' apart, so that would be approximately one per block.

Mr. Huth asked if there would be a map indicating where speed humps would go so that people who respond to the survey will know the proposed location and Mr. Johnson said no, he just gathered information to determine if there is a demonstrated speeding problem. No preliminary design has been done as to where speed humps would go.

Mr. Sitta said that the Fire Department is always in favor of creating a safer environment for people that visit and people that live in the community by limiting traffic speeds; it is not in favor of speed humps because they operate 43,000 lb. vehicles. Speed humps are basically stop signs in the sense that they have to stop. Fire Department personnel have the ability, running a Code 3, to go to a stop sign, determine whether or not traffic is opposing and that will dictate whether they do stop at a sign, whereas speed bumps are a mandatory stop for such a large apparatus. To have three or four of these in

route on an emergency call lengthens the time between when they receive a 911 call and get to the emergency.

Bonnie Clarey, 322 B Avenue, said that she and the people in this group of streets are looking for a win-win solution to a problem. The problem is that vehicles are speeding as well as using the street inappropriately; they're not supposed to be turning there before 8:00 a.m. but they do regularly. Heavy trucks come down there using it as a thoroughfare and it's not a problem of laws; the laws are in place to make these things happen and it's not even as if the laws are inappropriate. It's just that they're difficult to enforce. She appreciates what Mr. Sitta said and she has called periodically; most of the time her calls have not been returned, but all she has ever asked is that you periodically check people who are turning and periodically give them warnings. What she's been told is that the laws can't work – that this is a Catch 22, that you may not use radar on that street and so it's only a matter of your word against their word, so they don't give people citations on that street. It's a very short street but people can hit 40 mph on it and regularly do. She was interested in the comment that maybe the new 25 mph speed limit will make things slow down. She thinks it will actually do exactly the opposite. The people who are frustrated by the 25 mph speed limit know that they're not going to have any consequences on that little block and they have this illusion that they're going to get there faster if they speed. That's the other issue about this particular situation; speed is absolutely unnecessary – it's not even useful on that street. You're going to have to stop at the other end or you're going to get killed. You're going to save at maximum maybe a couple of seconds which you will spend at the stop sign waiting to get through traffic. This is about as useful as a fish needing a bicycle. So what have we got here? The police don't want to enforce it or can't use radar, so people have this little free place to let their aggressions out because they've got 25 mph on either side and speed humps are a no-brainer to her. The point is that the rest of the alternate north-south route is all protected by speed humps; we are now a part of that. She has 95% and growing of people on her street who have signed a petition wanting this. The C Avenue people are working on theirs too. She hopes the Committee understands that they're looking for a win-win here. It was never their intention to create animosity or dissension. From the day she moved into that street 20 years she thought "speed humps would be a really good idea here" because there's no reason for people to go any faster. She wishes we could let go of the emotional issues with the diverters because what they're looking for here is to keep this little group of people in this little section living a residential life. Technically speaking, the speed hump application lets her as a resident of B handle only B and so she did that in her previous application and got 100% of the people on that street to agree (and they didn't care where the humps where, by the way, and they'd really like two to slow them down as they turn the corner and start to accelerate). The point is that they all signed it, but that Council said "we can't do that for you without doing it for C and A." She thinks that's a great idea, but she wasn't allowed to get those signatures. So here she is now in another one of those Catch-22s. The reason she's here today with hardly anyone behind her is they all signed the petition and are all cheering for her, but they're all very much demoralized; she's not even sure she can do this many more times – they really and truly feel they're disenfranchised.

Mr. Sitta wanted to clarify something. On two occasions there has been discussion about law enforcement officials and he wants to make sure that everyone knows that he is from the Fire Department and his comments aren't reflective of the Police Department.

Jan Clark, 344 A Avenue, agrees wholeheartedly with everything Mrs. Clarey said. The 300 block of A Avenue is probably the smallest street in town but there are those who love it. There aren't very many houses, but she's lived there for 30 years and she has seen it get increasingly worse and worse and worse. People say "if you don't like it, why don't you move?" But she absolutely loves her house. If she could pick it up on her shoulders she'd take it with her and leave tomorrow. It's right – it's hard to speed on A Avenue; it's only 200-something feet long and it's already filled with cars, so you come around that corner and you come in the wrong lane when you're turning because it's backed funny and you're going to hit smack into somebody's rear end and it's happened. If you put bumps on B and C, and you know that A has more traffic than B and C, A will get more traffic than they already have. She doesn't really want a hump on A, but if that's going to happen she does want a hump. While you're considering this, think that if you don't put one on A they will come up her alley and they speed up the A and B alleys right now because it's the faster way to get to Fourth Street. She would recommend getting a counter in that alley and maybe consider putting a bump or hump in that alley if A doesn't warrant one.

Karen Wamhoff, 345 A Avenue, says the 25 mph speed limit is great because it always feels better to get hit at 25 mph than 100 mph, but these cars get mad and they come flying around the corner right now and what's happening is that the lanes are getting doubled up. There are two lanes of traffic trying to get across Fourth and she has photos of all of the accidents and incidents on A Avenue. If you put speed humps on B and C, people are going to take A and the street is too small; it's backing up, it's out of control. Nobody's even paying attention to the 5:00-8:00 a.m. turn restriction. She doesn't think a speed hump will solve anything. She thinks something else is needed to slow this down. Maybe senior citizens could sit out there and give tickets.

Storey Vogel, 350 D Avenue, says he supports the folks on A, B and C Avenues having speed humps. He went through this some years back trying to get humps on D. Certain streets in town like D, E and to a degree, F, have a grade that is somewhat excessive to the way the criteria for speed humps were written and on D, for instance, somebody came speeding up the street while he was backing out across the street from the diagonal parking and they ran right into him and smashed his car. So all these streets between Third and Fourth have the same problem more or less. He understands how the system works somewhat so he has a lot of sympathy for Mrs. Clarey. He said that Mr. Walton wrote the rules and the rules make D too steep to have speed humps, but it needs speed humps as do all streets between Third and Fourth. He has a proposal and thinks if the Committee can find a way to do it within the constraints of the regulation it should forward a recommendation to the City Council that speed humps should be put on A, B and C and they should consider redrawing the ordinance to allow humps on all the streets between Third and Fourth. He thinks the ultimate goal is to pacify the way people conduct themselves in vehicles. He understands that City employees have to work within the regulations and the problem is that they've been drawn too narrowly for the existing situation. So, in order to really protect the people who live on A, B and C and D, E, F, G, H and all the way down, maybe we need to make the ordinance more responsive to the reality and less responsive to criteria. For instance, A Avenue is such a short street and it's getting hammered by all the people turning left who want to get over to Glorietta and the south part of town. As you know, he is the person who put together the initiatives for the removal of the diverters and for cooperating with Caltrans for a left turn at Glorietta. As you can well imagine, the people who refused to sign the Glorietta initiative all lived

over there, but they were more than willing to sign to take down the diverters because they use A to get home. When you come down Fourth going toward the bridge you'll see any number of cars cross diagonally three lanes to get over in the far right lane to hang a right on Pomona or Glorietta. He endorses the humps for A, B and C, but maybe the Committee should advise the Council that we need to consider that whole corridor between Third and Fourth and all the lettered streets as part of a situation that we need to take a comprehensive, organic look at how to make our ordinances fit the situation to improve the overall situation.

Mr. Peña said that if humps are put on B and C, even though A is a short street, putting a hump on A should be considered as well. It doesn't make sense to skip one street that's located right next to the others and would attract more cut-throughs.

Mr. Walton agreed and said the criteria address that somewhat in that if traffic is diverted by more than five percent it could trigger removal of the speed humps. It wouldn't surprise him at all if they're put on B and C Avenues that traffic would flow more to A. He is going to support the recommendation although he doesn't think the results will be what everyone expects. The experience with them on Glorietta and Pomona is that they did curtail the speeding, but it was the high-end speeding – the 40 mph plus and it really dropped those speeders down, but the critical speed itself was still over 25 mph, so there's still speeding occurring on Glorietta and Pomona; it's just not the high end. He doesn't know if speed will be reduced that much by putting speed humps in here, but he believes the criteria have been met and he's going to support this.

Mr. Crook concurred with Mr. Walton and Mr. Peña that if humps go in on B and C one should also be put on A and allow them the opportunity to see if they can get the signatures. Mr. Huth's main concern is from a practical implementation standpoint. He'd like to know where they would go. Mr. Peña moved to support speed humps on B and C Avenues with the addition of A Avenue if this is supported by the required signatures. Mr. Crook seconded the motion and it passed with four ayes; Mr. Sitta voted nay. This item will be forwarded to Council once the signatures have been collected.

5. Recommendation Regarding the Installation of Curb Markings in Front of the Community Center – The recommendation to install a 60-foot white passenger loading zone; a 40-foot red no parking zone; and a 60-foot yellow commercial loading zone in front of the Community Center was unanimously approved, with the exception that the yellow zone would be operable on a 24/7 basis instead of the recommended 6:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. time period because of the use.

6. Recommendation to Update the City's Warrant for Installation of Green Curb Zones – It was recommended and unanimously approved to update the green curb warrant to include the requirement that the requestor shall pay for any necessary signage along with the curb marking.

7. Discussion Item Regarding the Proposed Reconfiguration of the Intersection of R.H. Dana Place and Churchill Place as Part of the Hotel del Coronado Master Plan Improvements – Mr. Johnson reported that the Hotel Del is undergoing some renovations as part of their master plan improvements. The first phase is some improvements on R.H. Dana Place. Right now they are doing a pedestrian plaza. They are also making a second entrance off of R.H. Dana to access the hotel site. One of the concerns the Planning Department has with that entrance is that people going to the hotel would access that

secondary entrance through the residential neighborhoods around Star Park and Flora. So as part of these improvements the hotel is having an engineer design a reconfiguration of the R.H. Dana/Churchill intersection.

Peter Fait, City Community Development (planning) Department, was present with the hotel's civil engineer to answer any questions. Mr. Fait provided some background: The hotel's master plan was approved in 2002 by the City Council. One of the conditions of the environmental impact report that was also approved by Council regarding traffic mitigation was that the Hotel Del would be responsible for a raised landscape median within R.H. Dana Place adjacent to the new secondary entrance on the south side of Dana to prevent traffic to and from the hotel from utilizing Flora Avenue. This was primarily initiated by the residents of the Star Park Circle area. They did not want and were concerned about cars cutting through Star Park and Flora. He said that Scott Colvin, a traffic engineer with Kimley-Horn (KH), has been working on a few different design options.

Mr. Colvin said there are three different alternatives. One objective was to stop the flow of traffic that would go from the Hotel Del onto Flora Avenue. Apparently there are quite a few loading trucks that make a U-turn onto Churchill and come up and park adjacent to the Coronado Plaza, on the south side of Churchill near Orange Avenue. The City asked KH to see if this could be allowed to continue because the truck drivers are used it. KH's goal was to extend the median far enough to allow some refuge for crossing pedestrians and once they got into creating that they decided to move the crosswalk. What that does is connect all the people who are coming from Flora, etc., to make their way back to the new businesses and new restaurants in the Coronado Plaza. One of the problems is a control issue with vehicles going this and that way. There's a conflict point for people going down R.H. Dana; there are lower traffic volumes on Churchill right now so it's a situation where at what point do we want to stop that conflict? If the intersection is to be redesigned it's going to be very difficult to leave that conflict point in there from a safety perspective. The initial thought with Alternative 3 was to put in a left-hand turn lane to get traffic off R.H. Dana and allow them to turn into the second and new entrance for the Hotel Del. This is consistent with all three alternatives. What changes is the median opening. With this alternative, Churchill has been made one-way as you come off Flora and turn right and there you simply merge as you continue down Ocean. When you're coming back up R.H. Dana, they've created a left-hand turn pocket that still allows access for the traffic that wants to get onto Churchill and park in the new proposed parking spots or anywhere along there. The intention is to not allow these people to make a left-hand turn onto Churchill and then also continue to make a left-hand turn onto Flora. They've tried to extend the median out far enough to eliminate that movement. There is still plenty of room for vehicles to make a left-hand turn onto Churchill. The opening is wide enough so that vehicles and delivery trucks can still come down R.H. Dana, and they will have to make a little bit wider turn, but there is plenty of space and they can make the turn as they do today.

Mr. Fait noted that there was a separate requirement for all of the alternatives to add angle parking on Ocean Boulevard in the corner. There is not a landscaped median at that location; it would probably just be painted. One reason for that is the public easement safety vehicle pathway at the new Paseo is about 90% done now. This needs to be open for emergency vehicles, so there are times that vehicles may need to drive over this median.

Mr. Colvin said the only real change that will be seen to this area is the distance on the north side of the striped median. It will always maintain a 12' minimum for the traveled way; it may vary by a few feet based on the left-hand turn pocket that's available. He went on to Alternative 4. The City asked if the median could be pushed down a little further and still create somewhat of a channelized approach for the conflict point, so KH left in the left-hand turn pocket and shifted everything to the left. This alternative accomplishes one of the goals which is to not allow vehicles to leave the Hotel Del and go across to Flora. This alternative also still allows people coming down Ocean Boulevard to make a left-hand turn, have some storage, get out of the flow of traffic and make a left-hand turn across and get onto Churchill and be able to park there. On all three alternatives the proposed sidewalk is located opposed to what exists now. A strong reason for that is it creates a nice refuge for pedestrians trying to cross both R.H. Dana and Churchill.

Mr. Peña questioned how people leaving the hotel's north lot or going west on Dana would be prevented from getting onto Flora; it seems easier for them to do that here than in Alternative 3. Mr. Colvin said that is true and it leaves room for people who are familiar with the area, if they have time, to cut across and make a U-turn. This alternative does channelize against that. This is trying to go a little more with the approach that was shown in the approved plan for the hotel which was to extend the median as far down as they could, but by leaving this open and striped they're allowing vehicles to make U-turns. Alternative 4 will not stop that.

Mr. Colvin said that Alternative 5 is very hard to support from an engineering standpoint, but he put it in to show a little more what's going on there today. It basically maintains the flow of traffic that we have today, but the problem is that although they've extended the median striping out, they don't really have any way to take away the conflict point. People traveling east will try to make their way across Churchill and all they have to go across is some centerline striping to try to promote a little channelization. This is would simply be a band aid on the intersection. Mr. Fait pointed out that this alternative does not have a left-turn pocket for east or southbound Ocean Boulevard traffic that wants to turn onto eastbound Churchill.

Mr. Colvin said that Alternative 3 is the best of the three alternatives for taking movement away from Flora. All three alternatives leave enough room for delivery trucks to make a U-turn onto Churchill and in all three there is pedestrian storage.

Mr. Crook asked about vehicles making a U-turn from Dana onto Churchill. In Alternatives 3 and 4 Mr. Colvin referred to them coming over to the east curb line. Do the trucks executing a U-turn have to be on the wrong side of roadway to execute that turn? Mr. Colvin said the vehicles will make their way into the left-turn pocket, end up a little bit over the centerline and come back in. A little bit of the wheel line would stay on the centerline, but just barely, and that's for the biggest trucks, about 50'. That's true for both Dana and Churchill. If the City wants to eliminate that movement then KH can narrow the space and make it even more channelized and maybe for Alternative 5, instead of striping, it could be raised all the way down. Mr. Peña said then there'd be a delivery problem because there's no loading zone on Orange. Mr. Crook is concerned about moving over into the left-turn lane, then going further out and executing a U-turn. The problem is that once you go into the turn pocket you're going to have vehicles passing on the right as you're making the U-turn and the Vehicle Code doesn't allow that movement. If somebody comes along on the inside and you make a U-turn the vehicle making the U-turn will be at fault. Mr. Colvin said that as the vehicle makes the turn

from the left-turn lane, the back end of the vehicle will still be half-way into the 12' lane, so they'll essentially take up all 24' as they're making the turn. It's possible for a car to attempt to scoot around them.

Jeff Allison, 1057 Ocean Boulevard, has some real problems with this. He said at the time the base lets out through the gate at the end of Ocean there is a sea of cars at high speed. He indicated an area with three lanes: one straight ahead and one left turn and two right-turn lanes. When the configuration was changed a while ago they left out the left-turn lane and it's back now. That traffic, virtually all of it going toward the Strand, backs up. You'll play havoc getting a left-turn lane into the new spot because there isn't enough room. You have two lanes of traffic plus one coming back down; you put a left-turn lane in to go into the hotel and you have one lane going toward Orange and one lane coming back. He recalls that the City's master plan he saw some years ago called for Churchill becoming one-way from Orange to the ocean and the idea was to make diagonal parking along there. That seems to work very well, but you've got to be there and watch this traffic. In the morning when they're going to the base, starting at about 6:00, this is a speed lane. They make that left turn onto Dana from Orange and they begin to pick up speed and they're going down Ocean Boulevard at a good clip. On paper this looks like it works out, but his family has lived in that house since the early 60s and they have seen all of that change and of course that south gate was not open during that period of time and Ocean Boulevard didn't have the traffic it has now. Forget the weekends – it's a parking lot on the weekends. The problem in the morning is not as severe as the problem in the late afternoon. It's very difficult for him to get out of his driveway and make a left turn to come back up Dana once the base traffic is out. He doesn't know what the effect the 25 mph limit on Third and Fourth will have on people coming out of the base and using Ocean to the Strand or going across Orange to Adella, picking up Pomona over to Glorietta and the bridge. Before we start taking a five-pound bag as far as this street is concerned and trying to put 10 pounds in it, we really have to take a hard look at what's really going on there. There really isn't very much traffic coming down Flora and trying to come across. He doesn't know what additional traffic or parking will be caused by the construction at the Coronado Plaza, but he thinks the whole complex needs to be studied as to what the traffic situation is now, what the loads and speeds are, and then worry about the new entrance to the hotel. He doesn't think there is room for a left-turn lane into the hotel from Dana.

Mr. Peña asked if it was the residents of the Star Park area that wanted limited access to that area through Flora related to the hotel's master plan and Mr. Fait said that was what initiated this. Mr. Peña observed that it wasn't the Flora people coming to Dana, it was to prevent flow from the north lot onto Flora directly. Mr. Fait agreed and said it was from both directions, in and out of the driveway, to and from Flora through that intersection. It was included in the traffic study that was part of the environmental impact report. The entire intersection was looked at in detail in the traffic study with counts and dimensions. The left-turn lane secondary entrance into the hotel was included in the master plan and studied in the traffic report as well. Both the median barrier and the left-turn lane are CEQA mitigations. It's come down to what design will accomplish those design elements and still not disrupt the neighborhood. The City is also hoping that by adding the median barrier and defining the lanes with striping in a more obvious manner traffic is going to slow down, so it should help the speed and it's also possible that if traffic is queuing up or blocking the entrance driveway you can mark or stripe to

keep the intersection open. Mr. Walton said "Do Not Block Intersection" could be designated.

Mr. Walton said he likes what was done with the crosswalk; it's a great improvement, giving the pedestrians refuge. It also brings it to a better location for the pedestrians. He's a little concerned about going forward with raised medians; he'd like to find the best alternative and stripe it first to see how the traffic reacts. He thinks the ultimate mitigation is a raised median, but he wouldn't be opposed to putting in striping first to see how people react before going to the expense of doing it in concrete.

Mr. Fait said this needs to be in place and functional before the secondary driveway is open and available to use which is scheduled for summer 2006.

Mr. Fait asked Mike Haslett, director of construction for the Hotel Del, to provide some information about the schedule for the cottages and the driveway. Mr. Haslett said that the target for the cottages and villas is to open in the third quarter in 2006, so the driveway construction for the second entrance into the west lot would be in that timeframe. They also want to complete all the street edge improvements on Dana, around the corner on Orange and the median work in the center of Dana. It would start around the first of the year. Mr. Huth said he was looking at how much time there would be to actually lay out something. Mr. Fait felt there would be time to do a temporary layout or test if we want to go that route. Mr. Haslett replied that the crosswalk refuge and the additional parking stalls are to be hardscape, raised curbs and he's not sure what the limits are as to what is built and what is striped. If all that new work was striped you'd have people crossing all on the same pavement level as the traffic. A striped refuge is not much of a refuge.

Mr. Peña said that from a planning point of view he would like as much landscaped space in that area as possible. For an interim, striping is OK, but he thinks that long term, Alternative 3 is better with full landscaping.

Mr. Crook said this intersection has been a problem for many years so he is grateful that someone is finally addressing the issues. He just doesn't know that these alternatives are going to do what we want to accomplish. He thinks there are some good pedestrian safety areas here but he's concerned about some of the movements. He doesn't have the design answer, but he thinks something else needs to occur here. Alternative 3 is probably the closest, but still not what he'd like to see. The turn area for the trucks is a problem, but also, if you're going to try to keep the traffic from Flora, where you want them to turn right onto Churchill, it's going to have to spike in farther because they're just going to turn left. He thinks there's some real confusion in this area and there needs to be some refinement.

Mr. Walton said he prefers Alternative 3. Mr. Huth prefers it as well. He knows what Mr. Allison was talking about in terms of speed and he knows that from an engineering design standpoint when you have an opportunity to narrow the roadway it does have an effect on speed; how much of an effect that will have is yet to be seen. He asked, when looking at the placement of the yield on #3, where is that in relation to the properties on that side of the street? Will any kind of problem be created for driveway back-out in that area? Mr. Fait indicated it would not; the house on the corner of Flora and Ocean's driveway is on Flora. He thinks that part of the challenge is to accommodate so many different things and one of those is the commercial vehicle loading zone. Perhaps if there was another location for that, and he's not sure if there is, then the design for this intersection could probably be different. It seems like sometimes, and maybe illegally, vehicles do park on Orange. He wondered if in the past that had

been marked as a loading zone and could it be looked at again? Mr. Crook said he thinks that when the plaza was first built it was loading and then it changed to red. Mr. Fait said there's a bus stop at the south corner so if trucks were stopped on the curb it could interfere with a bus trying to pull in. Mr. Huth said he tends to be in that area for public works stuff and he knows the loading zone on Churchill and with the exception of maybe Pepsi or Coke, most of those trucks are mid-size. He was really concerned about the concept of those trucks not being able to make that turn, ending up going down to Loma, coming through Loma, then Flora and then coming back in. Do you make that a bigger arc instead of 33', cut it in wider? He thinks you'd still have a situation where they'd all be making a wide swing turn. Mr. Crook said in the afternoon when traffic is queuing up for the light at Orange Avenue they're not going to be able to move over at all to get into position to make that turn. Mr. Fait wondered if most of the deliveries are in the a.m. before the peak p.m. period.

Mr. Fait asked if the Committee could give clear direction where to go with this. Mr. Peña said he felt this should go to the City Council, even though they've already approved the hotel's master plan, because it involves public streets and also residents who will need some input at that level. He wanted to emphasize that when it gets to the Council level the Engineering Department has more direct input as to what was taken into account for the design with today's traffic flow. He likes Alternative 3 with the landscaping and the overall flow. He thinks the node needs to be pushed out more toward the crossing to prevent movement from Dana to Flora. Mr. Fait asked if part of the recommendation would be to put the finished landscape median into the crosswalk, and the balance of the median to the west be tested with bollards and/or striping for a trial period. Mr. Huth said he was comfortable with the raised median as designed, or make it bigger or farther out.

Mr. Colvin said they don't have current traffic volumes or a speed zone study for this area so the level of engineering that was put into this was mostly geometric as far as lane taper lengths, shifts, storage bay lengths, etc. To get the ultimate storage bay lengths we would need a true traffic study run on certain software to determine what those lengths need to be, whether it's three car lengths or four; remembering that this is a secondary entrance into the hotel, more for employee parking; everybody really accesses the hotel by making a right off Orange Avenue.

Mr. Huth asked if this was envisioned as an entrance in the traffic study and Mr. Fait replied yes, but as a secondary entrance. This was modeled already in the traffic study that was used in the EIR as a reference document. Mr. Huth asked if there was any way to evaluate whether the queuing at Orange Avenue will be affected by reducing the lengths of what's existing there and forcing some of that queuing back up Ocean Boulevard. Mr. Walton said we also need to look further at the east on Dana because there's another left-turn pocket proposed for the first entrance. Mr. Fait said that one is almost exclusively for service vehicles. The secondary driveway which is farther to the left will be used mostly for automobiles. It's a very challenging design and some of the issues that have been raised exist today; he thinks that some of those problems may remain, but overall it's going to be better. The travel lanes will be defined, traffic will go slower because of the visual obstructions and there will be left-turn lanes where there are no left-turn lanes today. Mr. Walton said he thinks if this is striped and the Navy traffic leaving the base stays within the designated lane, you'll see the queue extended farther back on Dana. Currently they queue in the three lanes, predominantly the two right-hand

turns, and they probably extend farther down R.H. Dana in a single lane if the striping configuration is changed.

8. Consideration of Canceling the November 24, 2005 Meeting Due to a Conflict with the Thanksgiving Holiday – This item was approved unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 4:03 p.m.