

**CITY OF CORONADO
TRAFFIC OPERATIONS COMMITTEE
MINUTES
Thursday, September 23, 2004**

The regular meeting of the Traffic Operations Committee (T.O.C.) was held on Thursday, September 23, 2004, at 2:00 p.m. in the Police Facility Emergency Operations Center. Present were Robert Hutton, Ed Walton, Tony Peña, Kim Raddatz and Scott Huth. Also present were Dave Johnson, Assistant Engineer, Sgt. Elizabeth Brett and Sgt. Laszlo Waczek.

1. Minutes of the August 26, 2004 Meeting – The minutes were unanimously approved as written.
2. Oral Communications – None.
3. Recommendation Regarding a Request for Installation of a Marked Pedestrian Crosswalk at the Intersection of Avenida de las Arenas and Avenida del Mundo – Before Mr. Johnson provided background on this request Mr. Walton said that Avenida de las Arenas is not a public right-of-way street, but the City does have an easement; therefore, he's not sure who has responsibility for traffic control signage. The City Attorney has been asked to provide an opinion on this.

Mr. Johnson said that the Coronado Shores Condominium Association requested a marked crosswalk at the intersection of Avenida de las Arenas and Avenida del Mundo. He reviewed the City's warrant for marked crosswalks, for which all conditions must be satisfied. Items b. Pedestrian Volume and d. Gap Time were not met; therefore the recommendation is to not install a marked crosswalk at this location. Mr. Hutton asked if there were another higher peak period, would Mr. Johnson think there might be a corresponding increase in vehicles that would decrease the gap time? Mr. Johnson responded that it would be possible. Mr. Hutton then asked for clarification of the location of the proposed crosswalk. Mr. Johnson explained that it would be from the curb return at the north side of Avenida de las Arenas south to the pedestrian ramp on the south side of the intersection, about 30'.

James Walker, 1810 Avenida del Mundo, distributed a written request for a marked crosswalk. He said that particularly in July and August there is a lot of traffic going to the beach parking lot and the Shores are at full occupancy. This request arose because of a grandparent's concern for his grandchildren's safety when crossing at this intersection. Other residents have expressed the same concerns. The Landscape and Recreation Committee has unanimously voted for a crosswalk. This intersection is not original to the Shores plan, but was created because the City required a public parking lot. In a discussion with Scott Huth, Mr. Huth told him that pedestrian traffic is expected to be higher after the Glorietta Bay complex is built. Mr. Walker asked that the committee accommodate this request.

Mr. Hutton said that the City is looking for an answer from the City Attorney regarding the easement and who has responsibility. Mr. Walker responded that the Shores Enforcement Committee (which has responsibility for roadways and seawalls) told him that the Shores owns the property but the City has an easement and it is not a

dedicated roadway. He has since read the easement and it describes the area in question “as if it were a public walkway.”

Mr. Peña said there have been many discussions on the safety and security of crosswalks. If one is installed, some education should be performed. Pedestrians may be at a disadvantage if they have a false sense of security and the crosswalk may not be readily apparent to vehicles.

Mr. Huth suggested that it might be better to make the decorative paving look more like a crosswalk – it might be more visible. Mr. Walker responded that they may be doing away with the decorative work due to deterioration. It’s 30 years old.

Mr. Huth reiterated that he believes there will be more activity when the Glorietta Bay project and Hotel Del master plan are complete. He is sure that in the summer there are more than 10 crossings per hour from the City’s own recreation programs. Mr. Walton said he felt that putting a marked crosswalk over decorative paving might be confusing. He’s also concerned that if counts were not taken during peak periods it might meet the warrant; he’s seen people all over the place and would like to channel them.

Mr. Walker said the peak period would be the summer and that’s over. Mr. Raddatz would like to see counts done during the peak period. Mr. Hutton noted that even with different counts, nothing can be done without the City Attorney’s opinion. The peak period may be gone, but this won’t prevent finding out if the City is responsible. Mr. Raddatz asked if it would be truly fair to make a judgment without the City Attorney’s opinion and Mr. Peña responded that he did not see this as a problem – the City can make installation of the crosswalk contingent on the City Attorney’s opinion. Then Mr. Raddatz observed that the committee has the potential to say no to a crosswalk because of bad timing. Mr. Walton said he thinks the term “peak” might be getting confused; in traffic engineering you don’t usually design for the extreme peak and the “peak” hour has much variation, but this area does have increased foot traffic in the summer. He’d like to get a weekend peak count during warm weather. Mr. Raddatz made a motion to wait for the City Attorney’s opinion and to get pedestrian crossing counts and gap times in the weekend peak period. Mr. Hutton seconded the motion and said that the issue could then come back for further reconsideration. The motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Huth observed that this is a highly unusual situation; there is a beach parking lot and private roads – it’s not the easiest thing to take a typical warrant and try to force it to fit this situation. He’s comfortable with the recommendation but believes this is a unique situation.

Mr. Walker asked for a formal definition of “peak” and Mr. Johnson said he would get him that information.

4. Discussion Item: Use of SR-75 Bike Path – Mr. Johnson said this item was continued from last month. The requestor was contacted by phone and letter, both last month and this month, and there has been no response. Mr. Hutton said he believed that the Police Department had already responded to the requestor’s questions. His concerns really pertain to common courtesy. There being no need for additional action, this item was not discussed any further.

The meeting adjourned at 2:45 p.m.