

CITY OF CORONADO

A SPECIAL MEETING OF THE TRAFFIC OPERATIONS COMMITTEE MINUTES

Thursday, September 1, 2005

A special meeting of the Traffic Operations Committee (T.O.C.) was held on Thursday, September 1, 2005, at 2:00 p.m. in the Police Facility Emergency Operations Center. Present were Scott Huth, Ed Walton, Tony Peña, Kim Raddatz and Paul Crook. Also present were Jim Benson, Director of Engineering & Project Development, Dave Johnson, Assistant Engineer and Laszlo Waczek, Patrol Sergeant.

1. Minutes of the July 28, 2005 Meeting – Item 4, Page 4, was corrected to delete “and was replaced by Sgt. Waczek.” “At this point Captain Crook left the meeting and was replaced by Sgt. Waczek” was added before Item 6, Page 6. With these corrections the minutes were unanimously approved.

2. Oral Communications – None.

3. Recommendation Regarding the Implementation of a 25 MPH Speed Limit on State Routes 75 and 282, also Known as Third and Fourth Streets – Mr. Johnson provided some background. Several years ago Caltrans informed the City that it had a higher than average number of accidents on Third and Fourth Streets. Most were right-of-way accidents, so the City installed semi-diverters which were later removed by a popular vote. SANDAG voted to remove the bridge tolls and as a result of that, a group called the Congestion Relief Working Group (CRWG) was formed to identify and implement safety improvements. Some recommendations were to install signals, bulbouts and landscaping. The group also sought more ways to make the streets safer. Recently, Caltrans adopted the 2003 Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) which says that local authorities can set lower speed limits when there are special conditions and one of those conditions is residential density. Sixteen residential dwellings per one-quarter mile are sufficient to lower the speed limit and Coronado has on an average 25 units per quarter mile. Based on the fact of residential density, Caltrans determined they could lower the speed limit. The Engineering Department looked at what kind of impact this would have on drivers and with a typical travel time of 25 mph from Alameda to Orange it would be 85 seconds vs. 71 seconds at the existing speed limit. Travel time from Orange to Glorietta would be 56 vs. 40. There would be an overall increase of 24 seconds of travel time on Third and 30 seconds on Fourth. Engineering staff recommends implementing a phased enforcement program starting with public outreach, followed by a grace period and then strict enforcement of the 25 mph speed limit.

Jim Benson, Engineering & Project Development Department Director, said that he wanted to assure those at the meeting that the City sat for nine months with the CRWG getting feedback. The CRWG participants were Caltrans, SANDAG, Coronado, MTS, the City of Imperial Beach and local citizens and their task was to look at the results of the removal of the bridge tolls on traffic. They considered bulbouts,

landscaping, traffic signals and ramp metering. Twenty-five miles an hour was a political decision and it wasn't until the change to the law that 25 mph was within the realm of possibility. The City is still working on other aspects of traffic calming.

Pam Hollinger, 415 Alameda, asked whether it was true that if you lower the speed limit you can't use radar and Mr. Walton responded that it is not true with the new criteria. Ms. Hollinger asked if there would be police there and Mr. Crook said that he can't promise a presence at all times, but they will work the area very heavily for several weeks. Ms. Hollinger doesn't think this will work; she is also concerned about bulbouts because now cars are running into houses. She wants assurance that this will honestly be taken care of and it's not just being said.

Dick Scharff, 1310 Fourth, said that even before the CRWG, a group submitted a report to the City Council on November 6, 2001 with its recommendation for a 25 mph speed limit. They worked a long four years on this issue of restoring the integrity of the Third and Fourth Streets corridor as part of the community. An attitude of disrespect had been fostered onto these streets. Now the intersections of A, B and C Avenues will be safer. He would like to see plans from the Police Chief as to how this will be implemented. Forty thousand cars a day go by his door and it has been documented that 50% of them are going over the speed limit. He suggests doing the same for First, Tenth and Alameda. The community is only a mile square and it doesn't take more than five minutes to get from one point to another. He provided a copy of the November 6, 2001 report for the public record.

Pete Fagan, 379 F, lives at the corner of F and Fourth. He wants to emphasize that he worked on this years ago. Enforcement is really the key. A concerted effort on enforcement will really get the word out. Coronado has a reputation that you don't DUI here; he'd like to see the same for the speed limit – you don't go over the speed limit in Coronado. He agrees that people have disregard for Third and Fourth Streets; it's unbelievable – noise, boom boxes, beer bottles thrown. A 25 mph speed limit will bring order back.

Elaine Graybill, 939 Olive, said her home is bounded by Olive, Tenth and G. Tenth Street became 30 mph some years ago. The same problem as Third and Fourth Streets is going on at Tenth, Olive and Alameda. There should not be any street in Coronado over 25 mph. This is a residential community. She has been nearly killed three times this summer. The pressure will become very strong on other streets when the limit is lowered on Third and Fourth.

Mr. Walton said that for years highway and traffic engineers have had their hands tied, but now, with this new edition of the MUTCD, their hands are a little less tied. He read that a pedestrian hit by a vehicle going 30 mph is three times more likely to die than when hit at 25 mph.

Mr. Raddatz moved to accept the staff recommendation to implement a phased program for enforcement of the 25 mph speed limit on Third and Fourth Streets, include an information outreach, follow with an enforcement grace period and then use strict enforcement. Mr. Crook seconded the motion and it passed unanimously. Mr. Benson advised the attendees that Caltrans has processes they have to implement; this may take six to eight weeks.

4. Recommendation Regarding the Motion to Revisit the Conditions of the Intersection of Orange Avenue and B Avenue – Mr. Johnson said that at the last TOC meeting a request to install 100' of red curb was heard. Staff was directed to look at other

options, including speed because of the frequency of unsafe speeds in the accidents recorded there. This area is part of the Central Business District (CBD) and the California Vehicle Code (CVC) says that the prima facie speed limit in the CBD is 25 mph. Coming up from the Strand you go from 65 mph to 45 to 35 to 25. There is one small sign by the Hotel Del that shows the 25 mph speed limit, but there are no others. The staff recommendation, therefore, is to ask the City Council to direct staff to work with Caltrans to install more speed limit signs in the CBD. One item not in the staff report is consideration of a dynamic speed sign; this consists of a radar unit embedded in a sign and when vehicles exceed the speed limit the sign will change to say "Slow Down" or "Speed Too Fast."

Mr. Huth wondered if pavement markings could be used to indicate "slow" or the speed limit and Mr. Johnson responded yes, the local jurisdiction has that flexibility, but that is not required like speed limit signs are.

George Bruce, 1020 Alameda, believes the intersection is unsafe to pedestrians and motorists. The curve makes it hard to see and traffic is usually moving over 25 mph. He recommends putting a flashing sign by the Brigantine. The only sign showing the speed limit is a small sign in the median by the Hotel Del. It is easy to miss unless you're looking right at it. The main problem is that vision is sadly diminished by parked cars that eliminate the ability to see oncoming traffic. The first time you can see a car it's 35' away from you and you have one second to cross, but it takes two seconds to cross. The oncoming car has one second to brake. He speaks from sad personal experience. He stopped at the stop sign, eased forward and strained to see. Before he even cleared the first lane a small BMW sports car struck them. This was his first accident in over 60 years of driving. He knows parking is a premium because there are several restaurants in the area, but are five parking spaces more important than the safety of pedestrians and motorists? He recommends taking away five parking spaces and if that can't be done, take three. He agrees with the recommendation to have a flashing light, but this will not eliminate the problem of a dangerous intersection.

Jim Strickland, 1048 Olive, sent a letter earlier in support of Mr. Bruce's suggestion. He thinks most people driver faster than 25 mph. Flashing lights or markers in the street are good ideas, but that will not eliminate the line of sight problem. Some parking will have to be removed to make the intersection safer. He defies anyone to see from behind the pedestrian crosswalk and asked the Committee to take another look at this.

Elaine Graybill, 939 Olive, said this is "the intersection where I almost got killed." Oncoming traffic does not stop for a pedestrian in a crosswalk or another car. It's clear to her that unless there is aggressive enforcement to penalize folks they're not going to change. Drivers don't care if they hit a pedestrian or another car.

Linda Nichols, 1026 Flora, said she knows there is a serious parking problem in town. The intersection of B and Orange has been waiting for a major tragedy. Ten years ago her husband contacted the City when he was almost hit twice. It's as stupid as not having preventive medicine and wondering why you get cancer. You have to ease out gently, gently, then whoa! She avoids it as much as possible in her car.

Mr. Crook said at the last TOC meeting it was recommended that the City go back and take another look at the intersection. He is still supportive of reinstalling the speed limit sign that is missing (the wood post is still there). When you're coming up the hill you don't notice the speed limit sign on the left, but you would see one on the right. He

suggested removing one parking space; this would still leave seven more feet of parking than across the street.

Mr. Walton said he agrees that the speed limit sign is hard to see on the left-hand side. He's hearing that the biggest problem is speeding.

Mr. Peña said that the City spent a couple of years developing the Downtown Specific Plan and realized that in this area it's very difficult to find parking. He wondered if staff had considered a right-turn only at this location. Mr. Johnson replied they had not. Mr. Huth wondered if there is a standard for compact car parking only at metered spaces; he saw a sports utility car two spaces back and it obstructed the view. Mr. Johnson said the reason for the larger interior spaces (22') is to allow ease of parking and exiting. There is nothing in the Municipal Code that would disallow decreasing the size of the spaces.

Mr. Raddatz observed that every month this Committee gets inundated to make exceptions to the rules. He's starting to get concerned about making exceptions – at certain points you need to draw the line when there are other options and here there are additional signs and flashing lights. He's also against taking parking; we're supposed to be looking for more.

Mr. Huth suggested looking at a combination of an LED sign and additional speed limit signs. There may be benefit in doing a "25 mph Ahead" sign and then a "25 mph" sign. He thinks pavement markings might also be beneficial. Mr. Peña said that trying to slow traffic should be the number one goal. He would be in favor of a no crossing restriction before he would be OK with removing parking.

Mr. Huth made a motion to try to reduce speed by using signage. Mr. Peña seconded the motion with all voting aye except for Mr. Crook who voted nay.

5. Recommendation Regarding a Request to Install Traffic Control Measures at the Intersection of Isabella Avenue and E Avenue – Mr. Johnson said that a letter was received from Heinz Steiner expressing concern that the intersection of Isabella and E is not safe. Mr. Steiner suggested installing a yield sign on westbound Isabella, a marked crosswalk at the west end of the diagonal parking median and a limitation of vehicle height allowed in the five westernmost diagonal parking stalls. Mr. Johnson went on to say that the accident history at this location is very low, but vision can be obscured by high profile vehicles parked in the center median. A yield sign is not recommended because the California Vehicle Code (CVC) states that yield signs "shall not be erected upon the approaches to more than one of the intersecting streets" and there are already controls on the intersecting streets; therefore, if a yield sign were to be erected here it could be a real liability. As far as a crosswalk, three of the conditions in the warrant for installation of a marked crosswalk were not met: (a) General Condition of Intersection – crosswalk markings would not clarify a more obvious pedestrian route through the intersection; (d) Gap Time – there is adequate pedestrian crossing time here; and (e) Visibility – westbound Isabella can be obscured by high profile vehicles in the median.

Heinz Steiner, 1007 Flora, said that his objective is to reduce intersection right-of-way collisions and near collisions and clear up confusion. As far as the recommendation to restrict vehicles over six feet in height from parking in the five westernmost spaces of the center median, he appreciates the recommendation, but six feet is above eye level for 99% of pedestrians. If you were in a vehicle you'd have to be in a tall vehicle to see above. The Vehicle Code says it is not limited to six feet. A better way to make this intersection safer would be to have two disabled parking spaces; this would take up four

existing parking spaces with unloading spaces. The occasional van would not occupy the spaces as much or as often as other vehicles. As far as the yield sign, the Vehicle Code says there shouldn't be more than one at an intersection and this intersection has two and they have not had a lawsuit in 30 years. Traffic counts were only done in an east-west direction, but not the cross direction, so that does not give a clear picture. A yield sign here would calm traffic and cause drivers to slow down. He went on to say that a six-point intersection is a complex intersection. If you cross Isabella where he suggests putting a crosswalk it would suggest to pedestrians to cross there and would channel them into a shorter route. He doesn't feel the gap time evaluation is valid when you're talking about people with coolers, towels and so on. You do not see this during the weekday. The visibility criterion is arbitrarily applied – there are crosswalks on Ocean and Palm where visibility is not an issue. A yield sign and crosswalk will greatly increase safety at this intersection.

Elaine Graybill, 939 Olive, said she uses this area often. The only way to resolve this is to move parking spaces back. Visibility is the problem there.

Mildred Dahill, 1068 Isabella, is on the block that has parking in the middle of the street. There is a holiday coming up which is a marvelous opportunity to assess the situation. She has to park in the middle of the street and it's taking her life in her hands to cross that one lane. Cars come fast off Orange at the Flower Lady and there isn't even a speed limit sign on the street. Mr. Johnson mentioned only one accident, but at the corner of Isabella and E on an easement part of the grass a car drove into a pole which was replaced that day. There have been a lot of fender benders and people do not like to report them because their insurance goes up.

John Nichols, 1026 Flora, goes from his home at least once a day and often feels he has a blind view of cross traffic. He hasn't been hit yet, but is concerned that he cannot see. He would like to make a "beneficial suggestion," as they call it in the Navy. He has been measuring cars in the area: one-quarter of them are four feet tall and one-quarter are five feet tall. He has a six-foot SUV and his eyes are six inches below the top of his car, so that's five-and-a-half feet. If he is next to an SUV he can't see an oncoming vehicle and it can't see him. A Coronado police car is one inch less than five feet, so the view of a police officer driving that car is about four-and-a-half feet and seeing over these parked cars is problematic at best. If there were spaces between parked cars he could see between the cars. He would like to see no parking there, but a compromise would be to not allow parking every other slot.

Mr. Dahill (no address given) said the real problem started when big bulky vehicles started parking in those spots. If we can remove big bulky vehicles from those five slots we've improved safety and made a big difference. People do not know how tall their vehicles are, but if the signs say "No Trucks, SUVs or Vans," they will understand. He does not dare to cross at this intersection.

Bob Lindsay, 1117 Isabella, said that a six-foot restriction won't accomplish anything. Most cars, including a large Expedition at six feet will still be allowed. He has lived in the area since 1968. The problem really is speed. There's one recorded accident, but there have been a lot of close calls. If speed was less he does not think there would be a problem. He thinks a speed bump would slow traffic, especially with a sign saying "Dangerous Intersection – Slow Down."

Ward Boston, 1001 Flora, which is the corner of Flora and Isabella, said he's the "new boy on the block," having lived there nine or ten months. During his time here he has seen many near accidents. From 5:00 a.m. on people make the area of Isabella and E

a racetrack. It's not only cars, but motorcycles. It's a frightening moment trying to get across. Weekends are the critical time because people are rushing down Isabella to get to the beach. He thinks a blinking sign like Dave mentioned that says "Slow Up" might work. This would help in the immediate future, but in the long term it's a bad corner and there will be a fatality.

Linda Nichols, 1026 Flora, said everyone has said it very well. No matter how you approach this intersection you can't see. She likes Mr. Steiner's suggestion of having handicap access parking. She saw a lady in a wheelchair who came four blocks and asked "why don't you have handicap parking closer to the beach?"

Susan Heavilin, 1144 Isabella, said there's a grave concern in this town about speed and pedestrians. She applauds the TOC for considering the 25 mph speed limit. She suggests radar speed trailers like they have in Arizona that take photos. The City should put signs at the entrances to town saying "Speed Limit is 25 mph and We Stop for Pedestrians." In Utah they have cylinders with flags. When a pedestrian wants to cross the street they pick up a flag and replace it when they've crossed the street. She agreed that spaces in the median of Isabella could be converted to handicap, but said that often the handicapped have vans. She would prefer to see the spaces converted to compact parking. She's concerned because this is a big skateboard area. She's spoken to the kids and they say the skatepark fees have gone up and they don't go there anymore. She goes out on her bike every day and she gets almost hit every other day. It's a very dangerous situation. Data is fine, but data does not have life experience. The City really needs to address this.

Mr. Walton said he would try to address Mr. Steiner's concerns. Yield signs – yield signs are used to control the right-of-way and the right-of-way is already controlled with the present configuration. Crosswalk – the problem is that the visibility is not good for a marked crosswalk. Gap time – there needs to be a uniform system for evaluating this. He will go with the warrants. Visibility – there is a problem. It's tough to see when there are large vehicles, but you need a tool to enforce this. Mr. Johnson noted that the CVC allows local jurisdictions the authority to restrict vehicles over six feet in height 100' from an intersection. Mr. Peña said he likes the suggestion of marking the area for compact cars. Mr. Johnson agreed, but said that the City would probably have to physically restrict the space itself; otherwise non-compact cars may park there. Mr. Peña suggested combination wording on a sign stating "Compact Cars Only – No Trucks, Vans or SUVs."

Mr. Crook likes the idea of signs saying "No Trucks, Vans, SUVs." Some SUVs are actually considered compact cars. This would have to be reviewed by the City Attorney. Mr. Raddatz agreed that this is one of the better solutions. Mr. Huth said he is supportive of restricted parking.

Mr. Huth made a motion to install signage restricting vehicles to compact, low-profile vehicles and excluding SUVs, vans and trucks. Mr. Raddatz seconded the motion and it passed unanimously. Mr. Huth said that maybe when restricted parking is enacted some of the issues with the crosswalk will change and he recommended installing a crosswalk to channel people. Mr. Crook seconded that motion and it passed with three ayes. Mr. Peña and Mr. Walton voted nay on the second motion. Mr. Huth said that at this point he would not be in favor of doing anything else.

6. Recommendation Regarding a Request to Install Traffic Control Measures at the Intersection of Alameda Boulevard and G Avenue – Mr. Johnson reported that a letter

had been received from a resident at the intersection of Alameda and G. The resident suggested the intersection could be made safer by installing a stop sign, speed humps and marked crosswalks. The most recent three-year accident history shows one reported accident at this location. In 1979 Resolution 5836 was passed designating Alameda and certain other streets as through streets and this designation prohibits stop signs from being installed. There is a stop sign on Alameda at Sixth, but this item was passed on consent so there is no record of any discussion by Council as to why they approved stop signs on a designated through street. Because of the precedent set by Resolution 5836 staff does not recommend installing a stop sign. In addition, this intersection does not qualify for a marked crosswalk and it has been found that installation of marked crosswalks at uncontrolled intersections increases danger to pedestrians. The speed hump analysis speed survey showed that there is not a demonstrated speeding problem and there would be significant negative impact on emergency response times.

Dick Scharff, 1310 Fourth, would like to see a 25 mph speed limit on every street in Coronado. He doesn't understand why this wouldn't be immediately reduced or implementation started. He also suggested looking at pedestrian refuges; this is a known traffic calming technique – look at the distance pedestrians have to cross at this location. He urged the Committee to “look outside the box” and use new tools. “Come down on the side of safety.”

Courtney McGowan, 1140 Alameda, lives very close to the widest section of road. At certain times of the day it's a very busy thoroughfare. Where Country Club converges into Alameda they start going faster and by the time they get to her house they're going 60 mph. She had a dog knocked flat in Alameda Boulevard and a neighbor lost two dogs and a cat. She suggested placing traffic counters in the wider places of the street. There are a tremendous number of pedestrians going to the beach and kids on bicycles. There will probably be a major accident in the not-too-distant future. There are a lot of out-of-town people here and pedestrian laws are different in other places. Here the pedestrian has the right-of-way. If Third and Fourth Streets are getting 25 mph every other street in Coronado should have that.

Martha Jordan, 1125 G Avenue, worries every day about her daughter crossing this intersection. Alameda is not a flat street; it's curved and kids on bikes need to get momentum to cross. It's a blind intersection for cars and they don't see kids. Dogs and cats are the canary in a coal mine. Next will be a kid. The speed limit needs to be 25 mph. Cars are going too fast.

Kathleen Suros, 1105 G Avenue, lives at the corner of G and Alameda. She agrees with all the previous recommendations and wants to add that it's an intersection that adds more pedestrians because there is a mailbox there. She does not agree with staff's definition of visibility at this intersection and thinks a fair evaluation of visibility to pedestrians needs to be done.

Elaine Graybill, 939 Olive, doesn't want to be rude but she asked “do any of you folks really live here?” Drivers speed up when they see pedestrians. Drivers should be forced to go slower and this should be enforced. A driver going to and from work just wants to get to work and home. They don't realize that residents are using the streets too. Why shouldn't we be able to cross the street in the town we live in?

Bob Lindsay, 1117 Isabella, wondered if the City had applied the warrants to the crosswalks on Ocean Boulevard. Heinz Steiner, 1007 Flora, sees other crosswalks that don't meet the warrants and wonders if the warrants were used to install them.

Mr. Huth explained that there are crosswalks throughout town. The Committee makes technical recommendations and sometimes there are special circumstances, but City Council makes the final decision. This is the reason that you may see things that don't meet the warrants. Mr. Walton said that there are more accidents at marked crosswalks than at unmarked crosswalks. Marked crosswalks can lead to a false sense of security for pedestrians. Because of this one fact they are often denied.

Mr. Raddatz said that this Committee is tasked with public safety. He is extremely against speed humps. To a 40,000-50,000 pound emergency vehicle this is like a stop sign at every hump. The public has made it known that emergency response is a very important issue.

Mr. Huth said that from a practical standpoint he doesn't know if the Committee should be talking about a 25 mph speed limit because it hasn't been analyzed. He suggests bringing it back for discussion and Mr. Walton said a traffic engineering study could be done.

Mr. Huth moved to continue the item and take it to Council for direction to study all residential streets with speed limits marked above 25 mph and whether to reduce the speeds to 25 mph. Mr. Peña seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

7. Recommendation Regarding a Request to Extend the No Parking Red Curb Zone in Front of Bayview Park at First Street and I Avenue: Mr. Peña moved the staff recommendation to extend the red curb 25 feet to the east; Mr. Raddatz seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Wendy Miller, 101 I Avenue, stated that she has learned that what you think you want you don't always want. She is sorry Mr. Benson left because she wants to go on public record that he was right when he said "you don't want a stop sign." What they really wanted to do was reduce traffic. She thinks the red curb needs to be extended even ten more feet. There's a drain and she sees people stepping off the curb; she doesn't want to see them walk out immediately in front of a car. Mr. Huth asked if the inlet was in the area of the red curb and Mr. Johnson replied no, but he could work with Public Services to avoid the tripping area. Mr. Walton noted that this would have to be defined when going to Council.

Mr. Peña moved the staff recommendation to extend the existing red curb zone approximately 25 feet to the east. Mr. Raddatz seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

8. Recommendation Regarding Updating the City's Warrant for Installation of Residential Blue Curb Zones: Mr. Walton moved the staff recommendation to update the warrant for installation of residential blue curb zones, specifically with regard to renewal requirements. Mr. Peña seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 4:45 p.m.

**EXCERPT FROM TRAFFIC OPERATIONS COMMITTEE
MINUTES – SEPTEMBER 1, 2005**

5. Recommendation Regarding a Request to Install Traffic Control Measures at the Intersection of Isabella Avenue and E Avenue – Mr. Johnson said that a letter was received from Heinz Steiner expressing concern that the intersection of Isabella and E is not safe. Mr. Steiner suggested installing a yield sign on westbound Isabella, a marked crosswalk at the west end of the diagonal parking median and a limitation of vehicle height allowed in the five westernmost diagonal parking stalls. Mr. Johnson went on to say that the accident history at this location is very low, but vision can be obscured by high profile vehicles parked in the center median. A yield sign is not recommended because the California Vehicle Code (CVC) states that yield signs “shall not be erected upon the approaches to more than one of the intersecting streets” and there are already controls on the intersecting streets; therefore, if a yield sign were to be erected here it could be a real liability. As far as a crosswalk, three of the conditions in the warrant for installation of a marked crosswalk were not met: (a) General Condition of Intersection – crosswalk markings would not clarify a more obvious pedestrian route through the intersection; (d) Gap Time – there is adequate pedestrian crossing time here; and (e) Visibility – westbound Isabella can be obscured by high profile vehicles in the median.

Heinz Steiner, 1007 Flora, said that his objective is to reduce intersection right-of-way collisions and near collisions and clear up confusion. As far as the recommendation to restrict vehicles over six feet in height from parking in the five westernmost spaces of the center median, he appreciates the recommendation, but six feet is above eye level for 99% of pedestrians. If you were in a vehicle you’d have to be in a tall vehicle to see above. The Vehicle Code says it is not limited to six feet. A better way to make this intersection safer would be to have two disabled parking spaces; this would take up four existing parking spaces with unloading spaces. The occasional van would not occupy the spaces as much or as often as other vehicles. As far as the yield sign, the Vehicle Code says there shouldn’t be more than one at an intersection and this intersection has two and they have not had a lawsuit in 30 years. Traffic counts were only done in an east-west direction, but not the cross direction, so that does not give a clear picture. A yield sign here would calm traffic and cause drivers to slow down. He went on to say that a six-point intersection is a complex intersection. If you cross Isabella where he suggests putting a crosswalk it would suggest to pedestrians to cross there and would channel them into a shorter route. He doesn’t feel the gap time evaluation is valid when you’re talking about people with coolers, towels and so on. You do not see this during the weekday. The visibility criterion is arbitrarily applied – there are crosswalks on Ocean and Palm where visibility is not an issue. A yield sign and crosswalk will greatly increase safety at this intersection.

Elaine Graybill, 939 Olive, said she uses this area often. The only way to resolve this is to move parking spaces back. Visibility is the problem there.

Mildred Dahill, 1068 Isabella, is on the block that has parking in the middle of the street. There is a holiday coming up which is a marvelous opportunity to assess the situation. She has to park in the middle of the street and it’s taking her life in her hands to cross that one lane. Cars come fast off Orange at the Flower Lady and there isn’t even

a speed limit sign on the street. Mr. Johnson mentioned only one accident, but at the corner of Isabella and E on an easement part of the grass a car drove into a pole which was replaced that day. There have been a lot of fender benders and people do not like to report them because their insurance goes up.

John Nichols, 1026 Flora, goes from his home at least once a day and often feels he has a blind view of cross traffic. He hasn't been hit yet, but is concerned that he cannot see. He would like to make a "beneficial suggestion," as they call it in the Navy. He has been measuring cars in the area: one-quarter of them are four feet tall and one-quarter are five feet tall. He has a six-foot SUV and his eyes are six inches below the top of his car, so that's five-and-a-half feet. If he is next to an SUV he can't see an oncoming vehicle and it can't see him. A Coronado police car is one inch less than five feet, so the view of a police officer driving that car is about four-and-a-half feet and seeing over these parked cars is problematic at best. If there were spaces between parked cars he could see between the cars. He would like to see no parking there, but a compromise would be to not allow parking every other slot.

Mr. Dahill (no address given) said the real problem started when big bulky vehicles started parking in those spots. If we can remove big bulky vehicles from those five slots we've improved safety and made a big difference. People do not know how tall their vehicles are, but if the signs say "No Trucks, SUVs or Vans," they will understand. He does not dare to cross at this intersection.

Bob Lindsay, 1117 Isabella, said that a six-foot restriction won't accomplish anything. Most cars, including a large Expedition at six feet will still be allowed. He has lived in the area since 1968. The problem really is speed. There's one recorded accident, but there have been a lot of close calls. If speed was less he does not think there would be a problem. He thinks a speed bump would slow traffic, especially with a sign saying "Dangerous Intersection – Slow Down."

Ward Boston, 1001 Flora, which is the corner of Flora and Isabella, said he's the "new boy on the block," having lived there nine or ten months. During his time here he has seen many near accidents. From 5:00 a.m. on people make the area of Isabella and E a racetrack. It's not only cars, but motorcycles. It's a frightening moment trying to get across. Weekends are the critical time because people are rushing down Isabella to get to the beach. He thinks a blinking sign like Dave mentioned that says "Slow Up" might work. This would help in the immediate future, but in the long term it's a bad corner and there will be a fatality.

Linda Nichols, 1026 Flora, said everyone has said it very well. No matter how you approach this intersection you can't see. She likes Mr. Steiner's suggestion of having handicap access parking. She saw a lady in a wheelchair who came four blocks and asked "why don't you have handicap parking closer to the beach?"

Susan Heavilin, 1144 Isabella, said there's a grave concern in this town about speed and pedestrians. She applauds the TOC for considering the 25 mph speed limit. She suggests radar speed trailers like they have in Arizona that take photos. The City should put signs at the entrances to town saying "Speed Limit is 25 mph and We Stop for Pedestrians." In Utah they have cylinders with flags. When a pedestrian wants to cross the street they pick up a flag and replace it when they've crossed the street. She agreed that spaces in the median of Isabella could be converted to handicap, but said that often the handicapped have vans. She would prefer to see the spaces converted to compact

parking. She's concerned because this is a big skateboard area. She's spoken to the kids and they say the skatepark fees have gone up and they don't go there anymore. She goes out on her bike every day and she gets almost hit every other day. It's a very dangerous situation. Data is fine, but data does not have life experience. The City really needs to address this.

Mr. Walton said he would try to address Mr. Steiner's concerns. Yield signs – yield signs are used to control the right-of-way and the right-of-way is already controlled with the present configuration. Crosswalk – the problem is that the visibility is not good for a marked crosswalk. Gap time – there needs to be a uniform system for evaluating this. He will go with the warrants. Visibility – there is a problem. It's tough to see when there are large vehicles, but you need a tool to enforce this. Mr. Johnson noted that the CVC allows local jurisdictions the authority to restrict vehicles over six feet in height 100' from an intersection. Mr. Peña said he likes the suggestion of marking the area for compact cars. Mr. Johnson agreed, but said that the City would probably have to physically restrict the space itself; otherwise non-compact cars may park there. Mr. Peña suggested combination wording on a sign stating “Compact Cars Only – No Trucks, Vans or SUVs.”

Mr. Crook likes the idea of signs saying “No Trucks, Vans, SUVs.” Some SUVs are actually considered compact cars. This would have to be reviewed by the City Attorney. Mr. Raddatz agreed that this is one of the better solutions. Mr. Huth said he is supportive of restricted parking.

Mr. Huth made a motion to install signage restricting vehicles to compact, low-profile vehicles and excluding SUVs, vans and trucks. Mr. Raddatz seconded the motion and it passed unanimously. Mr. Huth said that maybe when restricted parking is enacted some of the issues with the crosswalk will change and he recommended installing a crosswalk to channel people. Mr. Crook seconded that motion and it passed with three ayes. Mr. Peña and Mr. Walton voted nay on the second motion. Mr. Huth said that at this point he would not be in favor of doing anything else.