

**CITY OF CORONADO**  
**TRAFFIC OPERATIONS COMMITTEE**  
**MINUTES**

**Thursday, June 26, 2008**

A meeting of the Traffic Operations Committee (T.O.C.) was held on Thursday, June 26, 2008, at 2:00 p.m. in the Council Chambers. Lou Scanlon was present and Scott Huth was absent and unrepresented. Jim Benson represented the absent Ed Walton; Ed Hadfield represented the absent Kim Raddatz; and John Swanson represented the absent Tony Peña. Assistant Engineer Dave Johnson was also present.

1. Minutes of the May 22, 2008 Meeting – The minutes were approved unanimously.
2. Oral Communications – None.
3. Request for Analysis of a Four-Way Stop Intersection at C Avenue and Second Street – Mr. Johnson presented the report. C Avenue and Second Street are two-way streets with a single lane in each direction; parallel curbside parking is allowed on both sides of each side; and both streets are classified as local streets. Currently, traffic is controlled on C Avenue with stop signs; there is no traffic control on Second Street. The topography of this area is relatively flat with no roadway curvature.

The City has an established warrant for the installation of four-way stops. This warrant spells out the criteria that need to be met for a positive recommendation for the installation of four-way stops. The criteria are as follows:

Volume: *Total vehicular volume entering the intersection from all approaches averages 300 vehicles per hour for any eight hours of an average day; and the vehicular volume entering the intersection from the minor street for the same eight hours averages at least one-third of the total volume entering the intersection.* The volume entering the intersection averages 604 vehicles per hour for any eight hours of an average day; the vehicular volume entering the intersection from the minor street for the same eight hours is approximately 20.4% (approximately 123 vehicles per hour) of the total intersection hourly average, which is less than the required one-third of the total volume entering the intersection. This condition is not met.

Accidents: *Six or more types of accidents susceptible of correction by stop signs within a 12-month period.* There was one reported collision at this intersection and stretch of roadway approaching the intersection in the preceding 12 months. This condition is not met.

Visibility: *Sight distance (straight line) on at least one of the approaches of the principal street for vehicles or pedestrians crossing the intersection is less than 160 feet.* The straight line sight distance of vehicles and pedestrians on the principal street (Second Street) is greater than 160 feet on both approaches to Second Street. This condition is not met.

Special Conditions for Residential Areas: *In residential areas the minimum vehicle volume may be reduced to sixty percent of the stated value of 300 vehicles provided all the following conditions are met:*

- a. *Both streets have residential frontage with existing 25 miles per hour speed limit. This condition is not met as portions of C Avenue and Second Street are located in the Limited Commercial Zone and have commercial property frontage.*
- b. *Neither street is a designated “through” street. This condition is met.*
- c. *Neither street exceeds 48 feet of curb-to-curb roadway width. This condition is met as both streets have a roadway width of 48 feet.*
- d. *No existing stop sign or signal is located on the principal street within a distance of 800 feet. This condition is not met. There is an existing stop sign at the intersection of Second Street and Orange Avenue, which is less than 800' from the subject intersection.*
- e. *Streets from at least three legs extend 800 feet or more from the intersection. This condition is met.*
- f. *Installation of a four-way or three-way stop is compatible with the overall traffic circulation requirements for the area. This condition is met.*

The warrant states that all conditions must be met to allow reduction of the traffic volume warrant. Since special conditions (a) and (d) are not met, the reduction to the traffic volume criteria is not applicable.

Based on the established City warrants and the collected traffic data, this intersection does not qualify for a four-way stop. Therefore it is recommended that no additional traffic control be installed at this intersection.

Nancy Granquist, 200 C Avenue, asked that the analysis include a four-way stop intersection at Orange and Second Street.

Peter Gallo, 244 C Avenue, is concerned that about four years ago there was a crosswalk across Second Street at C Avenue on the west side of C where the dip is. Then there was a re-seal and the crosswalk was not put back. He suggested that the crosswalk be replaced. He has no opinion on the stop signs.

Mr. Benson shared some observations. There was a request for a stop sign on First Street; the very people that asked for it now want it taken out. He warned that if you think an intersection is noisy now, if you put a stop sign in, all the vehicles will be stopping and accelerating away from it. The people most impacted by the noise are the people the closest to that stop sign. He imagines it's pretty noisy at that intersection now; it would get worse with a stop sign. People complain about the stop signs we already have; they ask “Why do we have so many stop signs?” Some of them were done prior to the policy (warrant) being written and the City Council has chosen not to go back and go through all of them, but if some of the stop signs in town were to be evaluated by the warrant, they probably would not have been installed. That's the reason for the criteria – to have some kind of yardstick for when they are installed and when they are not. The City sticks with the criteria pretty well, unless there is some real overriding consideration, so that there is consistency from one intersection to another throughout town. In this instance it's pretty overwhelming that the

warrant is not met. For an intersection this busy, having as few accidents as it does, means we're doing pretty well. He is inclined not to support making this a four-way stop and agrees with Mr. Johnson's analysis.

Mr. Scanlon moved to accept staff's recommendation not to install additional stop signs at this location. Mr. Swanson seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Mr. Benson commented on the issue that was raised on the stop sign at Second and Orange. Traffic control at that location is very difficult. The concern is that the volume is such that traffic would be backed up on Orange worse than it already is. A stop sign wouldn't work. If something happens it would have to be a signal. This intersection is only 500' from the signal at First and 500' to the signal at Third and Caltrans doesn't like signals that close together. Signals that close together don't work well; they have a hard time staying in sequence so that traffic has some kind of flow. So we'd be taking the existing traffic flow, which is heavy and confusing for people going across the median, and probably make it worse by putting a signal in.

Ms. Granquist wondered if a ladder crosswalk could help. They have them at the Community Center and when cars see you coming and they're in the ladder, they will back up and wait for you. She wondered if the crosswalk analysis for Second and Orange occurred near Boney's. It's safest to cross Orange near Boney's because cars are turning left onto Second. Mr. Johnson said that a crosswalk analysis at that location had been done a few years ago. There is warrant to evaluate where it's applicable to put in a marked crosswalk at an uncontrolled intersection. At that location it wouldn't be the best idea to put in a marked crosswalk. Studies have found that pedestrians get a false sense of security in a crosswalk in an uncontrolled location and they tend to think they can cross traffic without looking out for their own safety. One issue there is visibility; as you're coming northbound on Orange Avenue there is a very large fir tree in the median which obscures a driver's visibility to someone crossing Orange Avenue. The other thing looked at is gap time which is a measurement of the amount of time that a pedestrian would take to get across the road and whether or not there are a sufficient number of gaps where there's not a vehicle there for. It was found that pedestrians may have to wait a little while for traffic to clear up, but within a minute or two there is an available gap to cross safely. This criterion wasn't met when this crosswalk location was looked at, so it was recommended to not install a crosswalk. Ms. Granquist wondered if the evaluation occurred before or after Boney's was constructed and Mr. Johnson said it occurred two to three years ago and it might have been while Boney's was under construction.

Mr. Johnson said other inquiries have been made regarding traffic control at Orange and Second and the Engineering Department decided it would be more prudent to look at it once all of the multi-use developments were completed and filled with tenants. Unfortunately, those projects are completed, but are still vacant for the most part.

Mr. Gallo asked if there was any plan to repaint a crosswalk at Second and C and Mr. Johnson responded that there is a warrant for uncontrolled crosswalks. Prior to the warrant, if someone felt that a crosswalk was necessary, one was put in, but it was found from a liability standpoint that crosswalks should meet the criteria in the warrant before being installed. The policy for the last few years has been that when the City does a slurry seal project and there's an uncontrolled crosswalk that doesn't meet the warrant, it won't be reinstalled unless a new evaluation shows that it meets the criteria. Mr. Benson said there has been a lot of debate about crosswalks. The City of San Diego did a huge study and came to the conclusion that they had a lot of accidents take place in uncontrolled marked crosswalks. People tend to think that a crosswalk will somehow protect them and they get

picked off. The San Diego study was cited for years. Coronado has erred on side of leaving the crosswalks off and letting pedestrians make the decision when to step out.

Mr. Scanlon noted that the Vehicle Code says that pedestrians may not leave a place of safety if it's hazardous, so it's pretty hard to defend if you've left a place of safety and walked out in front of a car and gotten hit.

The meeting adjourned at 2:30 p.m.