

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

**Thursday, August 28, 2008**

A meeting of the Traffic Operations Committee (T.O.C.) was held on Thursday, August 28, 2008, at 2:00 p.m. in the Council Chambers. Scott Huth, Ed Walton Lou Scanlon and Tony Peña were present. Ed Hadfield represented the absent Kim Raddatz. Assistant Engineer Dave Johnson was also present.

1. Minutes of the July 24, 2008 Meeting – Mr. Peña moved to approve the minutes, Mr. Walton seconded the motion and they were approved unanimously with Mr. Scanlon and Mr. Hadfield abstaining.
2. Oral Communications – None.
3. Recommendation Regarding a Request for Removal of Stop Signs on First Street at the Intersection with I Avenue – Mr. Johnson said the Engineering Department received a resident petition requesting consideration of removing the stop signs at First Street and I Avenue. This issue was heard by the T.O.C. in March 2006 at which time the request to have them removed was denied based on some considerations that included completion of the Third Street Gate which is now completed and the removal of the truck route from First Street, which has been de-designated as a truck route. This issue has been brought back as a result of the petition. The City does not have a warrant for removal of stop signs, so data was collected based on the warrant for installation. He discussed the criteria in the warrant:

Volume: *Total vehicular volume entering the intersection from all approaches averages 300 vehicles per hour for any 8 hours of an average day; and the vehicular volume entering the intersection from the minor street for the same 8 hours averages at least one-third of the total volume entering the intersection.*

The eight-hour average exceeds 300 vehicles per hours, but for those same eight hours the volume is less than the one-third total on I Avenue, which is the minor street. Therefore, this warrant is not met.

Accidents: *Six or more types of accidents susceptible of correction by stop signs within a 12-month period.*

The most recent traffic collision data, from January 1, 2007 to December 31, 2007, showed that there were no reported collisions at this location. This criterion 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.*

Due to the straight geometry of this intersection, there are no sight visibility issues here. This warrant is not met.

Special Conditions for Residential Areas: *In residential areas the minimum volume indicated in Paragraph 2 may be reduced to sixty percent (60%) of the stated values provided all of the following conditions exist:*

- a. *Both streets have residential frontage with existing 25 miles per hour speed limits. This condition is met, as the speed limit on First Street is 25 mph.*
- 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.*
- d. *No existing stop sign or signal is located on the principal street within a distance of 800 feet. This condition is not met as there is an existing stop sign within 800 feet of First Street at Alameda; there is also one on the other end of I Avenue.*
- e. *Streets from at least three legs extend 800 feet or more away from the intersection. This condition is met.*
- f. *Installation of a four-way or three-way stop is compatible with 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 condition (d) is 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 three-way stop.

The petition also describes the need for marked crosswalks. The City has a warrant for uncontrolled crosswalks. At stop intersections, per the CVC, there is a crosswalk; those crosswalks tend to be marked with white paint at stop locations, but where there’s a heavy pedestrian crossing location that doesn’t have a stop control or some type of traffic control, the risks of marking that location are weighed against this warrant. The warrant states that for an intersection to qualify for the installation of a marked crosswalk there must be an evaluation and all the following criteria must be satisfied. The criteria are as follows:

Intersections:

(1) *The crosswalk will clarify and define pedestrian routes across a complex intersection.* First and I is not considered a complex intersection; all legs intersect at right angles, so it’s apparent where pedestrians should be crossing. This condition is not met.

(2) *The crosswalk will channelize pedestrians into a significantly shorter path.* Since all crossings at these intersections are perpendicular, a marked crosswalk will not identify a shorter path.

(3) *The crosswalk will position pedestrians to be seen better by motorists.* Due to the configuration of the intersections there is not a way that a marked crosswalk would position a pedestrian to be better seen. This condition is not met.

(4) *The crosswalk will position pedestrians so as to expose them to fewer vehicles.* At this location one of the desired crossings is across First Street to the park. A marked crosswalk would not expose pedestrians to fewer vehicles. They would be crossing the higher volume roadway anyway. This condition is not met.

Pedestrian Volume: *The total amount of pedestrians crossing the street during the peak pedestrian hour (including both crosswalks, if applicable) is 10 or more.* Staff did separate field visits during assumed peak pedestrian hours (8:00-9:00 a.m. and 4:00-5:00 p.m.) and it was noted that only five pedestrians were observed crossing between 4:00-5:00 p.m. and only four crossing between 8:00-9:00 a.m. The total number of pedestrians crossing First Street during the two hours observed was nine. This condition is not met.

Vehicle Approach Speed: *The 85th percentile approach of speed of vehicles using the street does not exceed 35 miles per hour.* A speed study performed on this stretch of roadway in December 2005 shows the 85th percentile speed of eastbound and westbound traffic was 31 miles per hour and 32 miles per hour respectively. This condition is met.

Gap Time: *The number of unimpeded vehicle time gaps, equal to or exceeding the required pedestrian crossing time, in an average five-minute period during the peak vehicle hour is less than five.* This criterion is not currently applicable since the stop signs are there. That in itself creates a gap for pedestrians to get across. Prior to the stop sign installation it was observed that during the peak vehicle hour there were not at least five crossing opportunities of at least 15 seconds during an average five-minute period during the peak traffic time. If the stop signs weren't there, based on data collected before they went in, the gap time criterion would be met.

Visibility: *Motorists have an unrestricted view of all pedestrians at the proposed crosswalk for a distance of not less than 200 feet on all approaches.* The geometry lends itself to visibility at this intersection, so this condition is met.

Illumination: *There should be adequate illumination either in existence at the crosswalk to make pedestrians visible at night to approaching drivers.* There are street lights at this location, so this condition is met.

The warrant states that all conditions must be met to allow a marked pedestrian crosswalk. Since the Intersection Conditions and Pedestrian Volume conditions are not met, this location is not warranted for a marked pedestrian crosswalk.

The petition also asks that the Committee consider installation of pedestrian warning signs at this intersection to alert drivers to the possibility of pedestrians crossing the roadway. Due to the low number of pedestrians crossing at this location, the effectiveness that a pedestrian sign may have on driver behavior is probably insignificant. Also, when signs are placed warning of a particular condition and that condition is rarely observed by motorists they tend

to develop a disregard for those signs which can pose a danger to pedestrians who have an expectation that drivers are aware of the crossing route. In March 2006 the Council approved a speed zone change on First Street from 30 mph to 25 mph; hopefully this reduction in speed limit will help pedestrians cross the intersection more safely. Also, last year First Street was de-designated as a truck route, so steps have been taken to get large vehicles off this segment of First Street.

Mr. Johnson noted that at the last T.O.C. meeting, the Committee recommended to the Council that the City look at using an in-road pedestrian warning sign on a trial basis at First Street and B Avenue as a first location. Based on the results of the trial period, staff can develop warrants for its use in other locations of the City. This is a sign that residents requested the City consider.

In conclusion, Mr. Johnson stated that based on staff's warrant analysis of stop signs and crosswalks it appears that stop signs are not warranted at this location; it also appears that a marked crosswalk in the absence of signs is not warranted. Based on the warrants, staff's recommendation is that stop signs and marked crosswalks not be installed at First Street and I Avenue.

Mr. Peña asked whether the stop signs had met the warrant when they were installed and Mr. Johnson said they had not met the warrant. They were installed on the basis of providing pedestrian safety and to a lesser degree, as a traffic-calming measure.

Mr. Scanlon was not on the Committee when the stop signs were installed and was interested in the accident data prior to their installation. From Mr. Johnson's statement that the stop signs did not meet the warrant when they were installed, he assumes there were an insufficient number of accidents prior to the installation to warrant the installation. Mr. Johnson said a three-year history evaluation was done at the time of the original request in 2003 and he believes the most there were in a year was three. It never met the six accident collision threshold.

Mr. Huth said if you're heading southbound on First you can see really well, but he doesn't know if that's the case when you're heading toward the base, especially since there's a ramp that sits next to a pole. There's a lot of activity right there, part of which is because of construction, and it's not a very clear view other than the fact that you have a stop sign. If you stop you can look, but if the stop sign wasn't there it seems that people coming out of the southern end of the park may have a problem with traffic that's moving toward the base in terms of being seen. He asked if the standard peak pedestrian time is the same everywhere it's evaluated and Mr. Johnson said not necessarily. Peak pedestrian time is very hard to quantify; unless you survey pedestrian crossings on a fairly regular basis it's really hard to determine. He picked the First Street survey times based on resident feedback received at the last meeting. The downtown business district would probably be looked at closer to noon; the beach would probably be the same.

Mr. Huth felt that most of the activity in the park would be on the weekend and there are periodic events in that park; he asked if this had been taken into account and Mr. Johnson said that it had not.

Mr. Walton clarified the information about accidents prior to the stop signs being installed; there was one accident, but it was not actually at the intersection, but close, so it wouldn't have been an accident that a stop sign could have prevented.

Wendy Miller, 101 I Avenue, gave a brief history of the First Street group. She was one of the first people to be a part of that, wishing to divert trucks off First Street as a traffic-calming measure and pushing for stop signs at two intersections, First and E and First and I. As said today, this didn't meet the City warrants; there wasn't really a traffic issue there or a

pedestrian crossing issue; however, they really wanted to reduce the speed and have traffic calming measures along First Street. They asked that stop signs be installed for that reason. Unfortunately, the neighbors abutting that intersection immediately realized that the stop signs were invasive and disruptive and they have been fighting since to be heard again to have them removed. Some things that are really upsetting to them are that the stop signs are there 24 hours a day; any heavy traffic is only there during certain periods; however, the screeching and acceleration is there 24 hours a day, seven days a week. Early in the morning they hear traffic sounds; the people immediately abutting this intersection have a vested interest in trying to remove that noise and air pollution from their homes. Also, adding stop signs has had other adverse effects on traffic; the residents now have an unbelievable number of people who use this place for a U-turn or they turn left on I, so the traffic on I is much heavier than it was before the stop signs, as is the traffic on Second because now the traffic comes up Second, turns and goes down I to intersect in the early morning. All of these are situations that the residents didn't really count on when they were trying to calm the trucks off of First Street. The residents first came to the City wanting the speed reduced, but it couldn't be reduced because First Street was a truck route; then somehow the speed was reduced and the truck route was removed. The majority of the trucks are going down Third and out Fourth like the plan; when you come out of the gate there's a sign that says "This is not an exit for trucks." So the base is really trying their best to help out. She said the City asked her to go to the neighbors and they got signatures of 90% of the immediate people on First Street and I Avenue; they wanted a less invasive alternate to the stop signs. She thinks everyone present really wants the same thing; she doesn't think anyone wants to have stop and go, stop and go, stop and go outside their neighbors' houses. Everybody wants to make sure they're safe. Not all of the petitioners could be here today; in this neighborhood there are a lot of vacation homes, there are a lot of houses under construction, but the bottom line is there were a lot of people that were interested in the petition. The petition is to change the sign; they did not ask that the signs be removed; they asked that the signs be changed by removing the stop signs and putting something else in their place. A couple of her neighbors were quite upset when they got the City's letter again. Ms. Miller said "We're being sabotaged again; this is not what we're asking." They want something there for those people that think they need something to cross that street; we want to provide them with something, but it doesn't have to be a stop sign that is causing those of us close to it such aggravation for 24 hours a day. The petition recommends removing the stop signs from the intersection based on the City's recommendation that it didn't meet the warrant originally and still doesn't meet it. It's not necessary. Secondly, they requested the crosswalk to remain in place. Although the City has given reasons why the crosswalk does not meet the warrant, they feel that the City should allow the crosswalk to remain in place pending the study that the City has already agreed to do for an in-street crosswalk. When they finish the study they can re-evaluate the crosswalk and put in an in-street sign. The City might also want to establish a traffic working group to analyze and come up with some special design for the in-street crosswalk signs that are more geared toward the style of living in Coronado. She doesn't think the ones the state offers are very attractive, so perhaps they could be changed somehow. In-street crosswalks do a lot of things. One is that it increases the awareness of drivers much farther away than a plain stop sign. It also reduces the speed of approaching traffic at a greater distance so it would allow cars going down First Street to go at a more even pace. Right now they gun from one stop sign to the other and a lot of them seem to be angry because they didn't see the stop signs, so they screech and they gun it because now they're upset that they were forced to stop. Having something that is more consistent as it

approaches the intersection would be preferable. Also, having crosswalks as pictured on her presentation, provides a safe haven for pedestrians in the center of the road. There are not that many people crossing the street and really, there is not a lot of trouble crossing the street with or without the stop signs, but to provide more security you'd have a little concrete in the middle of the crosswalk. Also, any time you are making the traffic veer even slightly it slows it down, so having this in the middle of the road and with a concrete barrier would allow drivers to veer around the stop signs. Her presentation displayed an in-street stop sign from Ventura County where residents had the same problem the First Street residents did in some people wanting a stop sign because people were going through their intersection too quickly. The residents are very happy with it and the City of Camarillo said they'd be very happy to discuss this. She showed another slide with a sign saying it's a state law to yield to pedestrians in the crosswalk. She researched in-street crosswalks around the world and they basically have four components. One is a tall sign right in the middle; two is warning bumpers on either side of the sign and you can use directional arrows; three is raised concrete; and four is street marking which delineates an obstacle in the road. She described two views of First Street: One was taken a block and a half from the intersection going toward NASNI; the other is three and a half blocks from the intersection. This shows that you can't see the stop sign or the present crosswalk in either one, so this is really doing nothing to slow the traffic down as you move along First Street. The next picture is the same, but with the suggested signage. In this picture there is a clear intent of what you want people to do if there's a pedestrian crossing, clear direction as to where the traffic is supposed to go and it's clearly visible. The next slide was taken some distance away and you can't see the stop sign or the crosswalk lines that are farther back. The next slide is from a considerable distance down the road and from four blocks away you can see a crosswalk sign in the middle of the road which allows drivers to start slowing down because you know something is in the road. Right now all they see is a straight line from Orange Avenue to the base and so they zoom up to the present stop sign and they slam on their brakes and then they gun it. There are studies that crosswalks are dangerous and give false security, but her research has shown that most of those arguments come from a study in 1970 done by Bruce Helms in San Diego. This was the granddaddy of all studies for a long time; his theory was that it gave false security to those in the crosswalk. However, more recent studies have shown it doesn't necessarily give that false security. In 2001 the Department of Transportation actually stated that pedestrians tend to look both ways before they enter a crosswalk, so they actually look as much or even more if there's a crosswalk there than they do if there's not a crosswalk. The study shows that with a crosswalk there's a 1.6 km. reduction in vehicle speed. Having something in the intersection is definitely safer as far as any kind of crosswalk. She suggested looking at removing the stop signs and definitely leave the crosswalk. This is what she believes most people want and feel secure with. And after the trial study at First and B is completed, add a similar in-street kind of signage to the intersection and then evaluate it for possible other locations throughout the rest of the City.

John Stihl, 724 First Street, recalls that the stop sign installation was a safety issue for entry into the parks. He still believes that today, that this is not a First Street or an I Avenue issue at all, but rather a safety issue for entry into those parks. He's been to both parks on First Street in the early morning and at night time too; an awful lot of people cross that street at night time because that's where you get the most beautiful view of the San Diego lights. Therefore, he thinks that rather than looking at one petition or one group of people in one location, this is an issue for the City because that park is open to all residents of Coronado and visitors, and the City ought to come up with a solution. He doesn't have anything

against technology; there may be something better than the old arterial stop, and he thinks that most of the people in Coronado would like to have access to those parks with a crosswalk and some kind of system to make them as safe as possible. The other people in Coronado should be able to participate, not just the First or I people. It ought to be framed as a safety issue.

Richard Sanders, 816 First Street, said that if there are alternatives to stop signs and crosswalks they need to be tested and recommendations need to be made. But that needs to be done before we go tearing down what we have and what works. That is paramount; we have worked hard to get these stop signs. There were reasons for that; a lot of it was safety and it still is today. It's a speed and a safety issue. The speed limit was dropped from 30 mph to 25 mph, but before there were cars and trucks going 40 and 50 mph and if that's dropped to five below we had 35 to 45 to 50 mph and that's unacceptable. He doesn't think we want to regress and go back to that. With regard to the warrants, a precedent was already set; not by the overriding failure of meeting all the warrants on First Street alone, but it's also happened in other locations around Coronado; in fact, the two on Second Street didn't meet the warrants. They were put in to slow the traffic down as they were put in First Street, to slow the traffic down and that's what they've done. They've become a "free policeman." He remembers the days before those controls and there was a lot of police activity on First Street generated by people who lived there because it was constant nightmare with cars going by at 30, 40, 50 mph. The warrants are guidelines, but they're not absolutes; there are circumstances that can't always be recognized. He was at the last meeting when the stop sign installation was recommended and he has to ask "What has changed since that time on First Street?" The only thing he can think of is that it's now de-designated as a truck route and there's been about a 90% reduction in truck traffic and so there's less noise and pollution. Otherwise he doesn't see what else has changed. Finally, he would like to keep in mind that First Street will be further impacted next year when the Navy brings aboard a third aircraft carrier which will be docked at the end of First Street; that's a 50% increase and it's not going to get to be less of a problem, it's going to become more of a problem and he thinks we need to be ahead of the curve and be ready for it. If we have safer alternatives other than stop signs and crosswalks he hopes the traffic engineering department will consider and recommend them, but if we're going to err, err on the side of caution until we do have alternatives.

Cindy Sanders, 816 First Street, opposes removal of the stop signs at First and I. They were installed as a traffic calming measure; the need for traffic calming hasn't stopped. She's heard that there are stop signs that are 50% larger than the ones we have, so if it's a visibility problem why couldn't we install something that is a legal stop sign and is larger that would show up to the oncoming traffic. The bay parks on First Street are used heavily from 5:00-8:00 p.m. daily and on many occasions they are rented for weddings and other social events. If the trade-off is noise over safety she thinks safety wins. Unless there is a better alternative she doesn't think you can take something out that allows people to cross the street until you have the other thing in place. It wouldn't be prudent.

Langdon Smith, 800 First Street, and his wife Jean are strongly opposed to the removal of the stop signs, both at First and I and at First and E. He believes these signs were installed to facilitate pedestrian crossings and to reduce the speed on First Street. There's a big difference in a car looking at a crosswalk and moving and a car that is stopped. He's also seen "California stops" at these stop signs, but they're not near what it would be without the stop signs. He thinks it's entirely a safety measure that is involved here. Granted, when cars stop at the stop signs and accelerate there's a little bit of objectionable noise that occurs, but

he would rather hear the noise than hear a screaming child or even a dog. This is a pretty sad situation that could happen and he thinks it's better to have the cars stop and make a little bit of noise than to have a potential accident by somebody cruising along, and then someone walks out in front of a moving car. At least there are two places on First Street that people can cross in relative safety and he'd like to keep them that way.

Shirley Kriet, 100 I Avenue, the northwest corner of First and I, said she is probably the most dreadfully impacted person in the room. Her major point is to say that it is pollution – both visual and noise and air quality. It is lousy at times. The trees are speckled with residue from the streets where cars are braking and accelerating through the intersection. Not everyone stops and not every stop is complete, many are just rolling stops, and not every pedestrian crosses with care regardless of what is there. Skateboarders, roller skaters and bicyclists go through and you can't legislate care and concern for others. She would like to see something to slow the traffic at this intersection so that pedestrians can cross it and so that she can get in and out of her garage safely. She rides a bicycle a lot and she'd like bicycles to be considered too. Bicyclists need to be aware of cars and trucks turning. Whatever you come up with, please think of the whole City, not just an individual or two. It is a safety issue for the crossing, but that's twofold – people have to watch for themselves.

Scott Godfrey, 123 I Avenue, the third house in from the corner, sent two letters via email to the T.O.C., one of which was also addressed to the City Councilmembers. His wife Nancy is a health and safety specialist and has worked for the Navy for over 26 years. She depends on those stop signs to get a break in traffic so she can safely cross the street to the bike lane because she rides her bike to work every day. He is concerned about pedestrian safety. A great deal of time and effort went into installing the stop signs in the first place; they were installed, along with the signs at E Avenue, specifically for pedestrian safety. To remove the signs at I Avenue would be fiscally irresponsible. First Street was just resealed this year and all the proper street markings were reapplied and they look spectacular. There's no question that you can see them from a long distance. You could even see them in the pictures Mrs. Miller was showing and saying that you couldn't see them. They're brand new; you can see them very clearly. He said we should not spend additional funds to remove an effective safety system already in place and then replace them with nothing. The residents of I Avenue are not the sole users of the intersection at First Street and I Avenue. Pedestrians from all over the globe depend on the stop signs and crosswalk to cross safely to the very popular Bay View Park. Most of their voices will not be heard regarding this matter. He urged Coronado to do the right thing and keep the signs to protect pedestrians. He sent another letter to Casey Tanaka saying the City did a fabulous job last year of renovating Bay View Park to make it more popular; it's a beautiful park. He doesn't know when the pedestrian counts were taken to evaluate the warrants, but if the counts were made before the renovation he is sure that the current count would be significantly higher. Also, the park can be rented from the City for \$100; shouldn't we provide safe access to the park for groups of up to 50 people? There's not enough parking along First Street on the park side for 50 people, so they have to park elsewhere on First Street and somehow cross. If there are that many people we should have some place safe for them to cross and in his opinion, it should be the stop signs and crosswalk. In another letter, he questioned the decision-making process used resulting in the recommendation to remove the signs. The analysis section of the T.O.C. report leans heavily on the fact that the intersection does not meet the warrant. The intersection did not meet the warrant in March 2003 either, yet the City Council approved the stop signs to allow easier pedestrian crossing to Bay View Park. So the precedent has already been set for the installation of stop signs despite the warrant. The need to provide

safe access for pedestrians crossing First Street to Bay View Park still exists. So what has changed to cause the T.O.C. to reverse this decision and recommend removal of the stop signs and the associated crosswalk? The background section of the report states “The residents learned that the stop signs had adverse impacts such as increased noise, vehicle emissions and lack of driver respect for the signs.” Where is the evidence to support this statement? Extensive data was collected to validate the warrant, yet by sharp contrast, absolutely no data is presented regarding the alleged increased noise and vehicle emissions. Has anyone taken any measurements of noise levels or collected any air samples? Therefore, the recommendation to remove the stop signs because of increased noise and vehicle emissions in his opinion has no merit. Another possible answer in the background section is the petition signed by local residents requesting that the City remove the stop signs at First Street and I Avenue. The agenda actually includes three petitions submitted over the past three years and all are full of contradictions, ambiguities and gross exaggeration of the perceived noise, pollution and traffic problems. His greatest concern with the petitions is the very questionable signatures that were submitted for this important issue. Who has verified the validity of the signatures? The attached resident petition, actually a cut and paste version of three separate petitions, lists his signature on the original petition; this is absolutely not true – he did not sign that first petition. Some of his neighbors have indicated to him the same; that they too are falsely listed. Additionally, there are signatures of residents who live on Glorietta, Marina, Isabella, etc. Are these residents truly impacted by the noise and pollution at locations over a mile away? Therefore, the petitions do not adequately support the removal of the stop signs. In summary, he is strongly opposed to removing the stop signs at First and I. He feels the T.O.C. has no justification to reverse the decision of the City Council and make a recommendation to remove the stop signs. His overriding concern is for the safety of pedestrians. We have a civic duty to protect them and removing the stop signs is a step in the wrong direction, one that could some day be harmful.

Ann Goodfellow, 409 First Street, said she was one of the people who thought a stop sign was needed, but she has learned the hard way that they are not as perfect as she thought. She worries very much about pedestrians crossing, but the noise starts at 4:30 a.m. and ends at midnight. It’s screeching, stopping, starting and is very uncomfortable. She had a houseful of guests and everyone was up by 6:00 a.m. and that’s not what people need to live with all the time. She came today because she wants to work with her neighbors and the T.O.C. to make this work for all the neighborhoods in Coronado. She recommends working together to make it work for everyone.

Erika Davis, 136 F Avenue, said her concern is not the noise and pollution, because she doesn’t live on First, but safety of not only pedestrians but the children. She has schoolgoing children and she used to not allow her children to go on Third and Fourth Streets; now, because of the stop signs she’s added First Street to that list. Trucks do not observe the signs; it seems to her they stop if they feel like it. She doesn’t see the stop sign although she knows it’s there and she doesn’t know how tourists see it. The people on First Street are forever building very huge homes which brings in a lot of extra traffic. Where she lives on the first block of F Avenue the little bit of safe space for her children to play is shrinking because the traffic comes down not only First, but Second, Third and Fourth. She does not allow her 11-year-old son to skateboard, walk the dog or ride his bicycle on First Street and she can speak for many other mothers who have the same concern. She thinks the solution would be to slow the traffic; it is going too fast and she doesn’t think the stop signs have any benefit at all. Since the stop signs, none of her friends’ children are allowed to use First Street.

Carla McNevin spoke also for her brother, Jim McNevin. They have property at 512 First Street and 117 I Avenue, so they are directly affected. The stop signs are not effective; you can't see it and the intersection is extremely noisy. She has stood out there and in a 20-minute period has seen three or four cars go right through it. The screeching is almost frightening; you can hear it in the house and you expect to hear the impact of cars crashing. The traffic starts early and goes late. If she stands out there she'll see maybe five cars turning around in the intersection now. She thinks it would be beneficial, not just on First Street, but throughout the island, with signage in the middle, to bring it back to a city where pedestrians really have the right of way. She remembers the old days in Coronado where if you stood at an intersection, cars stopped. We don't seem to have that any more and the stop sign is not helping; it's actually making it worse. In Europe the signage in the streets definitely slows down the traffic and you do see it a lot farther off. Now that it's 25 mph and not a truck route has helped a lot. She is against the stop signs and would like to see signage in the street with the crosswalk.

Annette Beus, 407 First Street, could not agree more about the noise and pollution because of the stop signs. It's almost like drag racing. Many times she's gotten up in the middle of the night to see what's going on. Her main concern is for the safety of pedestrians and she thinks that the stop signs are just a false security. She agrees wholeheartedly with what has been said that you can't see them. Many times she waits three or four cars before she would dare cross, even in the crosswalk because so many vehicles run the stop signs. She doesn't think the stop signs are effective at all; in fact, she thinks they're counter effective because they give a false security that this is a safe place to cross and it's quite often not.

Mr. Peña recalled that when the stop signs were put in the T.O.C. talked about noise and pollution and that this was not a good idea because of those factors. But because the residents wanted stop signs they got them and safety ruled, just like what he's been hearing today from some people – that safety trumps noise and pollution. He was surprised to hear from two speakers that they felt removing the stop signs would improve safety and children could play nearby again. He's not exactly sure how that works. The T.O.C. took action on this before because of the strong will of the residents to increase safety by installing stop signs. Now he's hearing mixed reviews from residents, some for, some against. Recently, the T.O.C. received close to 20 letters from people, probably 90% opposed to the removal of the stop signs.

Mr. Walton said there are no sidewalks on the north side of First Street to get to the parks so a lot of people will park on the south side and cross the street; that went into his decision to recommend installation of stop signs. There are more events in the parks now – weddings, more social functions and the park is being used more, so there is more pedestrian usage now. Another thing that hasn't been mentioned is that one reason the stop signs went in was to provide gaps in the traffic to allow traffic on the other streets to exit without fighting a constant stream of traffic. This was a difficult decision and at the time, he voted in favor of installing stop signs and he can't see that anything has changed. It's true it didn't meet the warrants and he thinks that is the only time he's voted against the warrants and that was because of the extenuating circumstances. Lastly, he thinks that removing a stop sign that is in place is even more dangerous than putting one in that's not warranted. To remove a stop sign that people are used to would be a very bad precedent.

Mr. Huth observed that heading toward the base he's seen people make abrupt stops northwest bound on First and some of that he attributes to the construction that's right next door, vehicle profiles and people not looking at the pavement markings. He'd like to look at

some other options to make the intersection more visible; he thinks the construction site plays a role in that for at least that direction. He isn't aware that people on the other side are having the same problem; he thinks coming back from the base the sign is pretty visible. He's not supportive of removing the stop signs without more review of the situation. He likes some of the thoughts that were presented on options for making the intersection better for pedestrian safety and would like to see them reviewed before the stop signs are removed, if the stop signs are to be removed.

Mr. Scanlon noted that he wasn't with the City when the original decision to install stop signs was made but it's his understanding that the decision was made as a traffic-calming measure. He asked if elimination of the stop signs would take the City back to 2003 where the traffic calming would not be there. Mr. Johnson said that's hard to predict; some things have changed – the street has been de-designated as a truck route, so the large trucks that were a concern are gone, and the speed limit has been reduced. Those are traffic-calming measures that have lent to calming traffic on First Street and things have changed for the better. Mr. Scanlon asked if there is information to illustrate that removing a sign would increase or decrease the gap time to any significant level and Mr. Johnson said that he evaluated the unmarked crosswalk prior to the stop signs being considered and found that during the peak vehicle hours it was nearly impossible to get across with a sufficient gap in traffic because the metered traffic coming off the base had such a spacing that it didn't provide the proper amount of time for a pedestrian to cross without the assistance of stop signs.

Mr. Peña moved that the stop signs and associated marked pedestrian crosswalk remain until such time that alternative measures are found to provide the level of safety that is perceived to exist today from correspondence from residents. Mr. Walton seconded the motion and it passed unanimously. Mr. Huth said the stop sign visibility issue would be looked at.

The meeting adjourned at 3:14 p.m.