

# CITY OF CORONADO

## TRAFFIC OPERATIONS COMMITTEE

### MINUTES

**Thursday, October 22, 2009**

A meeting of the Traffic Operations Committee (T.O.C.) was held on Thursday, October 22, 2009, at 2:00 p.m. in the Council Chambers. Scott Huth and Ed Walton were present. Ed Hadfield represented the absent John Traylor, Ann McCaull represented the absent Rachel Hurst and Laszlo Waczek represented the absent Lou Scanlon. Assistant Engineer Dave Johnson was also present.

1. Minutes of the September 24, 2009 Meeting – Approval – Mr. Hadfield moved to approve the minutes, Mr. Walton seconded the motion and they were approved unanimously, with Ms. McCaull and Mr. Waczek abstaining.

2. Oral Communications – Bo Bucklew, 811 H Avenue, stated that in the last three years he's noticed a big problem with jet skis at the Glorietta Bay Park beach. It's out of hand; they don't even bring their own anchors – they take rocks from the berm, tow them over, sink them and tie their crafts off and leave the rock. People who paddle there constantly pick up the rocks and put them back so that other people don't get hurt and they don't crush their crafts. This was supposed to be a swimming beach from his understanding. Mr. Waczek offered to speak with Mr. Bucklew after the meeting.

3. Recommendation Regarding a Request to Modify the Parking Prohibition Hours in Front of Glorietta Bay Park – Mr. Johnson said that an email was received from Dan Megna, asking that the City reconsider the current parking prohibition times in front of Glorietta Bay Park. Mr. Megna stated that he has been using the park over the last couple of years and was recently given a warning by the Police Department that he was in violation of the current parking restriction. He feels that the prohibition prohibits recreational users of the park from using it in the early morning hours and wanted to see if the City could amend the hours to accommodate early morning recreational users. Prior to 1988 the City Council passed a resolution which prohibited parking along Strand Way between 2:00-9:00 a.m. This was to prohibit overnight parking and to prohibit Navy personnel from parking along Strand Way. The Recreation Department asked that those hours be modified, feeling that, particularly on the weekends, the parking restriction hours were a little too severe. They asked the T.O.C. to recommend to the Council that the hours be changed to what they are today which are restrictions from 2:00-9:00 a.m. Monday through Friday and 2:00-4:00 a.m. on Saturdays, Sundays and holidays. This has been in place since 1988. Staff believes that the current parking restrictions are still necessary to prevent the Navy from parking there for long periods of time and displacing recreational users. For people who want to use the park during the early morning hours there is still unrestricted parking along SR 75 which is approximately a 50' longer walk across the bike path and down a little step wall. Staff is not recommending that any changes be made to the parking restrictions at this location.

Mr. Huth wondered if having a two-hour parking limit could achieve the same thing as far as preventing the Navy from parking there. Mr. Johnson said this could be done but would require more signage and could be confusing to users.

Mr. Hadfield asked about the night time park hours and Mr. Johnson said he believes it closes at 11:00 p.m. Maybe a few years ago it was open until 2:00 a.m. until there were problems with rowdies. The park hours were changed but the parking restrictions were not updated along with the new park hours. For early morning users of the park Mr. Hadfield felt there is a conflict in that there's an open park but we don't provide parking. He agrees that there shouldn't be multiple different parking restrictions and suggested (A) looking at the overall parking area restrictions; (B) looking at what best accommodates something we already have in place as far as the use of the park and providing parking for that facility; and (C) addressing military parking if that becomes an issue.

Mr. Waczek said it's a shame that someone can take a prime parking spot with a great view near the beach and leave for nine or 10 hours and not use the facility. He said eight-hour parking meter spots might accomplish two things: (1) prior to 8:00 a.m. those who wanted to use the park could use it for free because parking meters do not go into effect until 8:00 a.m.; and (2) if the Navy parked there prior to 8:00 a.m. they'd have to come back out and feed the meter and that would be a hassle. But on the flip side, somebody using the park for a day would have to pay a meter.

Mr. Huth said the City opened the lot that's on the other side of the Amphibious Base, but on City property, after 1988 (maybe in the mid 1990s). This gave more access for parking for people who couldn't get on the base.

Dan Megna, 1021½ Park Place, said that he's been using the park in the early morning for about two years for paddle workouts. There is a large group that paddles there in the early morning and there are kayakers and bikers. Until he got a warning a couple of weeks ago he was not aware of the parking restrictions. He spoke to Sgt. Eric Hima and some other police officers and they said they'd never enforce that down there. Apparently, someone has begun enforcing it though. He thinks the military problem could be dealt with by having a two or three-hour parking time. This would need to be enforced and enforcement would need to be consistent. You can park at the boat ramp but you need to have a trailer. If he put a boat trailer on the back of truck he could park right next to the water. He suggested a three-hour parking limit. If the Navy is jamming up the park by parking then the people doing early morning workouts have to park at the pool and that compromises the pool users.

Mr. Bucklew expressed that he is not in favor of parking meters. He thinks the way this has been dealt with has been great; there's been no Navy parking there, the park has been open with plenty of spaces for everyone. Most of the exercisers have racks on their vehicles. His workouts are from 7:00 or 7:30 a.m. until 8:00, 8:30 or 9:00 a.m. at best. Maybe the parking meter person can mark the tires. He doesn't want to infringe on other people's opportunity to enjoy a park but he definitely enjoys not having Navy parking there.

Mr. Walton said that in 1988 there was discussion about the problem the Navy caused by occupying the parking spots around the park, making it unusable for park users. When the restrictions went in that solved that. He is opposed to putting time limits on because of the different uses of the park; there are people who will use it all day for picnics and birthday parties. Other people will park and meet someone with a boat and go out on the bay all day. It would be extremely difficult to place a three or four-hour restriction and still allow those people to park there. He thinks that something needs to be done to keep the parking in tune with when the park is open.

Mr. Waczek pointed out that in years past parking on SR 75 was restricted to emergency parking only; now it's completely open for parking. He agrees that it seems like the parking should be in sync with the park hours.

Ms. McCaull is concerned about installing metered parking in a beach area. She thinks it should be available for the public to use at all times during the day and doesn't want to limit the amount of time that someone can enjoy the bay area. This has been in place since 1988 and she wondered if this is the first time this has been brought to Engineering's attention. Mr. Johnson said there have not been complaints in the past. Ms. McCaull said she's inclined to think it's been working pretty well over the last 20 years. She mentioned the parking along SR 75 and said she doesn't know how difficult it is to get kayaks from there to the bay. Those in the audience indicated that it is not particularly easy.

Mr. Hadfield said the T.O.C. needs to look at the entire area and come up with a consistent model. He also believes that the parking restrictions should mirror the hours of the park hours as opposed to being in conflict with them.

Mr. Huth said the City has an upcoming project which will place a boathouse in the park and Mr. Walton said this project will take away some of diagonal parking on the street, but it will also have a parking lot. Mr. Huth said having that will promote more activity that's generally associated with early morning hours when the water's glassier. He feels that the parking should be consistent with the park hours.

Mr. Walton said he thinks the parking at NAB is more long-term parking for sailors who go out to sea. The cars are pretty dirty. He thinks the people who were parking in the diagonal spots were day parkers. He thinks if the restriction is lifted they'll come back.

Mr. Huth asked if it would be possible to have different sections of parking with different restrictions. Perhaps we could restrict the most convenient spots for the Navy to park. Mr. Hadfield suggested identifying the first 10 stalls for parking between the hours of 5:00 a.m. to 9:00 a.m. and specifying that only those stalls are for those hours. This would accommodate early morning activity. Mr. Huth pointed out that the parking is well utilized in the morning for summer camps. Mr. Waczek said if there are different sections an area with a natural barrier should be picked so there's an obvious delineation between one area and the next because signage will be tricky. The pump station location is an idea.

Mr. Walton felt the whole park should be signed the same. He wondered if there is a way to restrict the parking on Strand Way to recreational use, but he doesn't think there is.

Ms. McCaull feels that SR 75 is being utilized a lot more now for military parking so maybe the potential impact on Strand Way isn't as great as it might have been in years past so maybe coordinating the parking hours with the park hours could be done on a trial basis. Mr. Waczek said if that's done he recommends the trial period be at least a year to get the summer in and get a true flavor as to how it's working.

Mr. Hadfield moved to change the parking hours and the signage to accommodate the park opening so that people are allowed to utilize the spaces starting at 5:00 a.m., including Saturdays, Sundays and holidays, and that it be done on a trial basis for one year. Ms. McCaull seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

4. Recommendation Regarding the Request for Installation of Red Curb Zones at the Intersection of Second Street and Prospect Place – Mr. Johnson said that Ella Croshier contacted the Engineering Department regarding the difficulty she has turning from northbound Prospect Place onto Second Street. She stated that when making this turn, cars parked along the curb line obstruct her view to oncoming traffic. She suggested that red curbs be painted on Second Street to improve the available sight distance. In 2000, the travel

lanes were narrowed on this section of Second Street and bicycle lanes were added which increased the amount of buffer, or parking, area. Typically there is about eight feet of curbside parking, but with those changes to the roadway striping it actually ended up increasing the parallel parking width to about 11 feet. Now, when you're exiting Prospect Place onto Second Street (where there's a yield sign), this additional parallel parking lane width allows vehicles to creep out toward the travel way to look beyond the cars that are parked parallel. The Engineering Department does not feel this is an inherently dangerous intersection; it's very typical of most of the intersections in Coronado, if not even a little better with respect to having a buffer area to be able to creep into the street and look for oncoming traffic. The Engineering Department does not recommend that additional red curbs be put in place.

Ella Croshier, 25 Blue Anchor Cay Road, does not agree with the staff recommendation. She drives that intersection very often and when you're on Prospect and going toward Second you have to creep out all the way into the bicycle lane area before you can see cars coming. Also, the cars coming from the right come around a curve and they go pretty fast. When you're coming out you have to gauge whether a car is coming and how fast one will whiz around the corner while you're trying to get out. It is a very unsafe feeling. Yes, you can creep out into the bike lane, but cars coming down Second that are going to turn in by the pharmacy move into the bike lane for about 200' before they come to the corner. So when you're creeping out into the bike lane to be able to see, you're also creeping out into the line of traffic. The same thing occurs with the parking lot behind the medical building. You have to creep out of it too. She said that parking is available; that parking lot is hardly ever filled and the hazard could be eliminated. She also believes there are ordinances in the City that prohibit tall fences on corners and this is no different. When you have obstacles, regardless of whether they're bushes, landscaping or fences, you can't see around the corners. She read from a letter she had written:

“Regarding a complaint I made recently about safety and cars entering from Prospect onto Second Street near Coronado Pharmacy. I am here today to ask the city to reconsider and paint red curbs at that location. Currently cars parked right on the corner obstruct the driver's view when trying to safely enter onto Second Street.

“I appreciate the review done by the city regarding my request but disagree with their findings. I am often at this location coming and going and while there is a problem with enough free parking there is always parking available in the private parking lot for \$2.00 per day, more than reasonable.

“The bike lane is not a protection for pulling forward into traffic. You are blindly pulling into the bike lane where you can be hit by either bikes or cars. Cars move into the bike lane before making their turn.

“I believe there are ordinances that don't allow tall fences around corner lots at the curb corners because of a safety factor of not being able to see oncoming cars. When these SUVs are parked right on the curb corner it is no different from a tall fence. They obstruct vision in the same way.

“I am an experienced driver for over 50 years and am a witness to the fact that these parked cars on corners at that intersection restrict visibility to safely enter onto Second Street. The same is also true when you pull out of the privately owned parking lot onto Second Street. The cars parked on either side of the driveway exit block visibility of the driver until they are well into the path of oncoming traffic.

“I am sure the city is more in favor of saving lives than parking spaces when there is adequate parking available and urge you to reconsider my request to eliminate parking on the curb corners.”

Mr. Hadfield said there are a number of similar intersections in the City where visibility and acuity are limited based on parked vehicles. With that being said, he agrees with the staff report and feels that this intersection presents no greater danger than any of the other intersections where there are similar parking requirements. He noted that Second Street is wide and provides a greater depth of acuity from Prospect Place although he understands that you do have to creep out a bit when vehicles are parked on both sides.

Mr. Waczek agreed; he drove Prospect this morning and was amazed at the line of sight he had down Second Street to Glorietta Boulevard. He has found himself in situations where he doesn't feel safe making a left turn so he makes a right turn and goes around the block. He concurs with Mr. Hadfield that this intersection is no more dangerous than any similar “T” intersection with a yield sign. In addition, the buffer zone allows you a little extra space to creep out.

Mr. Walton said he has noticed cars parked on the corner every time he drives past. When he drives down Prospect he has to ease out onto Second after he's stopped. It's an uncomfortable feeling but it's one you have to do in Coronado because of the way the streets are laid out. He thinks this intersection is actually a little better than some of the others so he'd hate to put red curb in here and open a precedent.

Mr. Huth concurred with what has been said. He thinks the intersection of Second and A is more of a challenge than this because of the lane configuration at Prospect which allows you to pull out more. The statistics don't show that this is a problem area. It's functioning; people who use it know they have to ease out more slowly and look to both sides and there is a considerable need for parking in the area. Any removed parking will push parking into other areas which can create other problems.

Ms. McCaull concurred with the other comments. Mr. Hadfield moved to accept the staff recommendation to deny red curb zones at the intersection of Second Street and Prospect Place. The motion was seconded by Mr. Waczek and it passed unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 3:05 p.m.