

# CITY OF CORONADO

## TRAFFIC OPERATIONS COMMITTEE

### MEETING MINUTES

July 22, 2010

A meeting of the Traffic Operations Committee (TOC) was held on Thursday, July 22, 2010, at 2:00 p.m. in the Council Chambers. Lou Scanlon and Rachel Hurst were present. Jim Newton represented the absent Ed Walton, Mike Blood represented the absent John Traylor and Scott Huth was absent and unrepresented.

1. Minutes of the June 24, 2010 Meeting – Approval – The minutes were approved unanimously with Mr. Blood abstaining.

2. Oral Communications – None.

3. Recommendation Regarding the Request to Install 12-Minute Time-Restricted Parking Spaces Adjacent to the Building at 878 Orange Avenue – This item was postponed to the August 26 meeting at the initiator's request.

4. Recommendation Regarding a Request to Install a Stop Sign at the Intersection of Adella Avenue and Eighth Street – Mr. Newton said that Engineering staff had received a request from a resident of the neighborhood to install some form of right-of-way control at this intersection. The City has a warrant which states the criteria that must be met to install a stop sign. The warrant looks at accident history, traffic volumes going through the intersection and visibility, and sets thresholds for what should and should not warrant the installation of a stop sign. In this case, no reported accidents were found to have occurred in the intersection in the past three years. No visibility issues were noted; it's pretty easy to see in all directions from all approaches. Staff compared the traffic volumes against the warrant and the intersection met the criterion for installation of a stop sign. The minimum vehicle volume for the principal street (Adella) states that if there are more than 1,000 cars per day or 100 in the peak hour and on the minor street (Eighth) if there are 500 cars per day or 50 per hour, a stop sign is warranted. In this case this criterion is met. Staff's recommendation is that a stop sign be installed on Eighth Street.

Mr. Scanlon said he's aware that there's been some pressure from the community as well as the City Council to avoid erecting stop signs when possible due to noise, emission, etc. and asked if this would qualify for a yield sign and would that be a better application? Mr. Newton said yield signs were looked at; the State guidelines for yield signs are all recommendations and in this case some of the criteria were met for installation of a yield sign, but not all were met. Once it was determined that the criteria for a stop sign were met staff decided to move in that direction.

Don Penniall and his wife live at the intersection of Eighth and Adella, 1413 Eighth Street. He said this is a large intersection. People coming off of A Avenue at Eighth Street have a stop sign and Adella begins two or three houses after A Avenue and you've just gone through a stop sign. They've lived in the house for 20 years and he doesn't recall in 20 years anything other than the screeching of brakes ever at that intersection. He realizes that sometimes people

probably don't yield when they should but as a resident there who traverses the intersection many times a day he doesn't see the need for a stop sign. There's never been an accident that he's aware of. However, he can understand a yield sign. Because of the size of the intersection he's not sure where you'd put it so that it would be visible to the proper people. There's traffic coming up the hill from Pomona, from the roundabout, never speeding. The only time you have speeding there is in the dead of night, youthful drivers, he would think, gunning their engines. Both he and his wife feel a stop sign would create toxic fumes and they don't see the need for it.

Nancy Hughes, 800 A Avenue, thinks a yield sign is more in line there because, as Mr. Penniall said, just two houses down is another stop sign. She goes that way to go to the bridge by way of Pomona and if there's a stop sign, even if there are no cars coming on Adella she'd have to stop. She understands that if there's a yield sign and no cars are coming she can go through. She thinks if something is in order, she would be in favor of a yield sign.

[Name inaudible] said she's lived in her house for over 40 years and there has not been one accident there that she knows of. [Inaudible.] She would not like to see a stop sign there and thinks a yield sign would be much better.

Mr. Scanlon made a motion to recommend against the staff recommendation and to install a yield sign on Eighth Street at Adella Avenue. Mr. Blood seconded the motion based on what he heard from the public and it passed unanimously.

Mr. Newton said that from an Engineering point of view, the criteria for a stop sign have been met. A yield sign is a slightly lesser way to control traffic at the intersection. Considering that staff was unable to find any accidents in over three years, he feels a little more comfortable with the idea of a yield sign, knowing that there are no visibility issues at the intersection. He's on the fence though because he doesn't know if there are any liability issues if the City doesn't follow the policy, knowing that the warrant for a stop sign was met.

Ms. Hurst said there doesn't seem to be any proponent for the stop sign. Mr. Newton said the original request was for some form of traffic control, yield or stop. He said that if this is advanced to the City Council staff would rewrite the report to address some of the state guidelines regarding yield signs and the liability issue and potentially adjust the recommendation.

The motion to install a yield sign passed unanimously. This recommendation will be forwarded to the City Council.

5. Recommendation Regarding a Request for Installation of "Keep Clear" Pavement Legends at the Intersection of Orange Avenue and Loma Avenue – This item was postponed to the August 26 meeting at the initiator's request.

6. Recommendation Regarding the Request to Review the Lane Configuration on the R. H. Dana Place Approach to Orange Avenue – Mr. Newton said that at the last T.O.C. meeting Mr. Jeff Alison asked staff to look into the lane configurations along R. H. Dana Place as it approaches Orange Avenue. As it exists today, there are three lanes at the intersection, two exclusive right-hand turn lanes and one shared left/through lane. Mr. Alison lives in the neighborhood and commented that as you move backwards, away from the intersection, R. H. Dana narrows and there's really only enough room for two lanes of traffic to stack up as you wait to get through the intersection. He has observed that the shared left/through lane sometimes stacks up during the peak afternoon hour and blocks vehicles' ability to get to that center right-hand turn. He asked staff to look into reconfiguring that intersection, changing the location of the shared left/through lane to try to increase access to all three lanes at the intersection. The way staff originally interpreted his request was not correct; staff thought he was asking for one

left, one through and one right lane and that is how the staff report is written. Mr. Alison contacted Mr. Newton earlier in the week and explained how he was actually asking for one left, one shared/through right and one right lane. This is a Caltrans-controlled traffic signal because Orange Avenue is a state highway so staff had to look at the guidelines Caltrans uses when they look at intersection configuration. They base their designs on the *Highway Capacity Manual* and this manual states that at intersections with more than 300 vehicles per hour per lane trying to make a turn, that requires two exclusive right-turn lanes, which is what exist now. At the present time, traffic volumes average about 370 vehicles per hour per lane, so two exclusive right-hand turn lanes are definitely needed in the eyes of Caltrans. Staff tried to see if it could be proved that Mr. Alison's recommendation would improve efficiency; the equations that are available to do that are all based on the idea that all the lanes approaching the intersection are free and clear for cars to back up into and in this case that's not true. Staff observed the intersection and agrees with Mr. Alison that the left-hand shared lane, as it exists today, can back up and block access to the middle lane. On the flip side, staff saw the middle lane back up and block access to the left-turn lane on occasion. At the end of the day, staff had nothing to go to Caltrans with to say "We understand the *Highway Capacity Manual* wants two dedicated right-hand turn lanes, but in this case we want you to ignore that and give us a shared right lane." There wasn't any evidence that staff felt Caltrans would consider. It's staff's recommendation to leave things as they are.

Nancy Hughes, 800 A Avenue, said that at Orange and Fourth, those lanes are not both dedicated right turns. The left one is straight through, the middle one is straight through or right turn and the right lane is right turn. Wouldn't that be justification to Caltrans? Mr. Newton said he didn't know the volume of cars that make that right-hand turn and he'd have to look into it.

Jeff Alison, 1057 Ocean, concurs with what staff has to work with, which is unfortunately, the state dictating to the City what it has to do about its internal traffic. We're talking about a little over two hours from 3:00 to 5:00 in the afternoon when the base traffic comes out of that south gate. For the other 22 hours we don't have the problem that dictates what the state wants. He doesn't see that there's much reason to fight the state on this and he withdrew his suggestion, but he still thinks we should have the authority within our community to do what is right for own traffic and not listen to Caltrans.

Mr. Scanlon moved to accept the staff recommendation to make no changes to the current lane configuration; Ms. Hurst seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 2:24 p.m.