

CITY OF CORONADO
TRAFFIC OPERATIONS COMMITTEE
MEETING MINUTES

May 22, 2014

A meeting of the Traffic Operations Committee (TOC) was held on Thursday, May 22, 2014, at 2:00 p.m. in the Council Chambers. Rachel Hurst and Ed Walton were present. Gary Brown was absent and represented by Duq Duquette; Mike Blood was absent and represented by Perry Peake; Jon Froomin was absent and represented by Mike Lawton. Assistant Engineer Dave Johnson was also present.

1. Minutes of the April 24, 2014 Meeting – Approved, with Mr. Peake abstaining.
2. Oral Communications – None.
3. Recommendation Regarding the 2012 Annual Traffic Report – Mr. Johnson said the reason this is the 2012 report and not 2013 is that for the last few years the Statewide Integrated Traffic Reporting Systems has fallen behind in getting the collision reports out in a timely manner. As of March 2014 they still didn't have all of the 2012 data in for Coronado, so staff took what was available and manually input the rest.

He said that the highlights of the 2012 Annual Report are that volumes on the bridge, as reported by Caltrans, did not change between 2011 and 2012. For 2012, there was a daily average of 73,000 vehicles (total number of vehicles divided by 365). Coronado also calculates weekday traffic only; those numbers are significantly greater than the average annual daily traffic because of Navy influence and summer visitors, which boost the weekday traffic volumes. The traffic volume on the Silver Strand increased very slightly – less than one percent. 20,400 vehicles were reported per day in 2011 and in 2012 the number was 20,500.

Mr. Johnson felt the most interesting thing about the report is the difference in the number of reported collisions. Over the past five years it was felt that the City had reached a leveling off at about 180 collisions per year; in 2012 that number jumped up to 269. The reason for that, as relayed by the Traffic Division of the Police Department, was that in previous practices, when a traffic collision call would come into the Police Department, it was understood that an officer would be assigned to the incident and if the officer found that there was not significant property damage and that the parties involved were exchanging information, a formal report was not necessarily taken. A repercussion of that practice was that many times insurance companies wanted a report after the fact. Therefore, the reporting requirements were changed in 2012 so that any time an officer responded to a traffic collision, they took a report, no matter what the damage was. It was found that the majority of the 2012 collisions were of the property damage-only type and there wasn't a large increase in injury accidents.

Cdr. Lawton explained that the change of procedure was to more accurately document the volume of collisions in the community in order to have more accurate data.

Frank Spitzer said he felt that weekly, if not monthly, reports should be made. In the report, he would like to have the fact why the City's reporting on 2012 now. Second, there's no measurement of near misses in the report. That report is for the purpose of near misses and

collisions to find out what we can and cannot do going forward. This is all government speak – it doesn't help the real world.

Cdr. Lawton said near misses are very difficult to quantify and qualify in terms of details. There is no official version of a near miss, so it's very difficult statistically to accurately tell what a near miss means. It's a very difficult concept to capture and it requires the public to contact the Police to report a near miss.

Cdr. Lawton feels Mr. Spitzer's request for an explanation as to why the 2012 report is being presented now is reasonable.

Mr. Walton referred to page 10, in the chart where intersections with five or more accidents is discussed. He would prefer to use the street names (Orange, Third, and Fourth) rather than SR 75. He intends to take this report to the Transportation Commission for its comments.

Mr. Walton moved to accept the document with the corrections noted and also seek comments from the Transportation Commission and forward the final report to the City Council. Chief Peake seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

4. Recommendation Regarding a Request to Install a 20-foot Blue Curb Zone in front of the Residence at 540 C Avenue – Mr. Johnson said that Marianne Turnipseed has a disability and feels that she qualifies for a blue curb zone in front of her house. She has a valid handicap placard and a note from her doctor stating that she is unable to travel 50 feet without assistance. The criteria that is most often not met is the condition that the existing property must not have a location that can be converted to disabled parking. The Turnipseed residence does have a garage at the back of the property and Mr. Turnipseed says that he does park his car in the garage. Mr. Johnson visited the residence and noted that there are several tall steps involved in transiting between the garage and the house, whereas from the front of the property, the step leading to the front door is not even a full step. In addition, the path of travel from the garage to the house is actually 30' greater than the path of travel from the front curb line to the front door. The recommendation is to install a 20' blue curb zone in front of the property at 540 C Avenue.

Carl Turnipseed said he was made aware of an email claiming that he does not park his car in his garage; this is not true as he always parks his car in the garage, while his neighbors, who have multiple cars, do not.

Mr. Lawton moved to accept the staff recommendation; Mr. Walton seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

5. Recommendation Regarding a Request to Install a 25-foot Blue Curb Zone and a Ten-foot Red Curb Zone in front of the Residence at 1005 Adella Avenue – Mr. Johnson said that John Weston has a disability that limits his mobility and there is no place on the property that can be utilized for parking. Normally, blue curb zones don't include a red curb zone recommendation, but in this case, there is a small concrete walkway in the parkway. The policy is to place blue curb zones in front of a location that can provide access for a disabled person, so they're generally located just in front of curb ramps or accessible paths. Here, from this path to the stop bar is 35', so it was decided to provide a 25' blue curb zone along with a 10' red curb zone to take up the space between the stop bar and the proposed blue curb zone in order to prohibit anyone from parking there. It was felt that if the proposed red curb zone were left as an open curb zone, a car could take up that space and make it not only difficult for the Westons to utilize the blue curb zone, but because it would be a substandard-sized space, a car parked there would also be encroaching upon the stop bar and the curb ramp at this corner.

Chief Peake questioned why this blue curb zone is recommended to be 25' when the previous one is 20'. Mr. Johnson said they had 35' to deal with, and rather than install a 15' red curb (taking up almost an entire standard car space), it was decided to recommend painting only 10' of red curb, which left 25' of blue curb for the Westons. He felt that it would work equally as well with a 20' blue curb zone and a longer red curb zone if that is the TOC's desire. Cdr. Lawton liked the idea of being consistent with other blue curb zones at 20'.

Ms. Hurst noted that adjacent to the paved area in the parkway would be the standard place to locate a blue curb, but in this case, a car parking behind the blue curb may park next to the paved area. Mr. Johnson agreed and said if a car is parked right up against the bumper of the Westons' car, it would make access to that path more difficult. Perhaps including the path in the blue curb zone would make it more accessible.

Cdr. Lawton noted that a resident at 1021 Adella sent an email stating that they are OK with the handicap zone, but they'd like the red zone to be on Tenth Street because of vision issues. Mr. Johnson responded that sight distance issues are a separate issue from the blue curb request, but the Engineering Department will take a look at that.

Mr. Walton's preference would be to move the 20' blue curb zone down so that the path would not be blocked.

Cdr. Lawton moved to accept the recommendation with the following modifications:

- That the blue zone be moved south to the south edge of the walkway that extends through the parkway;
- That the blue zone be 20'; and
- That whatever is remaining be a red zone to the stop line.

Mr. Duquette seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 2:40 p.m.