Coronado Comprehensive Active Transportation Plan
Stakeholder Advisory Committee Meeting #1 Summary (8/25/16)

Attendees
Stakeholder Advisory Committee
  Rita Alipour
  Eva Yakutis
  Lee Pontes (representing Dawn Ovrom)
  Georgia Farrell
  Michael Stellpflug
  Steve Wampler
  Morgan Miller
  Molly Haines McKay
  Colleen Glass
  Bob Lindsay
  Robin MacCartee
  Phil Monroe
  Susan Keith
  (Not present – Katherine Farley)

City of Coronado
  Allie Scrivener, Active Transportation Planner
  Nancy Reynolds, Administrative Secretary
  Ed Walton, City Engineer
  Mike Donovan, City Council member
  Whitney Benzian, City Council member
  Carrie Downey, City Council member

Consultant – Chen Ryan Associates
  Sherry Ryan
  Andrew Prescott

Members of the Public
  Bill Kennedy, Dan Orr, Carolyn Rogerson, Catherine Squitieri, Derik Mundt, Larry Hofstetter,
  Margaret Richardson, Georgia Ferrell, Elaine Graybill

Overview
The initial Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SAC) meeting for the Coronado Comprehensive Active
Transportation Plan (Plan) was held on Thursday, August 25, 2016 from 5pm to 7pm at the Coronado
Public Library Winn Room. Preliminary stakeholders were identified at the June 2016 project kickoff
meeting with Coronado city staff and the consultant team. Stakeholders were identified to represent a
variety of perspectives and local knowledge, including representatives from the Coronado Unified School
District, elementary/middle school parents, Bicycle Advisory Committee, Transportation Commission,
3rd/4th Street Organization (defunct), Rotary Club, Coronado Cays HOA, senior community, special
mobility needs community, Orange Avenue businesses, Navy, Optimist Club, and residents that were in
opposition to recommendations from the currently adopted Bicycle Master Plan (2011). Ultimately,
fourteen Coronado community members agreed to serve as stakeholders over the course of the project,
with twelve members present at the initial meeting and one alternate representative. The meeting was
also open to members of the public, with twelve additional community members recorded on the sign-in
sheet.
The first meeting served to introduce stakeholders to the project and define the purpose of the SAC. Preliminary work products were also presented for comment. The agenda included the following items:

1. Introductions
2. Purpose of the Stakeholder Advisory Committee
3. Project Scope and Schedule
4. Summary of Planning Document Review
5. Initial Needs Assessment Findings
6. Goals, Objectives and Evaluation Criteria Brainstorm
7. Stakeholder Interview Question Review

A PowerPoint presentation was used to present agenda items two through five, with agenda items six and seven intended to be discussion exercises. SAC members did not have comments on the committee purpose nor the scope or schedule of the project. The documents referenced within the Summary of Planning Document Review were deemed adequate and comprehensive, with SAC members not identifying additional documents at this time.

The Initial Needs Assessment Findings included a review of US Census data, an infrastructure inventory, collision data analysis, Pedestrian Environment Quality Evaluation (PEQE), Bicycle Level of Traffic Stress (LTS), and the Active Transportation Needs Model. Due to the large interest and feedback received during agenda item five, Initial Needs Assessment Findings, little time was left for the exercises. Additionally, SAC members cited interest in reviewing the currently adopted Bicycle Master Plan prior to providing their responses. It was agreed that SAC members would complete the two exercises outside of the meeting and provide to the project manager.

The following section lists specific comments/questions from the SAC. Items with a “+” sign indicate an action item, with the responsible party identified in parenthesis.

Specific Comments & Questions
- How are visitors/tourists impacting numbers presented (collisions)?
  + TOT from hotels may be a source for tourist data (City/CRA)
- How do we account for rideshare from the Navy base?
  + Review iCommute data from SANDAG for the City/Navy base (CRA)
- A representative from Naval Air Station North Island should be included on the SAC
  + City Council member will reach out to identify a representative to participate (City)
  + Include on the next Naval Complexes Committee agenda (City)
+ Label all “lanes” on the graphics and any other roads not labelled (CRA)
+ Identify locations with in-road pedestrian signage, bulb-outs, and curb ramps at alley locations on pedestrian infrastructure inventory graphic (CRA)
+ Revisit sidewalk inventory with focus on roads west of Country Club Lane (CRA)
+ Revise graphics to correctly identify “Alameda Boulevard” (CRA)
+ Verify “Silver Strand Boulevard” is correct roadway name (City/CRA)
+ Verify existing Class III Bicycle Routes from existing bicycle facility graphic (City)
+ Distinguish between pedestrian-vehicle and pedestrian-bicycle collisions on graphic (CRA)
+ Display youth collisions as own map (CRA)
+ Display collisions by roadway location on a map (CRA)
+ Display collisions by primary cause on a map (CRA)
- Primary Bicycle Collision Factor data displays a need for more education
- Vehicles on Orange Avenue do not have control of 3’ separation when cyclists approach from behind – cyclists are also responsible
- Multiple participants identified a need for increased enforcement
  - There is a problem with cyclists not stopping at stop signs and not using lights during night hours
+ Reach out to local law enforcement regarding bicycle violation data availability (City/CRA)
- Members are interested in knowing how many collisions involved residents vs. visitors
  - Want to ensure funding is appropriately spent. For example, do not want to spend more on local education if education of visitors is deemed necessary (should be Countywide education)
- A 1-page bicycle safety/education handout would be useful at bike rental locations
  - More education for the region would help cover visitors – San Diego Bicycle Coalition provides some materials
+ Display collisions that occur during school/Navy dismissal period on a map (CRA)
+ Display collisions by day of week on a map (CRA)
- Visitors driving/cycling do not know the roads/bicycle designated routes
- Line of sight can contribute to collisions and is not something that can be displayed in the data
  - Intersection of 3rd Street and B Avenue is an example
- Need to drill data down to get to the root cause. Parallel parking vs. diagonal parking, sunrise/sunset, the environment at that time of day all play into accidents. Look at trends spatially.
- Have residents mark-up maps to identify problem locations
  - Consultant stated that will be an exercise moving forward
- Question asked regarding the scope of recommendations from the SAC and the project: can vehicle-related recommendations be made to improve pedestrian/cycling environment?
  - Response: Yes, that is within the scope to make those recommendations, however, they may need additional vetting
+ Revisit PEQE missing sidewalk locations (CRA)
- Glorietta Boulevard does not have a sidewalk on the east side next to the golf course and we do not want one there
- Needs map does not reflect Ocean Boulevard and the beach as an attractor, or First Street
  + Revise beach weighting and also include 3 base entrance locations as an attractor (CRA)
+ Request to report Navy commute data
- Request to include data source on graphics
  - SAC members questioned the validity of SANDAG data
    - Consultant reassured SANDAG reports data provided by cities
- SAC members did not feel prepared/informed enough to provide input on goals & objectives
  - Agreed to provide a link to the adopted Bicycle Master Plan for SAC members to review and provide exercise forms for participants to complete at own leisure
- SAC members cited the adopted Bicycle Master Plan did not take pedestrians into consideration and did not include input from the vast majority of residents
+ Follow up email to SAC members will include a link to the adopted Bicycle Master Plan for review, and copies of the two exercise forms for members to complete at own leisure. Additionally, SAC members were asked to indicate if they would like to participate in small stakeholder interview groups and if they know other individuals. (City)
Coronado Comprehensive Active Transportation Plan
Stakeholder Advisory Committee Meeting #2 Summary (11/7/16)

Attendees
Stakeholder Advisory Committee
  Katherine Farley
  Cauleen Glass
  Susan Keith
  Bob Lindsay
  Robin MacCartee
  Morgan Miller
  Phil Monroe
  Michael Stellpflug
  Steve Wampler
  Eva Yakutis
  (Not present – Rita Alipour, Wes Bomyea, Dawn Ovrom)

City of Coronado
  Blair King, City Manager
  Cliff Maurer, Director of Public Services & Engineering
  Captain Jesus Ochoa, Police Department
  Allie Scrivener, Active Transportation Planner
  Ed Walton, City Engineer
  Tom Ritter, Assistant City Manager
  Nancy Reynolds, Public Services & Engineering Administrative Secretary
  Michael Donovan, City Council member

Consultants
  Andrew Prescott, Chen Ryan Associates
  Brian Gaze, Circulate San Diego

Members of the Public
  Alex Fitzpatrick, Bill Kennedy, Dan Orr, Margaret Richardson, Carolyn Rogerson, Tyler Rowden, Eddie Warner

Overview
The second Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SAC) meeting for the Coronado Comprehensive Active Transportation Plan (Plan) was held on Monday, November 7, 2016 from 5:30pm to 7:30pm at the Coronado Clubroom and Boathouse. The SAC is comprised of 13 members, with 10 members present at the second meeting. The meeting was also open to members of the public, with 8 additional community members recorded on the sign-in sheet.

The second meeting primarily served to identify active transportation issues in Coronado and to solicit input on the upcoming public workshop format and topics. The agenda included the following items:

1. Introductions
2. Active Transportation Issues in Coronado (discussion)
3. Purpose of the Active Transportation Plan
A summary of the comments heard during the discussion exercise are provided in the following pages, followed by the comments received on the proposed public workshop format and topics, and other general comments.

**SAC members identified the following as transportation issues in Coronado:**
- Vehicular speeding throughout the City
- Need for safe pedestrian crossings along 3rd and 4th Street
  - Intermittent crossing guard is not enough
  - Need solutions through engineering and enforcement
- Enforcement of bicycle and pedestrian violations within the business district could be increased
  (perceived violations include sidewalk cycling, pedestrians illegally crossing, bike lights)
  - Capt. Ochoa from the Coronado Police Department gave a brief overview of enforcement efforts in the City and data availability
- Surreys (rented multi-person bikes) ride in residential areas and take up sidewalks
  - Bicycle Advisory Committee (BAC) has met with multiple vendors to discuss the issue without resolve
  - BAC also identified preferred routes, however, City is unable to provide a surrey-specific map
- Navy commuters and tourists/visitors were identified as major contributors to congestion and unsafe behaviors
  - Additional comment that many Navy personnel live too far to commute via alternative modes
  - Need a plan for the traffic coming into town, Navy personnel does not stick to a single street to reach the base, creating issues on multiple residential streets
- Need to focus efforts on enforcement and education
  - Need to educate people on the rules of the road, where to ride, and where to park a bike
  - Challenge with education is that it will not reach tourists/visitors
- The way different transportation modes are incentivized or discouraged dictates commutes, which is currently cars above all else
  - Ample free parking promotes more vehicles
  - Free bridge promotes more vehicles
  - Inadequacy of public transportation
- There is no easy route for kids to get around the city on bike and foot
- 10th Street is a scary street for kids

**SAC members identified the following as things Coronado has done right:**
- Free summer shuttle
  - Support to expand
- Silver Strand bike path – great to bike, walk, and jog on
  - Well utilized and well maintained
  - The path width, from the ferry landing to the beach at the tidelands makes it very useful
- Recent RSIP change to zoning that restricts garages
- Existing bike lanes in the village
  o Need marked lanes on the west side of the City
- Roundabout slows traffic well and benefits all modes, consider one at Tenth/Glorietta/Pomona
- Bulb-outs at Second and Orange
- The bike racks that accept U-locks are good, need more

**Community Workshop**
- SAC members favored the format with multiple stations
- Include an exercise where community visions/goals are collected and displayed to the group in real time
- Suggested station topics:
  o Project Overview and Progress to Date
  o Future Vision for Coronado Active Transportation
  o 3rd and 4th Streets
  o Safe Access to Schools
  o Safe Cross-town Bike/Ped Routes for all
  o Facility Preferences
  o Ocean Boulevard
  o How to increase community cycling and walking

**Additional comments:**
- General support for bicycle commuting, however, “weekend warrior” cyclists were viewed unfavorably due to high speeds
- The SAC members stated the need to identify a future vision for transportation in Coronado
  o Support for a bicycle friendly community
  o Staff response: the project will identify a vision for active transportation through the SAC meetings, interviews, online questionnaire, and public workshop
- Lockers, showers, and bike parking would help encourage bike parking
- A more frequent and free ferry would help reduce traffic crossing the bridge
- As the County grows, the number of people coming to and from Coronado will increase, need to have a plan how to accommodate future transportation demand
- Concern that the BAC does not address the village area and the bike path, bike path street crossings are a hazard.
  o Paint warnings on the bike path to emphasize upcoming crossings
- Need to have another opportunity for the public to weigh in on issues and make recommendations
  o Response: Public workshops, online questionnaire, and interviews are also available
- Vehicular traffic and cyclists on Glorietta at Fifth Street has increased and is an issue for residents along Glorietta
- Sidewalks should be wider to accommodate high pedestrian volumes
- Consider one of the project goals as encourage a culture that supports active transportation
- Ned to shift attitudes towards cyclists, pedestrians, skateboards, and golf carts – anything that reduces speed. An “Active Transportation Culture” will honor and give access to bikes and pedestrians. Make fostering this type of culture a goal.
Coronado Comprehensive Active Transportation Plan
Stakeholder Advisory Committee Meeting #3 Summary (1/19/17)

Attendees
Active Transportation Plan Stakeholder Advisory Committee
Wes Bomyea
Cauleen Glass
Bob Lindsay
Robin MacCartee
Morgan Miller
Phil Monroe
Dawn Ovrom
Howard Somers, MD
Michael Stellpflug
Steve Wampler
(Not present – Rita Alipour, Katherine Farley, Georgia Farrell, Susan Keith, Maria Simon, Eva Yakutis)

Consultant – Chen Ryan
Andrew Prescott

Subconsultant – Circulate San Diego
Brian Gaze

City of Coronado
Cliff Maurer, Director, Public Services and Engineering Department
Jesus Ochoa, Police Captain
Tom Ritter, Assistant City Manager
Allie Scrivener, Active Transportation Planner
Kevin Shank, Field Services Lieutenant
Ed Walton, City Engineer
Nancy Reynolds, Public Services & Engineering Administrative Secretary

Members of the Public
Doug Brandt
Eric Kasarjian

Overview
Today’s meeting centered around planning for the first public workshop. Brainstorming ideas included:

- Be inclusive of the entire community. Consider residents, tourists, and commuters – where do they want to go?
- One station should include a definition of Active Transportation – what it is and isn’t and why we should have an Active Transportation Plan (ATP). Make this into a handout that people can take home.
- Note the importance of an ATP in obtaining grants. Can save a community money.
- Are skateboards an Active Transportation mode?
- There should be a miscellaneous category for anything that’s not a road-legal vehicle.
Remember that wheelchair users have a choice to use a vehicle or not.

**Safe Routes to School Issues**
- Need a statement as to what a Safe Routes to School (SR2S) is.
- Is there education for the non-biker and non-walker? (E.g., as to why bike lanes are in certain places.)
- How to educate the rest of the community (not just parents and students).
- There’s a school-age population on NASNI that uses Alameda to get to schools. Would like to see that acknowledged on the SR2S map.
- Provide information about how many children walk to school.
- Should we include private schools?

**Additional Prompt Questions and Workshop Format Suggestions**
- Where do you think there should be additional crosswalks?
- Where are people crossing at unmarked crosswalks?
- Don’t use the word “jaywalk.” Say “where do you think people are crossing where it’s unsafe?”
- Ask people to provide input both as pedestrians and drivers.
- Where are there visibility problems?
- Can there be an interactive map on the on-line survey (touch screen)?
- Discourage writing on maps – too hard to read. Comment sheets are better.
- Have morning and afternoon bike and walking tours and make them different.
- Suggestion for bike tour: Go from the Community Center to the Landing via Glorietta and go back via Alameda.
Coronado Comprehensive Active Transportation Plan  
Stakeholders Advisory Committee Meeting #4 Summary (4/10/17)

Attendees
Stakeholder Advisory Committee
  Susan Keith  
  Wes Bomyea  
  Phil Monroe  
  Morgan Miller  
  Cauleen Glass  
  Steve Wampler  
  Eva Yakutis  

City of Coronado
  Allie Scrivener, Active Transportation Planner  
  Ed Walton, City Engineer  
  Nancy Reynolds, Administrative Secretary  
  Cliff Maurer, Director, Public Services and Engineering Department  
  Captain Jesus Ochoa, Police Department  
  Michael Donovan, City Council member

Community Members
  Dan Orr, Fern Nelson, Robin Hayemann, Liza Butler, Margaret Herr

Overview
At the fourth SAC meeting, City staff (Allie Scrivener) provided a brief introduction to the meeting by describing all project activity to date, providing an overview of the Public Workshop, comments, and outreach, and answering initial questions about activity to date. Ms. Scrivener then turned the presentation over to Chen Ryan (Brian Gaze) to provide an in-depth analysis of comments received, and to present initial project concepts for the Active Transportation Plan. The agenda included the following items:

1. Introduction
2. Review activity to date
3. Introduce community feedback
4. Review feedback overview (heat maps)
5. Review potential project concepts
6. SAC Action Item: Think about potential projects
7. Final thoughts/Parking Lot
8. Non-Stakeholder Comments
9. Adjourn
Comments

- Objection to “fake” east-west road between Tenth and Ocean on Chen-Ryan’s map.
- Phil Monroe wants PD reports on Strand bike collisions.
- Coronado residents have opposed bike lanes.
- A lot of people in town are anti-bike. SAC does not reflect the overall vision of the town.
- Active Transportation is not all human-powered – there are electric bikes and electric wheelchairs. Maybe call them non-vehicular.
- In the phrase “A safe and respectful walking and cycling environment that is supported by programs and infrastructure,” the word “respectful” may not be useful in a situation like this. It makes cars the “bad guy.” Maybe say instead “a safe and respectful environment that is supported by programs and infrastructure” (take out “walking and cycling”).
- Need bicycle enforcement.
- The state should adopt the Idaho law. Infrastructure is set up for cars – for example, cyclists don’t set off traffic signals. It takes too long to get through intersections if bikes have to stop at stop signs and signals.
- Areas with potential conflicts, such as higher roadway volumes, should get higher priority.
- School pick-up and drop-off is chaotic – too much like the airport. Can traffic patterns during pick-up and drop-off be changed? Have “No Parking” zones? Maybe look at how other schools control this with cones, volunteers, satellite drop-offs, crossing guards, kids’ safety patrol. [A school administrator in the audience noted that most districts in San Diego have eliminated student patrols because they’re not considered safe.]
- Use logos on the street to direct bikes to the beach in a safe way. It’s especially difficult to come up the Strand and cross Pomona and then Orange to get to the beach. It would be safer to direct bikes from Strand Way to Pomona to Glorietta to Ynez to Adella to Ocean.
- Frustration with bikes on Orange. D or C Avenues would be better for bikes.
- Signs in North County say “Bikes can take whole lane.” This is helpful. Bikes need the whole lane. Sharrows up and down Orange would be helpful and would help get bikes off the sidewalks.
- Cars have to stay 3 feet away from bikes; bikes should stay 3 feet away from cars.
- A meandering walkway could be installed in the medians. It works in Austin, Texas.
- Put a greenway down the center of the 1100 block of Isabella and add reverse diagonal parking. You could put a bike lane in front of the parked cars because cars would see the bikes when they’re pulling out. Put a bike corral at the north end of Isabella. Use this space in a safe, productive way.
Overview
The fifth Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SAC) meeting for the Coronado Active Transportation Master Plan (Plan) was held on Thursday, June 8, 2017 from 5:30pm to 7:30pm in the Winn Room of the Coronado Library. The SAC is comprised of 13 members, with 9 members present at the second meeting, including a substitute participant for one member. The meeting was also open to members of the public, with 10 additional community members recorded on the sign-in sheet.

The fifth meeting served to discuss the upcoming public workshop format and to present draft networks, conceptual improvements, and materials to be presented at the workshop. The agenda included the following items:

1. Introductions
2. Overview
3. Facilitated Discussion of Proposed Concepts
4. Next Steps / Parking Lot
5. Non-Stakeholder Comments
6. Adjourn

A summary of the comments are provided in the following pages, with action items identified by a “+” symbol.
Board 1 – Project Summary
- Question regarding the “walking and biking in Coronado by the numbers” information, how many of the 108 cities Coronado is compared to have two (2) state highways traversing the City?
  - Response was that is unknown at this time, however, the data source is available

Board 2 – Project Vision, Goals, and Objectives
+ Provide a definition of the “Complete Streets” policy
- Support for adult bicycling educational program (included under Education)
- Need to provide better guidance to those that rent bikes or are visitors in Coronado; a map that can be distributed to bike shops was suggested

Board 3 – Shared-Use Paths
- Question regarding ferry landing property/parking lot and jurisdiction
  - Suggestion to improve access through wayfinding for bikes
  - Many people ride through the parking lot
  - When heading from Navy base down 1st towards ferry landing, can’t turn @ Orange
- There should be a multi-use path along Ocean Boulevard

Board 4 – Bicycle Lanes
+ Revise conceptual graphic to display dashed bike lane approaching intersection
- Consider bike lanes along Country Club instead of Alameda
  - Public can provide this comment during the workshop

Board 5 & 6 – Neighborhood Greenways
- Why was I selected, not H?
  - Intersections at 3rd and 4th
- Concern with the C Street Greenway crossing at 3rd and 4th

Board 7 – Bicycle Routes
- No reason we can’t paint sharrows on Orange Avenue
+ Bike route should go from Isabella up E Avenue to 10th Street
- Want to see Class III on Coronado Avenue
  - Additional group discussions built consensus against this idea

Board 8 – Places for Residents Who Bike
No comment

Board 9 – Suggested Routes to School
- Students at Strand Elementary go through the park to access the school
- Pedestrian and bike activated signals should be placed where crossing guards are

Board 10 – Places for Residents Who Walk
+ Include 3rd and 4th Street Study recommendations
+ Include Neighborhood Greenways
- Include crosswalks at 3rd and 4th at Alameda
- Leave 3rd and 4th Streets alone
- In-road flashing lights should be placed across Orange at 9th
Board 11 – Pedestrian Improvement Sample – Ocean Blvd
- Concept graphic focuses more on crosswalk than median
- Isabella is a very wide street with a lot of opportunity
- Isabella residents should be notified of proposed improvements

Board 12 – Design Toolkit
No comment
Coronado Active Transportation Master Plan
Stakeholder Advisory Committee Meeting #6 Summary (8/14/17)

Attendees
Stakeholder Advisory Committee
Susan Keith
Bob Lindsay
Morgan Miller
Phil Monroe
Cauleen Glass
Eva Yakutis

City of Coronado
Allie Scrivener, Active Transportation Planner
Cliff Maurer, Director of Public Services & Engineering
Ed Walton, City Engineer
Captain Jesus Ochoa, Police Department

Consultants
Brian Gaze, Chen Ryan Associates
Andrew Prescott, Chen Ryan Associates

Overview
The sixth Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SAC) meeting for the Coronado Active Transportation Master Plan (Plan) was held on Monday, August 14, 2017 from 5:30pm to 7:30pm in the Nautilus Room of the Coronado Community Center. The SAC is comprised of 13 members, with 6 members present at the sixth meeting. The meeting was also open to members of the public, with 23 additional community members recorded on the sign-in sheet.

The sixth meeting served to discuss the input heard at the second public workshop, revised recommendations, and to provide an outline of the environmental documentation process. The agenda included the following items:

1. Review Public Workshop #2 Comments
2. Updates to network Recommendations
3. Environmental
4. Programmatic Recommendations
5. Non-Stakeholder Comments
6. Adjourn

A summary of the presentation content and feedback heard from SAC members and the public is provided in the following pages.

Review Public Workshop #2 Comments
A brief summary of the second public workshop was provided, identifying the topics presented at the workshop, estimated number of attendees and number of public comment forms received. All public workshop comments received are posted in their entirety on the project webpage, enabling community
members to review at their leisure. Comments were reviewed and grouped to identify the most common themes among the comments. The top occurring themes recorded on comment cards, along with the number of occurrences the general topic was identified are listed below:

- Don’t add bicycle infrastructure to Orange (26)
- In favor of the Isabella landscaped median (18)
- Support neighborhood greenways (15)
- No new bike lanes (14)
- No neighborhood greenways (11)
- We need better enforcement (11)

Public comments heard related to the review of public workshop comments:

- Question regarding the number of comment cards received (80) compared to the number of estimated attendees (115).
- Were all people leaving comments Coronado residents?
- Can we identify whether people leaving comments were cyclists or not?
- Was the June 19th workshop recorded?
- Multiple attendees stated support for a Town Hall format presentation.

**Updates to Network Recommendations**

The following changes were made to the proposed network previously presented at SAC meeting #5 and the second public workshop based on the public input received:

- Class I multi-use path along Glorietta Boulevard, replacing the existing Class II Buffered Bicycle lanes.
- Median (painted or landscaped) along Isabella Avenue at Ocean Boulevard.
- No bicycle facilities recommended on Orange Avenue.
- Inclusion of the planned SR-75 grade separated crossing east of Glorietta Boulevard.

Public comments heard related to the revised network discussion:

- It would make sense to have a crosswalk at intersection of Isabella and Ocean.
- What exactly will be done to Isabella?
- Is there an official measurement of city streets?
- Why are bike lanes proposed on Pomona Avenue instead of San Luis Rey Avenue?
- Will bike routes include sharrow or just signs?
- Concern with bike route conflicts with angled parking along D Avenue.
- Will each bike facility include its own signage?

**Environmental Documentation**

A brief presentation identified the purpose of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), including four key aspects:

1. Inform government decision makers and the public about the potential significant environmental impacts of proposed activities.
2. Identify ways that environmental impact(s) can be avoided or significantly reduced.
3. Prevent significant avoidable damage to the environment by requiring changes in the project through the use of alternatives and mitigation.
4. Disclose to the public the reason that an agency approved a project notwithstanding its environmental impacts.

The presentation also covered the public participation process as well as the definition of a “project” as it applies to CEQA. “Significant Effect on the Environment” was also defined, and the 18 issues covered under CEQA were identified. The four possible environmental documentation conclusions were listed. Finally, the environmental scope of work, as it pertains to the Coronado Active Transportation Master Plan, was discussed. The scope of work currently includes preparation of a Negative Declaration, signifying the project would not have any impacts, or that any identified impacts would be less than significant.

Public comments heard during the revised environmental documentation discussion:

- Does safety get evaluated?
- Will comments be responded to from previous stages?
- Will there be additional opportunities to provide comments?
- What is the ATP trying to achieve?

Programmatic Recommendations

Four programmatic recommendations were presented, 1) Safe Routes to School, 2) Adult Bicycle Education, 3) Safe Behaviors Campaign, and 4) Active Transportation Monitoring. Each proposed program included the identification of the activity goal, targeted audience, estimated time commitment and cost, as well as potential partner organizations.

The Safe Routes to School program is comprised of a variety of strategies related to education, encouragement, and enforcement.

**Education Strategies**

- Walk this Way – An Educational presentation to teach basic pedestrian safety skills to students.
- Bike Rodeo – Educational course to teach students safe bike riding skills and the rules of the road.
- Parent Champion Program – Educate volunteers to provide Safe Routes to School support at trainings and activities
- Advocacy Training Program – Educational program to teach volunteers, school staff and students how to influence leaders and impact policy.

**Encouragement Activities**

- Walk and Bike to School Day – Promote walking and biking to school, celebrate active transportation as a preferred mode of travel for the school commute.
- Promotional Competitions and Incentives – Increase walking and biking to school through competitions to give students a sense of ownership.
- Walking School Bus & Bike Trail – Establish regular walking and biking routes led by parent volunteers as a way to promote walking and biking for the school commute.
**Enforcement Activities**

- School Safety Messaging Campaign – Utilize posters, signage, and video announcements to reinforce legal and respectful driving, bicycling, and walking behaviors.

The proposed *Adult Bicycle Education* program would target adults and seniors with varying levels of bicycle riding experience. Courses may include entry level learn to ride instruction, or be focused on intermediate riders. The overarching goal would be to improve bicycle skills and knowledge of safe behaviors, in courses led by League of American Bicyclist Certified Instructors (LCI).

A *Safe Behaviors Campaign* would be used to encourage safe driving, bicycling and walking behaviors through use of mobile changeable message signs. The signs would be sited at strategic locations to raise awareness of safety issues.

*Active Transportation Monitoring* is proposed as a program to better understand bicycle and pedestrian travel patterns and responses to investments. The program description included an outline of the various methods and technologies that can be used to count pedestrians and cyclists, as well as a brief description of the existing San Diego Regional Bike and Pedestrian Counter Network.

Public comments heard related to proposed programs:

- Is there a way to provide rental companies with information?
- What can we do to stop people on bikes from not stopping at stop signs?
- Encourage positive reinforcement, it can be a spirit of cooperation between bike shops and visitors.
- How do we measure whether programs/infrastructure are effective?
- Would like to see additional measures to encourage more active transportation.

Additional general comments not specific to the content presented:

- As a cyclist, I would use San Luis Rey as opposed to Pomona.
- Pomona/6th intersection is one of the most dangerous in the city.
- Would like the next workshop to incorporate smart phones and differentiate between bike riders and non-bike riders.
- Concern regarding the cost of infrastructure and how it will be funded.
- Objection to designating Isabella/E Street as a bike route.
- A count of people supportive of a bike lane along 10th Street was requested.
- Request that future workshop advertisement include the proposed network.
- Request for small group sessions followed by joint discussion at next public workshop.
- Request to include bicycle parking in the plan, specifically along Ocean Boulevard at the end of G, Central Beach, and at the Isabella/Ocean Boulevard intersection.

Comment cards submitted:

- I have no idea what is planned for Isabella Avenue. The meetings should be recorded so all people can watch in case they can’t make the meeting (only 3).
- I am a long-time resident of Coronado and have a house on Ocean that also abuts Isabella. It is not clear what is proposed, what is the goal. We are concerned. This plan does not have wide distribution of input from the community.
1) why are you discussing a plan when you haven’t collected baseline data? 2) This was a disjointed public meeting – why include the public when stakeholders haven’t been briefed? 3) Need to have a well-planned, organized public workshop that presents what is being proposed so public has a context.

I live on Isabella Ave and myself and neighbors are very interested in what specifically is proposed for that street. What is the “Isabella landscaped median”? I attended tonight’s meeting to find out since it seems it’s the only thing the rest of Coronado (or 15 people) said they wanted. Disappointed that no discussion of exactly what that looks like was shown tonight.

As a resident of Coronado that abuts both Isabella and Ocean, I have serious concerns about a landscaped median as well as bike lanes on both Isabella and Ocean.
Coronado Active Transportation Master Plan  
Stakeholder Advisory Committee Meeting #7 Summary (11/14/17)

Attendees
Active Transportation Plan Stakeholder Advisory Committee
   Cauleen Glass
   Howard Somers
   Morgan Miller
   Phil Monroe
   Robert Lindsay
   Robin MacCartee
   Susan Keith
   Wes Bomyea

City of Coronado
   Allie Scrivener, Active Transportation Planner
   Cliff Maurer, Director, Public Services and Engineering Department
   Captain Jesus Ochoa, Police Department
   Ed Walton, City Engineer
   Michael Donovan, City Council member
   Bill Sandke, City Council member
   Janine Zúñiga, Senior Management Analyst

Consultant
   Brian Gaze, Chen Ryan Associates
   Katja Dillmann, Chen Ryan Associates

The Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SAC) was asked to review a draft of the Goal, Objectives and Policies, as well as the Programs and Projects Matrix and a discussion draft of the Online Questionnaire.

- Goal, Objectives and Policies
  The project team explained that the Goal, Objectives and Policies section is an element required by law. Under the law, one of the stated purposes of this section is it serves to provide internal consistency.

  There was a discussion regarding what is required by law and why. The project team explained that a plan requires a land use map, collision analysis, and transit connections.

  Cauleen commented that the introduction to the plan needs to explain the legal requirements, as well as explain the complete streets concept.
There was a brief discussion surrounding (draft) Policy 1.1.b “goal of zero traffic deaths” and whether or not that was realistic. The project team explained that it had been adopted by several jurisdictions and is now a ‘best practice’ standard.

Phil pointed out that the City of San Diego tied its bike plan to its Climate Action Plan (CAP) and voiced his opinion that the committee has not actually made cycling easier for people on Coronado. He stated that the SAC wasn’t doing its job.

In response the project team asked if the ATP should include specific targets. Robert commented that under the current draft Goal, Objectives and Policies how does one know if one is successful? It’s hard to tell if a goal is too soft or setting one up for failure.

There was a discussion regarding setting benchmarks and mode share targets in the CAP. And that the Evaluation section, one of the five E’s included in the Goal, Objective and Policies document, is one way to measure success.

Robert stated that in order to evaluate something, the measurement needs to be tied to some sort of a metric. And stated that he feels the reason the last plan failed was there were no targets.

This opened up a larger discussion with multiple SAC members. One member agreed to the reasons regarding the failure of the last plan and a desire to craft an ATP that has a chance of passing council. Another member pointed out that Pomona has sharrows and there’s still conflict and another member stated he too would like a bolder plan. And yet another member voiced the desire for a bolder vision/action regarding the solutions. There was a comment that the most vexing issues were not being addressed. A comment was made about the amount of money the City of San Diego has invested in putting 210 miles of bike lanes, whereas currently the SAC is simply talking about wanting more bike lanes.

It was reiterated that the desire was to draft a passable plan. With a comment that the current draft makes a good start. And a responsive comment that this was merely a start, and not going far enough.

Cliff Maurer chimed in from the audience stating that the SAC was empaneled to represent a diverse set of views and that they need to find common ground and respect everyone’s views.

Susan Keith stated that there needs to be a public meeting where the public can stand up and speak directly to the SAC in a conversation format. She stated that the type of public comment and involvement she was speaking about was not about putting a comment on a board or a comment on a computer. She also stated that the people she knows in town are tired of seeing cyclists break the law and do not want to give them more privileges or space.
Allie stated that there is an open house/town hall set for January where people will have an opportunity to look at exhibits and there will be a podium for people to speak.

Following this there was a discussion as to whether this is the proper time in the process and whether this is the correct format. There were comments as well as time of day to host such an event. And the challenges of capturing input and creating forums/formats that allow for involvement by different people. As part of this, the online questionnaire was discussed and when that should be made available to the public.

The SAC agreed that it would be best to postpone posting the online questionnaire until January, to allow people to get through the holidays.

This was followed by a brief discussion regarding the mechanics of taking on online survey – how does the survey register IP addresses, are there protections against one person using multiple devices to take the survey multiple times, etc.

This lead to a conversation regarding the substances of the draft online questionnaire: the types of questions, the order of the questions, etc.

A member of the public asked why the questionnaire wasn’t a scientific survey and why the first question couldn’t be a general question about perceived bike safety problem. They also asked a question regarding the duplicative efforts of the port.

Allie responded that Council is looking at a scientific survey, but for the scope of this particular project it would be cost prohibitive.

Another member of the public asked why there’s not more emphasis on pedestrians.

Another member of the public shared that the port had removed the possible bike path by the golf course out of their plan.

Wes floated the possibility of having the first survey question address the issue of ‘is there a need?’ This was followed by multiple SAC members discussing the online questionnaire.

The discussion covered possible wording for the first question and general questions versus specific detail.

Cauleen raised that employers were missing from the conversation. Wes shared the military’s perspective, including rules for active duty members on bicycles, families on base getting to other parts of the island, challenges of ferry landing on bike and bike share issues.
Next the SAC focused on the Programs and Projects matrix. This discussion covered the cost of the various options of the programs and possible alternatives, such as training kids to count bikes versus bike counters. There was also a discussion about the enforcement programs, and how this dovetails with education.

The conversation came back to the ferry landing and whether it would worth the SAC’s time to come up with a preferred route for the ferry landing area. This included the idea of uniform wayfinding signs. And this lead to a discussion about the challenges at Cays.

The SAC then ended with a reminder that the meeting materials will be sent out with a request for comments on the materials.