



Mike Calandra
Chair

Ed Krulikowski
Vice Chair

Tony Ortega
Commissioner

Greg Paden
Commissioner

Dinah Justice
Commissioner

Richard Leja
Director of Public Works/City
Engineer

Jeff Manchester
Engineering Project Manager

Noemi Becerra
Administrative Coordinator

City of La Mesa
8130 Allison Avenue
La Mesa, California 91942
Tel: 619.463.6611
Fax: 619.667.1131
www.cityoflamesa.com

LA MESA TRAFFIC COMMISSION

AGENDA

A Regular Meeting

Wednesday, June 6, 2018

9:00 a.m.

City Council Chambers

The purpose of a Traffic Commission meeting is to accomplish the public's business as productively, efficiently and professionally as possible.

PLEASE NOTE: Materials related to an item on this agenda submitted to the La Mesa Traffic Commission after distribution of the agenda packet are available for public inspection at the City Clerk's Office located in La Mesa City Hall, 8130 Allison Avenue during normal business hours.

Citizens who wish to make an audio/visual presentation pertaining to an item on the agenda, or during Public Comments, should contact Noemi Becerra at 619.667.1143, no later than 12:00 noon, one business day prior to the start of the meeting. Advance notification will ensure compatibility with City equipment and allow Council meeting presentations to progress smoothly and in a consistent and equitable manner. Please note that all presentations/digital materials are considered part of the maximum time limit provided to speakers.

Individuals with disabilities who require reasonable accommodation in order to participate in City of La Mesa services, activities, programs and/or attendance at City Council meetings, Commission meetings, or any Public Hearings should contact the City's Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Coordinator, Rida Freeman, Human Resources Manager, 48 hours prior to the meeting at 619.667.1175, fax 619.667.1163, or freeman@ci.la-mesa.ca.us.

Hearing assisted devices are available for the hearing impaired. A City staff member is available to provide these devices upon entry to City Council meetings, commission meetings or public hearings held in the City Council Chambers. A photo I.D. or signature will be required to secure a device for the meeting.

AGENDA

June 6, 2018

9:00 A.M.

CALL MEETING TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

INVOCATION – COMMISSIONER ORTEGA

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

ADDITIONS AND/OR DELETIONS TO THE AGENDA

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS

1. TRAFFIC ACTION ITEMS SINCE PREVIOUS TRAFFIC COMMISSION MEETING (ATTACHMENT)
2. TRAFFIC CALMING UPDATE (ATTACHMENT)

PUBLIC COMMENTS – (TOTAL TIME – 15 MINUTES)

NOTE: In accordance with state law, an item not scheduled on the agenda may be brought forward by the general public for discussion; however, the Traffic Commission will not be able to take any action at this meeting. If appropriate, the item will be referred to Staff or placed on a future agenda.

OLD BUSINESS

NEW BUSINESS (ACTION)

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM MAY 2, 2018 TRAFFIC COMMISSION MEETING (ATTACHMENT)
4. REQUEST FOR ACCESSIBLE PARKING SPACE AT 7842 MOHAWK STREET.
5. REQUEST FOR ACCESSIBLE PARKING SPACE ACROSS FROM 4444 BEVERLY DRIVE
6. RED CURB POLICY DISCUSSION (ATTACHMENT)

COMMISSION INITIATED ITEMS

STAFF COMMENTS

FUTURE ITEMS – (FOR INFORMATION ONLY)

THE VISION SAFETY PARKING ZONE POLICY

THE NEIGHBORHOOD PARKING PERMIT POLICY

PROVIDE TRAFFIC CALMING DESIGN FOR HOWELL DRIVE

ADJOURNMENT

NEXT REGULARLY SCHEDULED MEETING IS JULY 11, 2018

Traffic Work Order Log 2018

Approved or completed since last Traffic Commission Meeting, May 2, 2018

Project Action/Description	Location	Status
Striping Modifications at Lemon Avenue and Bancroft Drive	Intersection of Lemon Avenue and Bancroft Drive - Westbound Traffic @ Lemon Ave	Work Order Completed, Awaiting Approval
Request to add mid-block crosswalk on Sacramento Drive	Sacramento Drive between Eastridge Drive and Hartford Court (by Existing Mailboxes)	Evaluating warrant for new midblock pedestrian crossing

Traffic Calming Status: Update 05-31-18

Street	Status	Neighborhood Meeting Date	Conceptual Design Date	Final Design Date	Neighborhood Design Notification and
Howell Drive	Phase II Design	City to re-issue letters to all residents and schedule meeting to discuss alternatives	6/15/2018	Week of June 29	Week of June 18
Guava Ave	Phase II Design	TBD - No contact with Point of Contact through calls; Letter to Point of Contact mailed 4/16, no response	TBD	TBD	TBD
Stanford Ave	Phase II Design	4/3/2018; On hold per City staff	TBD	Week of June 18	Week of June 25
Glen Street	Phase I Design and Implementation	TBD	TBD	Week of July 2	
Violet Street	Phase I Design and Implementation	TBD	TBD	Week of July 2	
Cresthaven Drive	Phase I Design and Implementation	TBD	TBD	Week of July 2	
Harbinson Ave	Preparing for studies				
Lois Street	Preparing for studies				
Lemon Avenue	Preparing for studies				

Minutes of a Regular Meeting of the La Mesa Traffic Commission
Wednesday, May 2, 2018 at 9:00 a.m.
City Council Chambers, 8130 Allison Avenue, La Mesa, California

The Agenda for this meeting was posted on April 27, 2018.

The meeting was called to order at 9:06 a.m.

ROLL CALL: TRAFFIC COMMISSION

PRESENT: Chair Calandra; Vice Chair Krulikowski; Commissioners Ortega, Paden, Justice.

ABSENT: None

STAFF: Director of Public Works/City Engineer Richard Leja; Engineering Project Manager Jeffrey Manchester; Associate Engineer Michael Kinnard; Police Traffic Sergeant Hildebrand; Administrative Coordinator Noemi Becerra; Administrative Assistant Daniela Rodriguez

INVOCATION – Vice Chair Krulikowski

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

ADDITIONS AND/OR DELETIONS TO THE AGENDA

None

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS

1. TRAFFIC ACTION ITEMS SINCE PREVIOUS TRAFFIC COMMISSION MEETING

Mr. Manchester reported on the four items on the Traffic Work Order Log that were approved or completed since the April 4, 2018 Traffic Commission meeting. (See agenda attachment – Traffic Work Order Log 2018)

2. TRAFFIC CALMING UPDATE

Mr. Manchester gave an update on the status of the traffic calming as of May 02, 2018. (See agenda attachment – Traffic Calming Status: Update 05-02-18) Mr. Manchester reported the next meeting with residents of Howell Drive would be to determine the final traffic calming design. Director Leja reported that there is a lack of response from residents of Howell Drive and Guava Ave. He stated the community meetings are held in the affected areas and the purpose is to get

consensus on which traffic calming measures should be pursued. He also stated that when there is a lack of community interest the effected street would be moved to the bottom of the list. Vice Chair Krulikowski suggested a member of the commission should attend upcoming community meetings.

3. LIST OF STREETS TO RECEIVE SB1 FUNDING

Director Leja reported on the list of streets approved by Council on April 24, 2018 to receive funding from the Road Maintenance and Rehabilitation Account created by Senate Bill 1 (SB1) funding. He explained the Public Works Department is making a dedicated effort toward implementing the City's Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan when resurfacing streets.

Commissioner Justice asked how much of Spring Street will the San Diego County Water Authority resurface once they have completed construction. Director Leja explained the San Diego County Water Authority has committed to resurfacing their effected areas of Spring Street from Lemon Avenue to High Street.

4. VISION SAFETY PARKING ZONE SUBCOMMITTEE UPDATE

Director Leja reported that the subcommittee will bring the red curb policy to the Commission prior to bringing the vision safety parking zone policy. With the purpose of that when the discussion of vision safety zones occurs, the Commission will have an understanding of how sight, distance and safety overlap in relation to red curbs.

PUBLIC COMMENTS – (TOTAL TIME – 15 MINUTES)

Dorcas Hermsmeier, 4827 Beaumont Drive

Ms. Hermsmeier made a public request that a discussion of speed humps be placed on a future Traffic Commission agenda. Ms. Hermsmeier stated that La Mesa's 50 percent approval requirement for speed humps and speed tables is too low. She would like the residential approval percentage increased to 75 percent for speed humps and speed tables to be installed.

OLD BUSINESS

None

NEW BUSINESS (ACTION)

5. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM APRIL 4, 2018 TRAFFIC COMMISSION MEETING

ACTION: Vice Chair Krulikowski moved to approve the minutes. Commissioner Ortega seconded the motion which carried 5-0.

AYES: Chair Calandra, Vice Chair Krulikowski, Commissioners Ortega, Paden, Justice

NOES: None

ABSTAINED: None

ABSENT: None

6. REQUEST TO EXEMPT SCHOOL BUSES FROM THE TIME RESTRICTION FOR RIGHT-HAND TURNING MOVEMENTS FROM HIGH STREET TO SACRAMENTO DRIVE (CONTINUED FROM MARCH 7, 2018 MEETING) (Attachment – Item 6)

Mr. Leja explained the item was continued from the March 7, 2018 meeting so that City staff could provide additional record information requested by the Commission.

Mr. Manchester presented a map showing the latest round of noticing that went out to residents, traffic counts for Sacramento Drive conducted on April 11, 2018 and a Traffic Collision History Report showing 3 incidents since January 1, 2008.

Mr. Bryant Jackson from the Grossmont Union High School District reported bus activity on Sacramento Drive. He noted buses from his district used Sacramento Drive for home to school transportation of a special education student and for extracurricular activities. Mr. Jackson emphasized he is obligated by federal and state regulations to transport students taking the most direct route possible. He noted that if busses are exempt it would not alleviate the traffic problems on Sacramento Drive. Mr. Jackson presented data showing the number of times his busses traveled on Sacramento Drive and the duration of the trips (See attachment).

Vice Chair Krulikowski asked if the primary reason for the request to exempt school busses is to pick up the special education students or to use the route for other busses. Mr. Jackson responded that the request for exemption was to provide the disabled students with the shortest ride time possible.

Mr. Jackson explained there are three levels of service provided to special education students and that the type of service is determined by the student's Individual Education Plan (IEP). The three types of pick-up service are; curbside, arterial, neighborhood stops. Commissioner Ortega asked how the no right turn impediment affects the overall bus schedule. Mr. Jackson responded that it results in the special education students being on the bus for a longer period of time. He noted many of his students ride with nurses, have oxygen, some have do not resuscitate orders and they should not be on a bus any longer than they have to be.

Director Leja reported on the original traffic study for the Serramar development conducted in 1984. A discussion followed and the consensus was that the study was adequate in 1984 but not adequate by present day standards.

The following is a summary of the public discussion heard by the Commission on this Item:

1. S. Skinner 7421 Orion Ave, La Mesa

Mr. Skinner is in favor approving the waiver for school busses. He is also in favor of removing the signs completely. He said his and other streets are much more impacted by school traffic and would like to know why Sacramento Drive receives so much attention from the Commission. He suggested the goal of the Commission should be to calm all traffic instead of just focusing on one street.

2. Ed Kirkpatrick – 3915 Sacramento Drive, La Mesa

Mr. Kirkpatrick is opposed to the action. He stated the exemption would lead to others also asking for exemptions.

3. Frank Baggett – 3980 Sacramento Drive, La Mesa

Mr. Baggett is opposed to the action. He urged the Commission not to approve the exemption due diminished home values and quality of life due to the traffic and speeding on Sacramento Drive.

4. Tim Morrow – 3970 Sacramento Drive, La Mesa

Mr. Morrow is opposed to the action due to the volume of school traffic. He presented 29 petitions from his neighbors all of which are also opposed to the action. He feels the exemption would lead to others also asking for exemptions.

5. Sean Russall – 3895 Sacramento Drive , La Mesa

Mr. Russall is opposed to the action. He stated the exemption would lead others to also ask for exemptions. He suggested the street should be blocked off and that granting the exemption would not solve the larger problem of high traffic volumes.

6. Claudette L. Reynolds – 7560 Eastridge Drive, La Mesa

Ms. Reynolds stated that the Commission should consider that there are 39 new homes being built on La Mesa Summit which will further increase the amount of traffic in the area.

7. Tysen BrodWolf – La Mesa Spring Valley School District - Transportation Department

Ms. BrodWolf clarified that general education school busses often times transport students with disabilities. She stated she is in favor of exempting all school busses.

The commission discussed the options available to them are removing the restrictions completely for all traffic, leaving the restrictions as is and rejecting the request from the school district, exempting busses from the restrictions, exempting disabled persons from the

turn restrictions, exempting busses while in the active transportation of disabled persons, and gathering additional information.

Traffic Sergeant Hildebrand reported that since January of 2016 close to 1,000 citations have been issued on Sacramento Drive. He stated the citations trend towards school traffic and people who were aware the signs are present. He stated he receives a high number of calls from residents on Sacramento Drive to enforce traffic laws in the area.

ACTION: Vice Chair Krulikowski moved to exempt busses while in the active transportation of disabled persons from the time restriction for right-hand turning movements from High Street to Sacramento Drive. Commissioner Ortega seconded the motion which carried 4-1.

AYES: Vice Chair Krulikowski, Commissioners Ortega, Paden, Justice

NOES: Chair Calandra

ABSTAINED: None

ABSENT: None

7. RESHEDULING THE JULY 4, 2018 MEETING DUE TO HOLIDAY CONFLICT

Director Leja explained that due to schedule conflicts the July 4, 2018 meeting should be moved to July 11, 2018 or the meeting cancelled.

ACTION: Chair Calandra moved to reschedule the July 4, 2018 to July 11, 2018. Commissioner Ortega seconded the motion which carried 5-0.

AYES: Chair Calandra, Vice Chair Krulikowski, Commissioners Ortega, Paden, Justice

NOES: None

ABSTAINED: None

ABSENT: None

COMMISSION INITIATED ITEMS

A discussion followed regarding the Commission's concerns related to schools and traffic calming on Sacramento Drive. The Commission discussed that schools are overseen by the Division of the State Architect and the City has a limited role in approving any decisions that are made as it relates to traffic impacts on the community.

STAFF COMMENTS

Director Leja stated City staff is in the process of updating the traffic study flow chart and requirements, streamlining them to address the most impacted areas first and best utilizing City resources. Director Leja commented on the future items and the order in which they would be presented to the Commission.

FUTURE ITEMS – (FOR INFORMATION ONLY)

PROVIDE TRAFFIC CALMING DESIGN FOR HOWELL DRIVE

RED CURB POLICY

REQUEST FOR ACCESSIBLE PARKING SPACES AT 4444 BEVERLY DRIVE AND
7842 MOHAWK STREET

THE VISION SAFETY PARKING ZONE POLICY

THE NEIGHBORHOOD PARKING PERMIT POLICY

ADJOURNMENT

NEXT REGULARLY SCHEDULED MEETING IS June 6, 2018

There being no further business before the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 11:17 a.m.



STREET PARKING SAFETY SIGNAGE & MARKINGS POLICY

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT / ENGINEERING DIVISION
8130 Allison Avenue, La Mesa, CA 91942

REVISION DATE: May 31, 2018

SUBJECT: Policy for the Evaluation and Implementation of Safety Related Street Parking Restrictions

PURPOSE:

The purpose of the policy is to:

- Provide guidelines for the evaluation and implementation of Safety Related Public Parking Restrictions within the public right of way.
- Protect public health and safety by providing parking prohibitions in areas where parked vehicles could affect the drivers, bicyclists, and pedestrians.
- Maximize the availability of public parking for the use of residents and businesses.
- Minimize the maintenance costs for traffic control devices.
- Comply with with the applicable portions of the California Vehicle Code and La Mesa Municipal Code.

BACKGROUND:

Public parking is typically a component of most streets within the City, particularly within lower volume residential street classifications. Due to the topography and other site conditions, the limits of parking areas can sometimes conflict with the safe use of the public roadways by drivers, bicyclists, and pedestrians. The La Mesa Municipal Code (Section 12.16.010, 12.40.030, 12.40.110, and 12.48.020) authorizes the City Engineer the power and duty to place and maintain official traffic control devices or curb markings where the parking or stopping of a vehicle would constitute a traffic hazard or that would endanger life or property. Members of the public frequently request changes to the existing parking restrictions, some of which can be classified as safety related requests.

SCOPE:

This policy shall apply to all safety related parking restrictions to the maximum extent practicable. This policy does not include parking restrictions on private property, those designated by the City Council for general needs (Section 12.50.040.d), Permit Parking preferential parking reasons (Chapter 12.42), or other reasons not related to safety of the travelling public.

DEFINITIONS:

- Curb: A raised concrete structure on a public street that defines the edge of the vehicular travelled way.
- On-Street Parking: Parking on a public street.
- Street Classification: Type of Street Identified in the La Mesa General Plan
- Travelled Way: The portion of the street used for traffic lanes or bikelanes.

PRACTICES:

PARKING SAFETY ZONE (SIGNAGE & MARKING) TYPES

The City of La Mesa identifies four general types of safety parking restrictions. These are: (1) no-parking zones (Red Zones), (2) loading zones (Yellow Zones), (3) short time-limited parking zones (White Zones), and (4) disabled-parking zones for the physically challenged (Blue Zones), which have been established in Section 12.48.020 ("Curb Markings for Zones") of the La Mesa Municipal Code. Although these are typically implemented as curb markings (painting of a public curb or berm), these may be established by: (1) placement of signs only, (2) by curb markings only – without signs, (3) markings on the pavement where no curb exists, or (4) by a combination of signs and curb/pavement markings, depending on the site conditions and criticality of

the need. The definitions of each type are discussed below, along with the locations where such markings and signage are appropriate.

No-Parking (Red Zones)

Red Zones are no-parking zones, where parking is not allowed at any time. Red means no stopping, standing or parking at any time, except that a bus may stop in a red zone marked or signed as a bus zone. In some cases, no-parking signage may also be installed and enforced. No-parking zones can be installed in any area of the City where the presence of parked cars at the curb creates an unsafe situation for vehicular, bicycle, or pedestrian traffic or reduces operational efficiency at a particular location to unacceptable levels. Thus, when it is warranted by an engineering review, red curbing can be installed on corners of the intersections of public roads to maintain safe and efficient vehicular maneuverability (or sight distance), or on certain segments of streets where narrow street widths cause vehicular operations to degrade to unacceptable conditions. The red curb installations discussed above are considered critical Red Zones, where parking restrictions are necessary to maintain safe roadway and traffic conditions as determined by the City Engineer. Red Zones could also include areas in front of fire hydrants, curb ramps, crosswalks, United States Post Office mailboxes, appropriately signed public transit bus stops, or similar safety situations. However, since these locations are already regulated by other codes and regulations, these will only be marked (signage or painting) as Red Zones if significant and regular violations or safety risks are identified. Red Zones that are determined to be non-critical by the City Engineer must be reviewed by the Traffic Commission and approved by the City Council prior to implementation. Once approved, these are listed separately in the municipal code on a street by street basis.

Private Driveways

Private driveways do not fall within the same design guidelines as public roadway intersections. Due to the significant impact to public parking and impracticality, Red Zones for sight distance from private driveways are not allowed, except for those serving multiple properties having very high exiting traffic volumes and poor site distance conditions. These exceptions are defined as private driveways (or private roadways) that serve more than 10 residential units or single driveways that serve commercial/office/retail properties with a peak hour exiting traffic of at least 40 vehicles (or equivalent usage) and a deficient sight distance condition as determined by the City Engineer. Under these exceptions, short sections of Red Zones (maximum of 15 feet long) can be installed on either side of a driveway to promote better maneuverability into and out of the driveway and to improve visibility from the driveway.

Loading (Yellow Zones)

Loading zones are special parking zones that allow for temporary parking for the sole purpose of loading and unloading freight and/or passengers. Loading zones may be established where the City Engineer has determined that the lack of a loading zone would create a safety hazard for the travelling public and no practical alternative exists. These are typically placed near the entrance to a business with a high loading demand or in front of a place used for the purpose of public assembly. A Yellow Zone loading activities are limited to 20 minutes for freight and 3 minutes for passengers.

Passenger Zones (White Zones)

White Zones designate areas where only passenger loading activities are permitted. Passenger zones may be established where the City Engineer has determined that the lack of a loading zone would create a safety hazard for the travelling public and no practical alternative exists. Passenger loading zones typically are found in commercial areas, near schools, senior care facilities, senior housing, hospitals, restaurants, hotels, apartment buildings, theaters, churches, and other large places of assembly. A white zone indicates an area that has been designated solely for passenger loading activities that are limited to 3 minutes between seven a.m. and six p.m. of any day (except Sunday and Holidays) and apply as follows:

1. When such zone is in front of a hotel, the restrictions shall apply at all times.
2. When such zone is in front of a theater, the restrictions shall apply at all times except when the theater is closed.
3. When such zone is in front of a school, the restrictions may be modified to apply to drop-off and pick-up times only, as determined necessary by Public Works staff and school officials.

Time Limited Parking (Green Zones)*

Time-limited or short term parking zones are areas where the length of time that a vehicle can remain parked in

a particular space is limited to a specified duration. Time-restricted parking zones typically are installed in commercial areas. Green Zones can be installed where unrestricted curb space in front of a particular business is used for long-term parking during the majority of the day, such that short-term parking is not available for customers of the businesses in the area. Appropriately marked Green Zones will have the parking time limit painted on the curb to supplement the parking signage. Please refer to the GUIDELINES FOR INSTALLATION/REMOVAL OF 2 – HOUR PARKING ZONES (latest version) for additional information about Green Zones.

**Green Zones are not safety related and therefore are the purview of the Traffic Commission and City Council. However, the City Engineer will provide the Traffic Commission with supporting information for their evaluation.*

Handicapped/Disabled Parking (Blue Zones)*

Blue Zones are areas reserved for parking by disabled persons with vehicles which display a distinguishing license plate or a placard issued pursuant to Section 2251.5 ("Disabled Persons' Exemption"), or Section 9105 ("Disabled or Blind Veterans"), of the California Vehicle Code. To be enforceable, a disabled parking zone requires blue painted curb and appropriate signage. Disabled parking zones typically can be installed in commercial areas or in front of multi-unit residential developments where a disabled person resides, provided that (in the opinion of the City Engineer) no off-street parking spaces (including garages) exist that can feasibly be converted to a compliant accessible parking space and the street parking within 100 feet of property is more than 70 percent used at all times. Documentation of both of these conditions must be submitted to the City Engineer for evaluation. If it is found that there are an insufficient number of disabled spaces available to meet the needs of the area, then a recommendation for the approval of a new disabled parking space would be submitted to the Traffic Commission for review and then to City Council for approval. It should be noted that the location that best serves the disabled parking needs of the area will be identified and not necessarily the specific location suggested by the individual or business making the request.

**Blue Zones are not safety related and therefore are the purview of the Traffic Commission and City Council. However, the City Engineer will provide the Traffic Commission with supporting information for their evaluation.*

PARKING SAFETY ZONE PROCESS

Initiation

Parking Safety Zones in accordance with this policy can be requested by the public by submitting a request on the City's public request application (YourGov) at <https://yourgov.cartegraph.com/> or on the City's website or by contacting the Public Works Department Traffic Hotline at 619-667-1450. Please provide a detailed description of the request with pictures of the location and other documentation described herein. Incomplete requests will be delayed until the requestor provides the missing information.

Fees

Fees are collected for Parking Safety Zone requests, except for reconsideration of previous requests, which will require fee collection in accordance with the City's approved fee schedule (listed under Other Services).

Evaluation Process

When the Public Works Department receives a completed parking safety zone request, City staff will process the request on a first-come first-serve basis along with other City business and citizen requests. Listed below are the steps involved in evaluating a request.

1. Prioritization – If multiple requests are received, critical Red Curb requests should be a priority above other types of requests.
2. Field Visit – After the request is received, City staff will conduct a field visit to assess the problem and identify possible solutions.
3. Data Collection (if necessary) – Additional data, such as parking survey information, may be necessary to review some parking zone requests. A parking survey may be needed to assess the impact on parking in the area when parking activity is high, or to determine if the parking activity in the area is high enough to warrant installation. An additional two weeks is needed when parking surveys are necessary to evaluate the need and feasibility.

4. Contact Adjacent Residence/Property Owners (if necessary) – An additional step in the review process is necessary when the requested safety zone requests will affect several locations other than that owned by the requestor. Under such conditions, the City will seek input from the affected property owners to the extent practical. Notices will be sent out to property owners when requests will occur in front of their property.
5. Contact Downtown Merchants Association (if necessary) – When curb markings are requested in the downtown area, Public Works staff will share information and obtain input from the Downtown Business Association and Parking Commission when evaluating the request.
6. Review and Evaluation – Following the field visit and data collection, staff will evaluate the circumstances of the particular request and make a determination regarding the feasibility of the requested curb marking. The review and evaluation process will be completed within one month of the time when the field visits and data collection are complete, unless the request involves complex analysis.
7. Notification – Upon completion of the review, City staff will contact the requestor with the results of the analysis, the City's findings, and a preliminary schedule for any work that is determined to be necessary.
8. Curb Marking Installation – If the City Engineer determines that the requested parking safety zone is feasible and justified, then the work will typically be completed within four weeks. Any curb markings found without records of a City installation will either be removed or modified as necessary.

Evaluation Criteria

Every curb marking and signage request involves a different set of circumstances. As such, each request will require a unique analysis that takes into account the particular set of circumstances involved. Some of the common issues involved in evaluating a curb marking request are discussed below:

Is the request related to a safety issue for the travelling public? If not, then the request should not be considered under this policy. Requests for other types of parking restrictions (Green Zone, Blue Zone, etc) must be referred to the Traffic Commission and City Council.

How much parking is removed to accommodate the request? When a zone marking is requested, consideration is given to the preservation of adjacent parking spaces. It is undesirable to install zone sections of colored curbing that would leave a relatively long, but unusable portion of unpainted curb (less than 18 feet).

Would the requested curb marking affect other property owners? Occasionally, installing curb markings at one location causes drivers to park their cars closer to an adjacent driveway or property frontage, thereby creating a problem at that location. Under circumstances such as these, the feasibility of adjusting the length of the requested curb marking at adjacent driveways is reviewed.

How is parking in the area affected by adjacent land uses? Time-limited parking and loading zones may be warranted in areas where long-term parking regularly occupies the curb space that is needed for loading and short-term customer parking. A parking occupancy survey may be necessary to quantify the magnitude of the parking problem and the usage of curb space in the area.

How big does the requested zone need to be and how many deliveries are expected during peak times? For Yellow and White Zones, what size vehicle will be using the zone? Consideration will be given to providing the zone that is requested while maintaining as much parking in the area so as not to unfairly impact nearby property owners.

How does the requested curb marking impact surrounding properties? City staff will evaluate if the requested curb marking would remove parking spaces that nearby businesses rely on. What is the impact on motorist safety? City staff will adhere to accepted engineering practice when determining whether the requested curb markings are feasible and appropriate.

Is the curb marking going to be installed in a location other than the requestor's property frontage? If so, then the Public Works Department will not grant the request without consent from the affected property

owner allowing the curb on their frontage to be painted per the request. However, consent from the affected property owner is not required if a red zone is to be installed on their property on a segment of curb that does not constitute a legitimate parking space (i.e., less than 18 feet of unmarked curb space).

For Green Zones; is there a clear need? Green Zones are not safety related and therefore are the purview of the Traffic Commission and City Council. However, the City Engineer will provide the Traffic Commission with supporting information for their evaluation including an opinion about the need for the time-limited parking zone that is not met by any off-street parking spaces and other factors.

For Blue Zones; is there a clear need? Blue Zones are the purview of the Traffic Commission and City Council. However, the City Engineer will provide the Traffic Commission with supporting information for their evaluation including an assessment regarding the need for disabled parking that is not met by any off-street parking spaces.

Special Considerations for Critical Red Zones

Evaluating the need for critical Red Zones involves the following criteria in addition to those described above. Establishing critical intersection and roadway Red Zones will be based primarily on evidence that could identify a particular location as a safety problem or high-accident location.

When evaluating the need for Red Zones at a particular location, the primary areas of investigation will be accident records at the location, the traffic volume at the location, and the street/intersection geometrics associated with the location. Locations with multiple complaints of visibility problems and locations with many requests for red curbing will be considered candidates for safety improvements and will be evaluated further to assess the need for red curbing to improve sight distance and/or traffic operations.

When determining if an intersection is a safety problem, the accident rate at the subject location will be compared to a citywide rate to determine the relative safety of the subject location. A particular location will be considered a potential safety problem if the accident rate at the intersection is more than 1.5 accidents per million vehicles passing through the location. Note that when determining the accident rate at a location, only those accidents that could be corrected by installation of Red Zones will be considered.

To identify potential safety problems, the available sight distances at the subject location will be measured in the field and compared to required sight distances. The City's procedure for evaluating intersection sight distance is contained in Appendix A. Obstructions on private property that are taller than 3 feet and within the sight triangle established by the intersection sight distance procedures should be removed or lowered. Such objects include walls, fences, landscaping, trees, and buildings. Similarly, any tree located within the sight triangle must be maintained such that its canopy provides seven feet of vertical sight clearance. Thus, within the sight triangle, objects must be lower than three feet and/or higher than seven feet. Please refer to the 'Right of Way Tree Trimming', Exhibit IV of the City Tree Policy Manual for further information.

Under some circumstances, vehicles parked at the curb can be considered sight obstructions. The accident history at an intersection will be the primary indicator of unsafe roadway conditions due to sight obstructions caused by parking. A sight obstruction at an intersection may exist when the curb near the intersection is continuously occupied by a parked vehicle for a significant portion of the day, or when large vehicles (trucks, RVs, buses, vans, SUVs) are often parked at the corner. Under such circumstances and when - in the opinion of the City Engineer - parking activity constitutes a sight obstruction, a recommendation to the Traffic Commission for the establishment of a Vision Safety Zone may be made.


Maintenance Considerations for Signage and Markings

All signage and markings require maintenance for proper effectiveness. The costs of this maintenance can be substantial costs, when considered city-wide. Therefore, excessive use of signs or markings is discouraged, when other measures are effective. Existing curb markings that have become faded will be refreshed by Public Works Department as funds allow and are prioritized by their criticality and the frequency of public requests. Private marking or signage in the public ROW is prohibited by the La Mesa Municipal Code. Under no circumstances shall the property owner be allowed to paint or repaint any curb markings, which is prohibited under La Mesa Municipal Code (Section 12.16.090).

Removal of Curb Markings

Public Works will sometimes receive a request for the removal of an existing zone marking. Any such request would be reviewed using the same process and evaluation criteria as staff would be used for new zone marking requests. If it is determined that the existing zone marking serves no purpose, the zone marking will be removed at no cost to the individual making the removal request.

APPROVAL:



Richard B. Leja
Director of Public Works/City Engineer

REFERENCES:

1. Chapters 12.40 and 12.48 of the City of the La Mesa Municipal Code
2. Sections 12.16.010, 12.40.030, 12.40.110, and 12.48.020 of the City of La Mesa Municipal Code