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AGENDA
August 4th, 2016 (Special Meeting)

A. FLAG SALUTE

B. ROLL CALL AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

C. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS* (At this time, members of the public are encouraged to speak to the Commission concerning items not already on this agenda. A time limit of three [3] minutes per speaker and a total time allotment of fifteen [15] minutes will be observed.)

The Brown Act provides an opportunity for the members of the public to directly address the Commission on any item of interest to the public, before or during the Commission’s consideration of the item. If you wish to speak regarding an agenda item, please fill out a speaker’s slip and give it to the minute’s clerk who will forward it to the Chairman.

If you wish to speak concerning an item not on the agenda, you may do so under “Oral Communications” which is listed on the agenda.

The City of Escondido recognizes its obligation to provide equal access to public meetings to those qualified individuals with disabilities. Please contact the Human Resources Department (839-4643) with any requests for reasonable accommodation, to include sign language interpreter, at least twenty-four (24) hours prior to the meeting.
D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF APRIL 14, 2016 MEETING

E. CONSENT ITEMS – Staff will provide Overview for single vote

1. No Items.

F. NEW BUSINESS

1. Pilot Residential Parking Permit Program (RPPP) for Neighborhood Transformation Program #2

   Source: Resident Request

   Recommendation: Approval and forward recommendation to City Council

   Previous action: None.

2. Downtown Parking – Survey for 3 hour and 15 minutes limited time parking in Municipal Lots.

   Source: Staff

   Recommendation: Approval and forward recommendation to City Council

   Previous action: In 2015 parking time limits on Grand Avenue between Escondido and Juniper were increased from 2-hours to 3-hours. In addition, one row of the free-parking in Lot 1 (Valley Parkway & Maple) was changed to 3-hour parking.

   Two parking spaces in Lot 1 were also converted to 15-minute parking to serve businesses with high turn-over parking demand. One diagonal parking stall on N Broadway at its intersection with Grand Avenue was also converted to 15-minute parking.

3. Missing Link Project – Amend Bicycle Master Plan to include Cycle IV Track (30% Conceptual Design and Public Outreach Workshop #1)

   Source: Staff

   Recommendation: For review and comments

   Previous action: Approval of the Cycle Track concept plan in the Bicycle Masterplan.

4. All-Way Stop at N. Escondido Blvd. and W. Lincoln Ave.

   Source: Staff

   Recommendation: Approval and forward recommendation to City Council

   Previous action: None.
5. Bear Valley Parkway from Glenridge Rd. to East Valley Parkway – Signal Coordination Project – Before and After Travel Time with new signal timing plans

Source: Staff
Recommendation: Receive and File report
Previous action: None.

6. Municipal Code revision for Sec. 28-142. Parking, stopping and standing prohibited in specified places

Source: City Attorney
Recommendation: Approval and forward recommendation to City Council
Previous action: None.

G. **OLD BUSINESS**

1. An overview of various projects involving the City.

   Source: Staff

Written or verbal reports may be presented on the following topics:

a. **Traffic Signals in Design**: El Norte/FIG & East Valley Pkwy/Date – Design 100% complete, construction documents to be submitted to Caltrans for construction funds authorization.


c. **FY 15/16 TMPL Project Progress**: Gamble St. Radar Signs, N. Broadway Radar Sign installation. Complete and Radar Signs are active.

d. **Centre City Pkwy ICM I-15 corridor and 9th Avenue corridor – Traffic signal timing synchronization**. Complete pending Travel Time runs.

H. **SCHOOL AREA SAFETY**

   a. No new items.
I. **COUNCIL ACTION*** (A briefing on recent Council actions on Commission related items.)
   
   a. No new items.

J. **ORAL COMMUNICATIONS*** (At this time, members of the public are encouraged to speak to the Commission.)

K. **TRANSPORTATION COMMISSIONERS*** (Commissioners may bring up questions or items for future discussion.)

L. **ADJOURNMENT**

*In order for the Transportation Commission to take action or conclude discussion, an item must appear on the agenda which is posted 72 hours in advance of the meeting. Therefore, all items brought up under the categories marked with an asterisk (*) can have no action. Such items can be referred to staff or scheduled for a future agenda.

**AVAILABILITY OF SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIALS AFTER AGENDA POSTING:** Any supplemental writings or documents provided to the Commission regarding any item on this agenda will be made available for public inspection in the Engineering Office located at 201 N. Broadway during normal business hours, or in the Council Chambers while the meeting is in session.

(August 4th, 2016) TCSC Agenda
CITY OF ESCONDIDO

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING
OF THE TRANSPORTATION AND
COMMUNITY SAFETY COMMISSION

April 11, 2016

The regular meeting of the Escondido Transportation and Community Safety Commission was called to order at 3:00 p.m., Thursday, by Chair Durney, in the City Council Chambers, 201 North Broadway, Escondido, California.

Commissioners present: Chair Durney, Vice-chair Spoonemore, Commissioner Simonson, Commissioner Thornburgh, Commissioner McManus, and Commissioner Blackstock.

Commissioners absent: Commissioner Leone.

Staff present: Julie Procopio, Assistant Director of Engineering; Homi Namdari, Assistant City Engineer; Ali Shahzad, Associate Engineer/Traffic Division; Virpi Kuukka-Ruotsalainen, Department Specialist, and Ty Paulson, Minutes Clerk.

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS:

Karen Ruiz, Escondido, Member of CX3, thanked the City for the implementation of safe crosswalks around the City and especially around the schools. She stated that they felt crosswalks have a positive impact on the residents and community. She indicated that they supported the City’s new policies for installing crosswalks at mid-block and uncontrolled locations as streets were being resurfaced. She asked that during any resurfacing project that the crosswalks be included and/or repainted.

Yasmine Lopez, Escondido, Member of CX3, thanked the City for the implementation of safe crosswalks. She asked that the City consider CX3’s crosswalk advocacy when working on any street improvements or City improvements. She hoped funds would be made available in the future for the purpose of creating more walkability throughout the City.

Brian Eveland, Escondido, noted that as of today the speed measuring signs that were installed in March on Gamble were not operating, noting his concern for the length of time it was taking to get them operating. Mr. Namdari noted that the speed signs were being fixed and should be operational in two weeks. Mr. Eveland reiterated his concern with the signs taking 3 months to get up and running, noting that speeding was still occurring.
MINUTES:

Moved by Commissioner Blackstock, seconded by Commissioner Spoonemore, to approve the minutes of the January 14, 2016, meeting. Motion carried unanimously.

CONSENT ITEMS:

1. FY 15/16 Pavement Project Stripping cross-sections (7 segments)

Ali Shahzad, Associate Engineer, referenced the staff report and recommended the Commission approve the new signing and striping for the FY 15/16 Citywide Pavement project as outlined in the staff report.

Commissioner Thornburgh requested that staff consider increasing the size of the bike lane at the El Norte Parkway - Nordahl Road to I-15 location.

ACTION:

Moved by Commissioner Blackstock, seconded by Commissioner Spoonemore, to approve staff’s recommendation. Motion carried unanimously.

NEW BUSINESS:

1. High Visibility Crosswalks for Mid-Blocks

Ali Shahzad, Associate Engineer, referenced the staff report and noted staff recommended the Commission approve the high-visibility ladder-type crosswalk marking style for mid-block and uncontrolled crossings.

Discussion ensued regarding the delineation of colors for crosswalks as well as what other jurisdictions were installing.

Commissioner Thornburgh felt the continental sidewalk style was more aesthetically pleasing than the latter-type crosswalk.

Commissioner Blackstock asked if the crosswalk material would be thermal. Mr. Shahzad replied in the affirmative. Commissioner Blackstock felt the ladder style provided more visibility.

ACTION:

Moved by Vice-chairman Spoonemore, seconded by Commissioner McManus, to approve staff’s recommendation. Motion carried unanimously.
2. Speed Surveys – Various Locations

Virpi Kuukka-Ruotsalainen, Department Specialist, referenced the staff report and noted staff recommended the Commission approve the updated speed surveys.

ACTION:

Moved by Chairman Durney, seconded by Commissioner Simonson, to approve staff’s recommendation. Motion carried unanimously.

OLD BUSINESS:

1. An overview of various projects involving the City

   a. Gas tax funding reduction of $1.6 M over last 3 years results in no funding for TMPL projects in FY 16/17.
   b. North Bear Valley from Glenridge Road to East Valley Parkway – Traffic signal timing synchronization near schools – Will present before and after travel time report when Boyle/Bear Valley is operational.
   c. Traffic Signal in Designs: El Norte/Fig & East Valley Parkway/Date – 100% complete to be submitted to Caltrans for review
   e. FY 15/16 TMPL Project Progress – Gamble Street Rad Signs, North Broadway Radar Sign. Lack future funding.
   f. Centre City Parkway corridor and 9th Avenue corridor – Traffic signal timing synchronization.
   g. Missing Link cycle track preliminary design by consultant (KOA)

Received.

SCHOOL AREA SAFETY: None.

COUNCIL ACTION: None.

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS: None.

TRANSPORTATION COMMISSIONERS:
Commissioner Blackstock and staff discussed the new detour signage for I-15 on Centre City Parkway as well as the methods for publicizing the purpose for said signage.

Commissioner Blackstock questioned whether protected left turn phasing was slated east and west at 13th, 9th, and 5th Avenues at Centre City Parkway, noting his concern for safety. Mr. Shahzad replied in the negative but noted that the timing for said signals was being adjusted.

Chairman Durney and staff discussed the concept, costs, and possible grant funding opportunities for roundabouts, with emphasis on the intersections of Juniper and Chestnut as well as Juniper and 9th Avenue.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

Chairman Durney adjourned the meeting at 3:49 p.m. The next meeting of the Commission would be held July 14, 2016, at 3:00 p.m. in City Council Chambers, 201 North Broadway, Escondido.

Ali Shahzad, Associate Engineer

Ty Paulson, Minutes Clerk
CITY OF ESCONDIDO

TRANSPORTATION and
COMMUNITY SAFETY COMMISSION


Item No.: F1

Location: Vicinity of Grand Avenue between Rose and Foxdale

Initiated By: Residents of the Rose to Foxdale Neighborhood Group

Request: Recommend to the City Council a Pilot Parking District in the Rose to Foxdale Neighborhood.

Background & Survey Methodology:

In January of 2015, the City of Escondido commenced a Neighborhood Transformation Project (NTP) in the East Escondido area. The NTP is a community policing initiative with the strategic goal of promoting environmental change in Escondido neighborhoods. During the initial stage of the project, the project coordinator learned that parking was a significant issue. The police officers assigned to the project began writing parking citations in an effort to address the problem. Most of the citations were issued to vehicles whose registration indicated they did not live in the neighborhood. It appeared that the majority of the vehicles cited belonged to people living in nearby apartment complexes. Within a few months, it became clear that parking enforcement was not solving the problem.

In March of 2015, the City of Escondido conducted its first Project Neighborhood Enhancement and Awareness Training (NEAT) sweep, a field review of the neighborhood intended to identify potential Code-related issues to support the NTP. Many trash cans had been left in the street outside of normal trash collection days. When asked, the neighbors stated that they were leaving trash cans to reserve on-street parking spaces.

In May of 2015, the City of Escondido held its first NTP neighborhood meeting on Fairdale Ave. There were over 100 neighbors in attendance. The residents expressed concern about the lack of available parking and asked about the feasibility of a special parking district. Chief Carter encouraged the neighborhood to organize and contact the management from the surrounding apartment complexes to determine if there was anything the apartment communities could do to alleviate the problem. The Rose to Foxdale Neighborhood Group was formed and the President of this group met personally with the management from each of the nearby apartment complexes. Meetings with apartment complex managers were not successful at addressing the community parking issues.

In April of 2016, the Escondido Police Department and Neighborhood Services Division hosted a community meeting where Chief Carter explained the concept of a special parking district in broad terms and informed the neighborhood that at least 70% of the residents would need to support a
pilot residential parking permit program in order for the program to be considered. The neighborhood group was tasked with collecting petition signatures. By June 1, 2016, the neighborhood collected the signatures representing 70% resident approval for the special parking district.

Discussion & Purpose:

In a residential permit parking district, on-street parking is prohibited during certain hours, except for vehicles displaying valid permits, or valid disabled placards. Vehicles not displaying a valid permit or disabled placard will be issued a parking citation. Residential permit parking removes non-residents from competition for on-street parking. This program does not reserve specific on-street parking for individuals. Special parking districts are specifically authorized in the California Vehicle Code Section 22507. As an example, the City of San Diego currently has five of these districts in place.

The Rose to Foxdale Neighborhood is comprised of 252 single family residences with single car garages as shown in Exhibit 1. A total of 345 on-street parking spaces are available within the district limits. Based on this information, there is adequate space for one on-street parking space per residence and 93 additional (guest) spaces.

It is proposed that the parking district be enforced between 5:00pm and 5:00am, 7-days per week. This timing coincides with the time-period where parking availability is most limited. Emergency, public agency, delivery and service vehicles that are in service would be allowed to park without a permit.

Parking permits would be issued to residents by the Police Department after showing proof of residency and paying an issuance fee. One placard would be available per residence. One transferrable visitor parking permit would be allowed per residence.

It is recommended that the Rose to Foxdale Neighborhood Parking District be authorized as a one-year pilot program to gauge the program success as well as the staff administrative, management and enforcement commitment prior to considering other parking districts. After the one year pilot period, the program would be evaluated to determine if it is effective and if adjustments are warranted.
Proposed Rose to Foxdale Neighborhood Parking District

EXHIBIT 1
Recommendation:

Staff recommends that the Transportation and Community Safety Commission recommend to the City Council adoption of the attached Resolution to establish a one-year pilot residential parking district in the Rose to Foxdale Neighborhood. The District would restrict parking within the limits shown in Exhibit 1 to vehicles displaying valid placards between the hours of 5:00pm and 5:00am. One permit per residence would be allowed. One guest permit would also be allowed.

Necessary Council Action:

Approval of a pilot Residential Parking Permit Program requested by area residents.

Respectfully submitted,

Recommended by:

Jeff Valdivia
Police Sergeant

Reviewed by:

Julie Procopio, PE (Civil)
Assistant Director of Public Works Division

Approved by:

Edward N. Domingue, PE (Civil)
Director of Public Works/City Engineer
RESOLUTION NO. 2016- YY

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ESCONDIDO, CALIFORNIA, TO ESTABLISH A PILOT PROGRAM FOR RESIDENTIAL PARKING PERMITS IN THE ROSE TO FOXDALE NEIGHBORHOOD

WHEREAS, California Vehicle Code section 22507 authorizes the City Council to restrict the stopping, parking, or standing of vehicles, on certain streets upon which preferential parking privileges are given to residents adjacent to the streets for their use, and to establish provisions that are reasonable and necessary to ensure the effectiveness of a preferential parking program; and,

WHEREAS, California Vehicle Code section 22651(n) provides authority to tow vehicles parked in violation of local regulations when specifically authorized by the City Council and signs are posted giving notice of the removal; and,

WHEREAS, in May 2015, the Escondido Police Department conducted a neighborhood meeting to address a Neighborhood Transformation Project in the 1600-1800 blocks of East Grand Avenue (ROSE to FOXDALE NEIGHBORHOOD) and residents asserted a resident parking preference was their number one priority for improving their neighborhood; and,

WHEREAS, Exhibit (1) contains a map that identifies the streets of the ROSE to FOXDALE NEIGHBORHOOD Parking District and its boundaries, and is incorporated herein; and,

WHEREAS, in January 2016, residents from the ROSE to FOXDALE NEIGHBORHOOD attended a City Council hearing to advocate establishing a
neighborhood parking district and the City Council directed staff to work with the residents to evaluate establishing a residential permit parking district; and

WHEREAS, in April 2016, City staff conducted a neighborhood meeting with residents in the ROSE to FOXDALE NEIGHBORHOOD; and

WHEREAS, in June 2016, ROSE to FOXDALE NEIGHBORHOOD residents presented City staff with a signed petition from residents living in more than 70 percent of the dwellings in the proposed residential permit parking district;

WHEREAS, the City staff has studied the ROSE to FOXDALE NEIGHBORHOOD and identified 252 homes and 345 on-street parking spaces in the proposed permit parking area; and

WHEREAS, if all 252 resident permits are simultaneously used, 93 parking spaces would be available for guests or other exempt vehicles; and,

WHEREAS, City staff recommends, as a one year pilot program, establishing a resident preferred parking program in the ROSE to FOXDALE NEIGHBORHOOD, according to the following terms:

a) The permit only parking restriction will apply between 5 p.m. until 5 a.m. each day,

b) One residential parking permit be allocated to each dwelling unit at a cost of $40 per permit,

c) One guest permit will be available per dwelling unit at a cost of $40 per permit issued;

d) All permits will expire one year after the effective date of this resolution; and,

WHEREAS, City staff recommends that the following categories of motor vehicles
may park in the residential parking district without a permit:

a) Vehicles bearing a disabled person or disabled veteran license plate or placard
    issued by a state motor vehicle department are exempt from time or area
    restrictions imposed by this division,

b) Vehicles owned or operated by a public utility, a government agency, or
   government contractor when used in the course of business,

c) An authorized emergency vehicle when used in the course of business,

d) Commercial or service vehicles parked while actively delivering supplies,
   materials or freight to a dwelling unit in the district and parked for less than five
   minutes,

e) Driver-attended vehicles parked for the less than five minutes for the purpose of
   picking up or dropping off passengers.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of
Escondido, as follows:

1. That the above recitations are true.

2. That the ROSE to FOXDALE NEIGHBORHOOD Residential Permit Parking
   District is established with the boundaries described in Exhibit (1) and permit holders shall
   be exempt from the parking restrictions.

3. That the City Council adopts the staff recommendations for the type,
   quantity, duration and cost of the permits and the categories of vehicles exempt from the
   preferred parking restrictions.

4. That the City Council authorizes the towing of vehicles illegally parked in the
   ROSE to FOXDALE NEIGHBORHOOD Parking District after appropriate signs are
posted.

5. That the City Manager is authorized to adopt rules and procedures deemed necessary to implement this Resolution.

Locations: Downtown Public Parking Lots and Grand Avenue

Initiated by: Staff

Subject: Downtown Parking Pilot Program Survey Results

Background:

In August of 2014, the Downtown Parking Subcommittee requested that staff conduct an outreach to the downtown business community to obtain input and develop plans to improve downtown parking accommodations for the businesses and customers at the City Parking Lots 1-7 and along Grand Avenue. In January of 2015 a community meeting was held and a survey conducted. As the result, in May of 2015, City Council adopted a Downtown Parking Pilot Program to designate one row of 3 hour parking in Lot #1 and 15 minute parking spaces (one space in Lot #1 and one space on S. Broadway). In addition, the time limit for parking spaces along Grand Avenue, between Escondido Boulevard and Juniper Street, was increased from 2 to 3 hours per the attached map.

In July of 2016, a year after implementation of Downtown Parking Pilot Program, staff conducted a survey to obtain feedback from the downtown business owners, property owners and their customers to determine the success of the Downtown Parking Pilot Program and potential improvements to better serve our downtown business community.

Discussion and Purpose:

Staff sent a survey request via email to downtown businesses and property owners to obtain their input on success of the Downtown Parking Pilot Program and potential improvements to better serve our downtown businesses parking demands. In addition, staff conducted in-person surveys of several businesses along Grand Avenue to obtain more responses from the business owners, employees and customers to further expand the survey to present more conclusive results to the Commission.

The majority of survey respondents were in favor of the changes made with the Downtown Parking Pilot Program (3-hour parking time limit along Grand Avenue, one row of 3-hour parking in Lot 1 and two 15-minute spaces). The survey results conclusively support expansion of the 3 hour parking limit to the entire length of Grand Avenue between Centre City Parkway and Valley Blvd. The survey feedback was either inconclusive or unsupportive of changes to the current parking time limits in Parking Lots 1-7 and additional 15-minute parking spaces.
Recommendation:

Staff recommends that the Transportation and Community Safety Commission recommend to the Downtown Parking Sub-Committee that the 2 hour parking time limits on Grand Avenue be extended to 3 hours between Center City Parkway and Valley Blvd., based on the result of survey of downtown businesses.

Necessary Council Action: Approval

Respectfully submitted,

Prepared by:
Homi Namdari
Assistant City Engineer

Reviewed by:
Julie B. Procopio, PE
Assistant Director of Public Works

Approved by:
Edward N. Domingue, PE
Director of Public Works/City Engineer
CITY OF ESCONDIDO

TRANSPORTATION and
COMMUNITY SAFETY COMMISSION


Location: Citywide

Initiated By: Staff

Request: Amend the 2012 Bicycle Master Plan to include Class IV Bikeway (Cycle Tracks) as part of the Missing Link Project

Data/Background:

City of Escondido Bicycle Master Plan was first adopted in 1993. On March 29th, 2012, the Transportation and Community Safety Commission approved the update to the City of Escondido Bicycle Master Plan. This Update was later adopted by the City Council on October 17, 2012.

The 2012 Bicycle Master Plan identified the need for the Missing Link project to connect a missing section of the Escondido Creek Bike Path between N. Broadway and the Escondido Transit Station on Valley Parkway. The 2012 Bicycle Master Plan Missing Link project consisted of a Class II Bike Lane on both sides of N. Broadway between Woodward Avenue and Valley Parkway and a Class I Bike Path adjacent to the sidewalk on the north side of W. Valley Parkway between N. Broadway and Centre City Parkway. (See Exhibit I). In March 2015, the City was awarded an Active Transportation Program grant of approximately $1.1 million to fully fund the design and construction of the Missing Link project.

Since the update of the Bicycle Master Plan in 2012, Class IV Bikeway (Cycle Tracks) has been adopted in California and categorized as new classification of bicycle facilities in September 2014. The four classifications of bicycle facilities are as follows (see Exhibit II):

- Class I – Bike Path
- Class II – Bike Lane
- Class III – Bike Route
- Class IV – Bikeway (Cycle Tracks)

Design Guidelines that have been published for Class IV Bikeway (Cycle Tracks) design include:

- Separated Bike Lane Planning and Design Guide, Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), May 2015
- Class IV Bikeway Guidance (Separated Bikeways/Cycle Tracks), Caltrans, December 30, 2014
Discussion & Purpose:

The proposed amendment to the 2012 Bicycle Master Plan includes installing Class IV Bikeway (Cycle Tracks along N. Broadway and Valley Parkway as part of the Missing Link project. The Missing Link project proposed alignment and overview are as follows:

Project Alignment

Figure 1 depicts the new bike facility alignment to connect the Escondido Creek Trail to the Escondido Transit Center.

![Map diagram](image)

**Figure 1: Proposed Missing Link Project Alignment**

The proposed new bike facility, connecting the existing Escondido Creek Trail that ends east of N. Broadway and the existing Regional Trail north of the Escondido Transit Center, will run along the west side of N. Broadway between Woodward Avenue and Valley Parkway, then along the north side of Valley Parkway to Centre City Parkway. The bikeway will then continue north along the west side of Centre City Parkway to just south of the Flood Control channel. There, the bikeway will run along the south side of the channel and connect the existing Regional Trail north of the Transit Center on the west side of Quince Street. A two-way Class IV Bikeway (Cycle Tracks) is proposed along N. Broadway and W. Valley Parkway and a Class I Bike Path is proposed along Centre City Parkway and south of the channel.
Two-way Class IV Bikeway (Cycle Tracks)

A two-way Class IV Bikeway (Cycle Track) is a bicycle facility that allows bicycle movements in both directions on one side of the roadway and is physically separated from the through vehicular traffic. Figure 2 depicts an example of a two-way Cycle Tracks installed in Redondo Beach, California.

Figure 2: Example of Class IV Bikeway (Cycle Tracks) in Redondo Beach, CA

The major differences between Class IV Bikeway (Cycle Tracks) and Class I Bike Paths are: 1) Class IV Bikeway (Cycle Tracks) are located in roadway right-of-way but separated from vehicular lanes by physical barriers while Class I Bike Path usually are constructed in independent right-of-way; and 2) Class IV facilities are exclusively for bicycle use while Class I Bike Paths are shared-use by bicycle, pedestrian, and other non-motorized travel.

A photo simulation of the proposed two-way Cycle Track on N. Broadway between Woodward Avenue and Valley Parkway is shown in Figure 3. A raised barrier between the parked cars and the Cycle Tracks is proposed to provide for door swing and a landing area for the passenger, so as to not obstruct the bicyclists’ path of travel.
Figure 3: Photo Simulation of the Proposed Class IV Bikeway (Cycle Tracks) on N. Broadway

Class IV Bikeway (Cycle Tracks) has gained popularity in the recent years. Multiple cities in California and other States have implemented Cycle Tracks on existing roadways in place of Class II Bike Lanes. Some of the benefits of two-way Cycle Tracks identified in the National Association of City Transportation Officials (NACTO) Urban Bikeway Design Guide include:

- Dedicating and protects space for bicyclists by improving perceived comfort and safety.
- Reduces risk of “doorin” compared to a bike lane.
- Relatively low implementation cost when making use of existing pavement and drainage.
- More attractive to a wide range of bicyclists at all levels and ages.

A project public outreach workshop was conducted at the City Hall on June 23, 2016. Conceptual design was presented at the workshop. Overall, the project alignment and design concept were well received by the community. Valuable comments were collected and to be included in the project design. The conceptual design is included in Exhibit III.

The conceptual design of the project proposed to relocate the existing pedestrian crossing south of Pennsylvania Avenue to just north of Sherman Place in front of the San Diego Children’s Discovery Museum, as shown on Figure 4. Based on the preliminary evaluation, the new crossing located north of Sherman Place would be a more appropriate location with the following reasons.

- The crossing will provide a direct connection between Grape Day Park entrance and the San Diego Children’s Discovery Museum.

- With the new Grape Day Park Plan, the projected 140,000 annual visitors of the San Diego Children’s Discovery Museum, and the anticipated increase in pedestrian and bicyclist activities with the Missing Link project, this crossing location is expected to be heavily
used by bicyclists, families, and school groups. The San Diego Children’s Discovery Museum has already expressed strong support to this crosswalk relocation.

➢ The new location will be at the mid-point between the intersections at Valley Parkway to the south and at Woodward Avenue to the north (proposed new traffic signal).

Figure 4 Proposed Relocation of Crosswalk on N. Broadway

Recommendations:

The following amendment to the existing 2012 Bicycle Master Plan is recommended:

➢ Amend the 2012 Bicycle Master Plan to include Class IV Bikeway (Cycle Tracks) as the proposed bicycle facility along N. Broadway and Valley Parkway for the Missing Link project.

Necessary Council Action:

Approve the proposed amendment to the 2012 Bicycle Master Plan to include Class IV Bikeway (Cycle Tracks) as part of the Missing Link Project.
Respectfully submitted,

Prepared by:

Miriam Jim, PE (Civil and Traffic)
Associate Engineer/Traffic Division

Reviewed by:

Homi Namdari, PE (Civil),
Assistant City Engineer

Approved by:

Edward N. Domingue, PE (Civil)
Director of Public Works/Engineering
Exhibit I: City of Escondido Bicycle MasterPlan Existing and Proposed Bike Facilities
### Exhibit II: Bicycle Classifications

#### Class I – Bike Path

![Diagram of Class I Bike Path]

#### Class II – Bike Lane

![Diagram of Class II Bike Lane]
Class III – Bike Route

Class IV – Bikeway (Cycle Tracks)
Exhibit III: Missing Link Project Conceptual Design Exhibits

[Diagram of Escondido Creek Bikeway Missing Link, showing the layout of the creek channel, W. Valley Parkway, and Centre City Parkway.]
ESCONDIDO CREEK BIKEWAY MISSING LINK

Looking south from bridge on Broadway at proposed class IV 2-way cycle track with parallel parking.
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Location: Intersection of Escondido Boulevard and Lincoln Avenue

Initiated by: Lincoln Elementary School Students

Request: Approval of All-Way Stop Control (AWSC) for the intersection Escondido Boulevard and Lincoln Avenue

Background:

In response to concerns of the Lincoln Elementary School student body regarding the safety of students crossing Escondido Blvd. an all-way stop warrant analysis was conducted for the intersection of Escondido Boulevard and Lincoln Avenue.

In 2014, a Safe Routes to School -Walk Audit was conducted for Lincoln Elementary School. Issues identified by attendees included high speeds, crosswalk safety and lack of visibility at the intersection of Escondido Boulevard and Lincoln Avenue. In November 2015, a group of 110 residents and parents of Lincoln Elementary students signed a petition. They were concerned about the pedestrian safety at the intersection of Escondido Boulevard and Lincoln Avenue. As a result, additional PD enforcement was planned in the area, red-curbing was installed on Escondido Boulevard to improve sight distance and vegetation was trimmed at the location.

Existing conditions:

Currently, Stop-signs are placed on Lincoln Avenue for vehicles entering Escondido Boulevard.

Average Daily Traffic (ADT) on Escondido Boulevards exceeds 10,400 vehicles per day with the peak hour traffic of 952 vehicles/hour. ADT on Lincoln Avenue averages 2,600 vehicles per day with the peak hour traffic of 286 vehicles/hour.

The pedestrian volume at the location is relatively high with midday pedestrian volumes of 105 pedestrians in 2 hours (Wednesday, 2-4pm, school lets out at 2:40pm). Pedestrian numbers can be expected to rise with an improved sense of safety, as presently many parents report driving the students very short distances to avoid crossing the intersection.

Escondido Boulevard is 64-feet wide with a speed limit of 35 mph. Pedestrian crossing times are calculated to be 20 seconds. With existing vehicle volumes, the pedestrian gap (availability to cross) is available only once in 10 minutes during peak school traffic hours.
Warrant analysis:

The purpose of this report is to present the results of the warrant analysis. Section 2B.07 of the California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (CA MUTCD) provides the warrants for installing multi-way stops. The manual states,

"The following criteria should be considered in the engineering study for a multi-way STOP sign installation:

California MUTCD 2014 Edition Page 130
(FHWA's MUTCD 2009 Edition, including Revisions 1 & 2, as amended for use in California)
Chapter 2B – Regulatory Signs, Barricades, and Gates November 7, 2014
Part 2 – Signs

Section 2B.07 Multi-Way Stop Applications
Support:
- Multi-way stop control can be useful as a safety measure at intersections if certain traffic conditions exist. Safety concerns associated with multi-way stops include pedestrians, bicyclists, and all road users expecting other road users to stop. Multi-way stop control is used where the volume of traffic on the intersecting roads is approximately equal.
- The restrictions on the use of STOP signs described in Section 2B.04 also apply to multi-way stop applications.

Guidance:
- The decision to install multi-way stop control should be based on an engineering study.
The following criteria should be considered in the engineering study for a multi-way STOP sign installation:

A. Where traffic control signals are justified, the multi-way stop is an interim measure that can be installed quickly to control traffic while arrangements are being made for the installation of the traffic control signal.

B. Five or more reported crashes in a 12-month period that are susceptible to correction by a multi-way stop installation. Such crashes include right-turn and left-turn collisions as well as right-angle collisions.

C. Minimum volumes:
   1. The vehicular volume entering the intersection from the major street approaches (total of both approaches) averages at least 300 vehicles per hour for any 8 hours of an average day; and
   2. The combined vehicular, pedestrian, and bicycle volume entering the intersection from the minor street approaches (total of both approaches) averages at least 200 units per hour for the same 8 hours, with an average delay to minor-street vehicular traffic of at least 30 seconds per vehicle during the highest hour; but

3. If the 85th-percentile approach speed of the major-street traffic exceeds 40 mph, the minimum vehicular volume warrants are 70 percent of the values provided in Items 1 and 2.

D. Where no single criterion is satisfied, but where Criteria B, C.1, and C.2 are all satisfied to 80 percent of the minimum values. Criterion C.3 is excluded from this condition.

Option:

Other criteria that may be considered in an engineering study include:

A. The need to control left-turn conflicts;

B. The need to control vehicle/pedestrian conflicts near locations that generate high pedestrian volumes;

C. Locations where a road user, after stopping, cannot see conflicting traffic and is not able to negotiate the intersection unless conflicting cross traffic is also required to stop; and

D. An intersection of two residential neighborhood collector (through) streets of similar design and operating characteristics where multi-way stop control would improve traffic operational characteristics of the intersection.

Analysis Results:

Criterion A: Applies as traffic signal installation is recommended and planned in future.

Criterion B: Does not apply
In order to examine Criterion B, the crash history of the intersection was pulled from the Police Department's crash records. During 2012-2016 two accidents were reported at the location.

Criterion C: Does not apply
Minimum traffic volumes are not met for 8 consecutive hours.

Criterion D: Does not apply

Option 05: Applies as intersection has relatively high pedestrian volumes
Discussion and Purpose:

At this time, the installation of a multi-way stop is warranted and recommended.

Considering the high number of students crossing Escondido Boulevard, improving pedestrian safety is a key factor for this intersection.

Environmental Impact Report for the Centerpointe 78 – project (Supermarket and fast-food restaurant, located at the intersection of North Broadway and Lincoln Avenue) a traffic signal is proposed for the intersection of Escondido Boulevard at Lincoln Avenue as a traffic mitigation measure.

As an interim measure, prior to installing traffic signal two (2) Stop-signs can be added to make this intersection an All-Way Stopped intersection.

Per CA-MUTCD Section 2B.07 Multi-Way Stop Applications “Where traffic control signals are justified, the multi-way stop is an interim measure that can be installed quickly to control traffic while arrangements are being made for the installation of the traffic control signal.” Stop-control can also be installed at locations with a need to control vehicle/pedestrian conflicts near locations that generate high pedestrian volumes.

Preliminary evaluations show that new Stop-controls will not significantly cause queuing on Escondido Boulevard with present volumes of traffic. Even during peak traffic hours the Level Of Service (LOS) will remain C or better and the maximum delay time will not exceed 23.6 seconds. The City of Escondido’s General plan (Street Network Policy) states a goal of maintaining LOS C or better throughout the city except for within the urban core.

Picture: Proposed new Stop-controls (2).
All-Way Stop at N. Escondido Blvd and W Lincoln Avenue
August 4th, 2016
Page 5 of 5

Recommendation: Approval of the proposed installation of 2 new Stop-signs to create an All-Way Stop-controlled intersection.

Necessary Council Action: Approval Resolution for Stop-Signs schedule amendment.

Respectfully submitted,

Prepared by:

[Signature]
Ali M. Shahzad, PE (Traffic)
Associate Engineer/Traffic Division

Reviewed by:

[Signature]
Homi Namdari, PE (Civil)
Assistant Director of Public Works

Approved by:

[Signature]
Julie B. Procopio, PE (Civil)
Assistant Director of Public Works

Location:  North Bear Valley Parkway from Glenridge Road to East Valley Parkway

Initiated By:  City Staff.

Subject:  North Bear Valley Parkway from Glenridge Road to East Valley Parkway SIGNAL COORDINATION - Travel Time Runs Before & After.

Data:
A consulting firm was hired to coordinate the existing traffic signal systems along the northly segment of Bear Valley Parkway between Glenridge Road and East Valley Parkway. An inventory of geometric and signalization conditions was conducted for each study intersection. This included assessment of intersection configuration, peak hour traffic conditions, existing signal timing and phasing, intersection spacing and other traffic data. Turning movement counts were collected at each study intersection for the following time periods: AM Peak (7 am-9 am), Midday (2pm-4pm) and PM Peak (4 pm-6 pm).

Background:
North Bear Valley Parkway (BVP) has several schools along the corridor and is a major commute corridor to the I-15 from Valley Center. This segment was constructed several years ago and the signals along the corridor were not in coordination. The eight (8) signals in the BVP corridor that were coordinated are:

1. Boyle Avenue (Under construction).
2. Glenridge Rd.
3. Midway Dr.
4. Oak Hill Dr.
5. E. Grand Avenue
6. N. Citrus Ave.
7. Hayden Dr.
8. East Valley Parkway.
Travel-time (travel delay) studies determine the amount of time required to travel from one point to another on a given route. Information may also be collected on the locations, durations, and causes of delays.

SYNCHRO 8.0 software as a tool for development of signal timing plans was used. The model was used to prepare optimized timing plans to minimize overall system delay and stops along the Bear Valley Parkway corridor. The optimized timing plans were fine-tuned using the time space diagram editing procedures to insure smooth traffic flow. In addition field observations and minor modifications were incorporated.

**Discussion & Purpose:**

The goal of coordination is to get the greatest number of vehicles through the system with the fewest stops in a comfortable manner. It would be ideal if every vehicle entering the system could proceed through the system without stopping. This is not possible, even in well-spaced, well-designed systems. Therefore, in traffic signal coordination, the busiest traffic movements are given priority over the smaller traffic movements.

The purpose of this report is to present the Before and After results of the N. Bear Valley Parkway Signal Coordination Project. A synopsis of the Northbound and South AM and PM results are provided below.

**SYNOPSIS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AM</th>
<th>SB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>Max. No. of Stop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PM</th>
<th>SB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>Max. No. of Stop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary**

1. Travel time reduced by 10% to 30%.
2. Reduction in delays at intersections (improve from 42% to 80%)
3. Travel patterns are more predictable
North Bear Valley Parkway from Glenridge to East Valley Parkway

SIGNAL COORDINATION
### BEFORE

#### AM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Stop</th>
<th>Go</th>
<th>Delay</th>
<th>Stop</th>
<th>Go</th>
<th>Delay</th>
<th>Stop</th>
<th>Go</th>
<th>Delay</th>
<th>Stop</th>
<th>Go</th>
<th>Delay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Glennridge Rd</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midway Dr</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak Hill Dr</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Ave</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citrus Ave</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>2.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayden Dr</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valley Plwy</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### SB

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Stop</th>
<th>Go</th>
<th>Delay</th>
<th>Stop</th>
<th>Go</th>
<th>Delay</th>
<th>Stop</th>
<th>Go</th>
<th>Delay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valley Plwy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayden Dr</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citrus Ave</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Ave</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak Hill Dr</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midway Dr</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glennridge Rd</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### PM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Stop</th>
<th>Go</th>
<th>Delay</th>
<th>Stop</th>
<th>Go</th>
<th>Delay</th>
<th>Stop</th>
<th>Go</th>
<th>Delay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Glennridge Rd</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midway Dr</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak Hill Dr</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Ave</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citrus Ave</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayden Dr</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valley Plwy</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Average

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stop</th>
<th>Max Stop</th>
<th>Travel Time</th>
<th>Delay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Stop</th>
<th>Go</th>
<th>Delay</th>
<th>Stop</th>
<th>Go</th>
<th>Delay</th>
<th>Stop</th>
<th>Go</th>
<th>Delay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valley Plwy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayden Dr</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citrus Ave</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Ave</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak Hill Dr</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midway Dr</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glennridge Rd</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Average

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stop</th>
<th>Max Stop</th>
<th>Travel Time</th>
<th>Delay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Stop</th>
<th>Go</th>
<th>Delay</th>
<th>Stop</th>
<th>Go</th>
<th>Delay</th>
<th>Stop</th>
<th>Go</th>
<th>Delay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valley Plwy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayden Dr</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citrus Ave</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Ave</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak Hill Dr</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midway Dr</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glennridge Rd</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Average

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stop</th>
<th>Max Stop</th>
<th>Travel Time</th>
<th>Delay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### AFTER

#### AM NB Travel time Runs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Stop</th>
<th>Go</th>
<th>Delay</th>
<th>Stop</th>
<th>Go</th>
<th>Delay</th>
<th>Stop</th>
<th>Go</th>
<th>Delay</th>
<th>Stop</th>
<th>Go</th>
<th>Delay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Glennridge Rd</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midway Dr</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak Hill Dr</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Ave</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citrus Ave</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>1.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayden Dr</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valley Pkwy</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### SB Travel Time Runs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Stop</th>
<th>Go</th>
<th>Delay</th>
<th>Stop</th>
<th>Go</th>
<th>Delay</th>
<th>Stop</th>
<th>Go</th>
<th>Delay</th>
<th>Stop</th>
<th>Go</th>
<th>Delay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valley Pkwy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayden Dr</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citrus Ave</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Ave</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak Hill Dr</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midway Dr</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>1.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenridge Rd</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### PM NB Travel time Runs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Stop</th>
<th>Go</th>
<th>Delay</th>
<th>Stop</th>
<th>Go</th>
<th>Delay</th>
<th>Stop</th>
<th>Go</th>
<th>Delay</th>
<th>Stop</th>
<th>Go</th>
<th>Delay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Glennridge Rd</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midway Dr</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak Hill Dr</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Ave</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citrus Ave</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>3.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayden Dr</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valley Pkwy</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### SB Travel Time Runs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Stop</th>
<th>Go</th>
<th>Delay</th>
<th>Stop</th>
<th>Go</th>
<th>Delay</th>
<th>Stop</th>
<th>Go</th>
<th>Delay</th>
<th>Stop</th>
<th>Go</th>
<th>Delay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valley Pkwy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayden Dr</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citrus Ave</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Ave</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak Hill Dr</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>2.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midway Dr</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>2.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenridge Rd</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Average

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Stop</th>
<th>Max Stop</th>
<th>Travel Time</th>
<th>Delay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AM</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recommendation:

The success of the project is demonstrated by:

- Travel time savings of 10% to 30% for the residents of Escondido and the commuting public.
- Reduction in delays at intersections from 42% to 80% measured.
- Travel patterns are more predictable along the corridor.

Necessary Council Action: Note and File report.

Prepared by:  
Ali M. Shahzad, PE (Traffic)  
Associate Engineer/Traffic Division

Reviewed by:  
Horni Namdari, PE (Civil)  
Assistant City Engineer

Approved by:  
Julie Procopio, PE (Civil)  
Assistant Director of Public Works
CITY OF ESCONDIDO

TRANSPORTATION and
COMMUNITY SAFETY COMMISSION


Location: City-wide

Initiated By: Staff

Request: Amend Escondido Municipal Code (EMC) Section 28-142, Parking, stopping and standing prohibited in specified places

Data:

A review of police department records found that officers use EMC Section 28-142 when enforcing the City’s parking regulations.

Background:

A routine review of our ordinances identified several areas in EMC section 28-142 that refer to terms or areas that are no longer relevant to today’s traffic engineering; i.e. midblock end of a safety zone and a boulevard stop sign. The current code section also only allows the traffic engineer to restrict parking at intersections in the central traffic district and business district. EMC section 28-1 defines the central traffic district but does not address any business district.

Discussion & Purpose:

Representatives from the Traffic Engineering, Police Traffic Division and City Attorney’s Office met and compared the current no parking, stopping and standing regulations and found them to be out dated. City staff reviewed similar parking restrictions in the cities of San Diego, Carlsbad, Oceanside, Vista, San Marcos, and Poway before revising EMC section 28-142. The proposed changes simplify the regulations to specifically authorize the City Traffic Engineer to place signs and to mark curbs throughout the City of Escondido when necessary to promote public safety. Staff also added a parking restriction to preclude parking in areas not designed for parking; i.e. medians, traffic islands or in an area designed to separate or guide the movement of traffic. This restriction, see EMC 28-142(c), does not require the placement of signs or curb markings.

Recommendation:

Staff recommends approval.
Necessary Council Action:

Amending EMC 28-142 will require City Council approval.

Respectfully submitted,

Prepared by:  
Ali M. Shahzad, PE (Traffic)  
Associate Engineer/Traffic Division

Reviewed by:  
Homi Namdari, PE (Civil)  
Assistant City Engineer

Approved by:  
Julie Procopio, PE (Civil)  
Assistant Director of Public Works
Chapter 28 TRAFFIC

ARTICLE 5. STOPPING, STANDING AND PARKING

DIVISION 1. GENERALLY

Sec. 28-142. No parking, stopping and standing.

a. The city traffic engineer is authorized to place and maintain vertical signs or to mark curbs to designate no parking, stopping or standing near safety zones, intersections, and traffic control signals or devices, and within street cleaning zones and in any other area when necessary to eliminate traffic hazards or to promote public health and safety. A safety zone is defined as an area or space lawfully set apart within a roadway for the exclusive use of pedestrians and which is protected, or which is marked or indicated by vertical signs, raised markers or raised buttons.

b. No person shall stop, park, or leave standing any vehicle, whether attended or unattended, in an area where a sign or a marked curb indicates a parking restriction.

c. No person shall stop, park, or leave standing any vehicle within a median strip between roadways, or within any traffic island or in an area designed to separate or guide the safe and orderly movement of traffic.

Sec. 28-142. Parking, stopping and standing prohibited in specified places

—When the city traffic engineer shall appropriately sign or mark the following places, and when so signed or marked, no person shall stop, stand or park a vehicle in any of said places.

—(1) Near safety zone. At any place within twenty (20) feet of a point of the curb immediately opposite the midblock end of a safety zone.

—(2) Near intersection. At any place within twenty-five (25) feet of an intersection in the central traffic district or in any business district.

—(3) Near signal. Within twenty-five (25) feet of the approach to any traffic signal, boulevard stop sign or official traffic control device.

—(4) Other expedient places. At any place where the city traffic engineer determines that it is necessary in order to eliminate dangerous traffic hazards.

—(5) Maintenance or cleaning zones. At any place where the city traffic engineer has placed signs indicating a parking prohibition for the purpose of street maintenance and/or cleaning.