



Mike Calandra
Chair

Ed Krulikowski
Vice Chair

Tina Angeles
Commissioner

Dinah Justice
Commissioner

Alex Mueller
Commissioner

David Nichols
Commissioner

Tony Ortega
Commissioner

Leon Firsht
Director of Public Works/City
Engineer

Philip Kern
Engineering Project Manager

Michael Kinnard
Associate Engineer

Carla Farr
Administrative Office Assistant

PLEASE NOTE: Materials related to an item on this agenda submitted to the La Mesa Mobility 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.

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, Director of Administrative Services, 48 hours prior to the meeting at 619.667.1175, fax 619.667.1163, or freeman@cityoflamesa.us.

AGENDA

MOBILITY COMMISSION

A Regular Meeting via Teleconference

Wednesday, March 3, 2021 at 9:00 AM

City Manager's Office Conference Room
8130 Allison Avenue, La Mesa, CA

This meeting is being conducted utilizing teleconferencing and electronic means consistent with State of California Executive Order N-29-20 dated March 17, 2020, regarding the COVID-19 pandemic.

The public may view the meeting live using the following remote options:

Teleconference Meeting Webinar

[Zoom Link](#)

Telephone (Audio only)

US: +1 669 900 6833 or +1 253 215 8782

Webinar ID: 919 3041 7790

Public Comments for Items not on the Agenda

Members of the public who wish to make public comments may submit their comments by email to be read aloud at the Mobility Commission meeting by staff. Email comments must be submitted to Carla Farr at cfarr@cityoflamesa.us by 7:00 am the day of the Commission meeting and be no more than 300 words. Any language beyond the 300 words shall not be read during the Commission meeting. The counting of words, for the purposes of public comment submissions shall follow the same standards as set forth in Elections Code § 9 (see Attachment A). Please note in your email subject line that this is for "PUBLIC COMMENT". All email comments shall be subject to the same rules as would otherwise govern speaker comments at the Commission meeting.

Public Comments for Items on the Agenda

Members of the public who wish to make comments on items on the agenda may submit their comments by email to be read aloud at the Mobility Commission meeting by staff. Email comments will be accepted prior to the Commission meeting and up until the time that the Chair announces that public comment is closed for that item. Email comments must be submitted to Carla Farr at cfarr@cityoflamesa.us and be no more than 300 words. Any language beyond the 300 words shall not be read during the Commission meeting. The counting of words, for the purposes of public comment submissions shall follow the same standards as set forth in Elections Code § 9 (see Attachment A). Please note in your email subject line the agenda item number related to the comment. All email comments shall be subject to the same rules as would otherwise govern speaker comments at the Commission meeting.

State of California**ELECTIONS CODE****Section 9**

9. (a) Counting of words, for purposes of this code, shall be as follows:
- (1) Punctuation is not counted.
 - (2) Each word shall be counted as one word except as specified in this section.
 - (3) All proper nouns, including geographical names, shall be considered as one word; for example, "City and County of San Francisco" shall be counted as one word.
 - (4) Each abbreviation for a word, phrase, or expression shall be counted as one word.
 - (5) Hyphenated words that appear in any generally available standard reference dictionary, published in the United States at any time within the 10 calendar years immediately preceding the election for which the words are counted, shall be considered as one word. Each part of all other hyphenated words shall be counted as a separate word.
 - (6) Dates shall be counted as one word.
 - (7) Any number consisting of a digit or digits shall be considered as one word. Any number which is spelled, such as "one," shall be considered as a separate word or words. "One" shall be counted as one word whereas "one hundred" shall be counted as two words. "100" shall be counted as one word.
 - (8) Telephone numbers shall be counted as one word.
 - (9) Internet Web site addresses shall be counted as one word.
- (b) This section shall not apply to counting words for ballot designations under Section 13107.

(Amended by Stats. 2014, Ch. 697, Sec. 3. (SB 1253) Effective January 1, 2015.)

AGENDA

MARCH 3, 2021

9:00 A.M.

CALL MEETING TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

INVOCATION – COMMISSIONER MUELLER

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

ADDITIONS AND/OR DELETIONS TO THE AGENDA

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS

1. INTRODUCTIONS
2. OVERVIEW OF COMMISSION (ATTACHMENTS)
3. VISION ZERO (ATTACHMENT)
 - a. CIP PROJECTS
 - i. MASSACHUSETTS AVE AND BLACKTON DRIVE
 - ii. LA MESA BLVD SEGMENT I
 - b. GRANTS AND APPLICATIONS
 - i. LA MESA BLVD SEGMENT II
 - ii. ATP

PUBLIC COMMENTS – (TOTAL TIME – 15 MINUTES)

NEW BUSINESS (ACTION)

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM FEBRUARY 2, 2021 MOBILITY COMMISSION MEETING (ATTACHMENT)

COMMISSION INITIATED ITEMS

STAFF COMMENTS

FUTURE ITEMS

E&TS FOR MURRAY DRIVE
LOCAL ROAD SAFETY PLAN

ADJOURNMENT

NEXT REGULARLY SCHEDULED MEETING IS APRIL 7, 2021



LA MESA MOBILITY COMMISSION

March 3, 2021

Greeting from the Director of Public Works/City Engineer

The City of La Mesa Public Works Department provides public works services that improve the quality of life for the people of La Mesa. We provide a variety of services including, designing, constructing, cleaning, repairing, and maintaining City streets, sanitary and storm sewers, traffic control devices, parks and streetscapes, fleet and facilities. We also provide public infrastructure engineering, traffic engineering, and land-development engineering services, among others. The Department provides high quality public works services in a professional manner, contributing to the quality of life enjoyed in La Mesa.

As Director of Public Works/City Engineer, I'd like to welcome you as a new member of the Mobility Commission. This handout has been prepared to provide a better understanding and purpose of the commission.

Leon Firsht
Director of Public Works/City Engineer

Important Reference Documents

Mobility Commission Creation, Appointments, and Powers and Duties

[Municipal Code, Mobility Commission 12.08.060-.180](#)

Commission Members

[Commission Members & Terms](#)

Authorities & Municipal Code

Approval Levels for Traffic Control (attached)

Traffic Calming

[Neighborhood Traffic Management Program](#)

[Traffic Calming](#)

[Traffic Calming Tools](#)

[Ranked List of Streets](#)

Climate Action Plan

[Climate Action Plan](#)

[FY19-21 Implementation Plan](#)

Plans

[General Plan \(Circulation\)](#)

[Bicycle Master Plan](#)

[Sidewalk Master Plan](#)

Traffic Signals and Coordination

[Traffic Signals](#)

[Signal Coordination Times](#)

Authorities & Municipal Code

City Council

- Traffic signals (12.16.040)
- One-way street or alley (12.24.010)
- Stop signs (12.28.010)
- Permit parking zones (12.42.020)
- Diagonal parking zones (12.44.070)
- No stopping zones (12.44.090)
- Disabled person parking spaces (12.44.130, VC 22511)
- Commercial parking restriction (12.52.070)
- Parking meter zones (12.56.010)
- Speed limits (12.64)
- NTMP Phase 2/3

Mobility Commission

- Vision safety parking zone (12.40.115)
- Timed parking (12.44) 2 or more properties
- Taxicab stands (12.48.080)
- Visibility obstruction removal (shrubs) (12.52.060)

Traffic Engineer

- Traffic control devices (12.16.010)
- Striping for centerlines and lane lines (12.16.050)
- Distinctive roadway markings (12.16.060)
- Remove, relocate or discontinue the operation of any traffic control device (12.16.070)
- Hours of operation of traffic control devices (12.16.080)
- Place markers, buttons, or signs within or adjacent to intersections (12.10.010)
- Restricted turn signs; left, right, and U turns (12.20.020 & 040)
- Crosswalks (12.36.010)
- No parking signs, red curb and other curb markings (12.40.030)
 - Zones require a resolution to amend the Muni Code which needs to be approved by CC
- Parking space markings (12.44.080)
- Parking prohibited on narrow streets (12.40.110)
- Loading zones (12.48.010)
- Bus loading zones (12.48.070)
- Traffic signal timing (12.64.030)
- Timed No Parking
 - Single property

Mobility Commission Creation, Appointments, and Powers and Duties

12.08.060 - Mobility commission created.

There is hereby created a mobility commission to consist of seven voting members. All seven voting members shall be residents of the city. Of the seven voting members, five shall be members of the general public. One member shall preferably have experience as a vulnerable road user, who frequently walk, ride a bicycle, or use another vulnerable non-car mode of transportation. One member shall preferably have significant experience with climate or environmental issues. The city public works director shall be a non-voting, advisory member of the commission. In addition, the city public works director, or his/her designee, shall serve as secretary to the commission. The chief of police, or his/her designee, shall serve as a non-voting, advisory member of the commission. The La Mesa Spring Valley and Grossmont High School Districts may each designate a non-voting advisory member.

(Ord. 2037 § 1, October 28, 1975; Ord. 1379, § 2.5, August 27, 1963; Ord. 2563 § 1; July 24, 1990; Ord. 2002-2722 § 3 (part); August 27, 2002; Ord. 2020-2883, § 1, November 24, 2020)

12.08.070 - Commission—Appointment.

Voting members of the mobility commission shall be appointed by the mayor with the approval of the city council.

(Ord. 1379 § 2.6; August 27, 1963; Ord. 2002-2722 § 3 (part); August 27, 2002; Ord. 2020-2883, § 2, November 24, 2020)

12.08.080 - Commission—Terms of office.

The term of office for each member appointed by the city council shall be four years, which shall commence on July 1 and terminate on June 30, four years thereafter. Member's terms shall be maintained so that not more than four terms expire in any given year and appointments may be made for less than a four-year term in order to accomplish that purpose.

(Ord. 2002-2722 § 3 (part); August 27, 2002; Ord. 2020-2883, § 3, November 24, 2020)

12.08.090 - Filling vacancies.

Each vacancy on the mobility commission shall be filled for the unexpired portion of the term vacated in the manner set forth in Section 12.08.070.

(Ord. 2002-2722 § 3 (part); August 27, 2002; Ord. 2020-2883, § 4, November 24, 2020)

12.08.100 - Expiration of terms.

In the event the reappointment in the manner set forth in Section 12.08.070 is not made upon the expiration of a term of office, a member shall continue in office until reappointment or until his/her successor is appointed and qualified.

(Ord. 2002-2722 § 3 (part); August 27, 2002)

12.08.110 - Statement of economic interests.

Each member as given in Section 12.08.060 shall comply with the provisions of the conflict of interest code of the city of La Mesa.

(Ord. 2002-2722 § 3 (part); August 27, 2002)

12.08.120 - Traffic commission—Powers and duties.

The mobility commission shall exercise the powers and duties as provided in this title and in the ordinances of the city. In addition, the commission may provide advice on other mobility issues as directed by the city council of the City of La Mesa and as set forth within the organization, rules, and procedures of the mobility commission.

Whenever the mobility commission is required or authorized to place or maintain official traffic control devices, said commission may cause such devices to be placed or maintained.

It shall be the further duty of the mobility commission to advise the City of La Mesa on mobility issues including, but not limited to, the implementation of neighborhood traffic calming activities, Vision Zero, and other plans for mobility improvements. The mobility commission shall also advise the City of La Mesa about the mobility elements of the climate action plan, concurrently and in coordination with the environmental sustainability commission.

(Ord. 2002-2722 § 3 (part); August 27, 2002; Ord. 2020-2883, § 5, November 24, 2020)

12.08.130 - Compensation.

All appointed members shall be paid such allowance as compensation for expenses incurred in their attendance at authorized meetings within the city of La Mesa as the council may from time to time fix by resolution.

(Ord. 2002-2722 § 3 (part); August 27, 2002)

12.08.140 - Study by members—Attendance at conferences.

The members of the mobility commission shall inform themselves on matters affecting the functions and duties of the commission. For that purpose, such members may attend meetings, conferences, or hearings on subjects or issues relating to traffic and mobility as authorized by the city council.

(Ord. 2002-2722 § 3 (part); August 27, 2002; Ord. 2020-2883, § 6, November 24, 2020)

12.08.150 - Travel expenses.

The reasonable travel expenses incidental to such attendance shall be charged upon the funds allocated by the city council for such purposes.

(Ord. 2002-2722 § 3 (part); August 27, 2002)

12.08.160 - Organization—Rules and procedures.

The mobility commission shall establish rules, regulations, and procedures consistent with the requirements of the law to govern their activity.

(Ord. 2002-2722 § 3 (part); August 27, 2002; Ord. 2020-2883, § 7, November 24, 2020)

12.08.170 - Absence and removal of members.

Members of the mobility commission who absent themselves from three consecutive regular meetings for any reason shall be recommended for removal from membership on the commission to the city council by the chairperson; however, said absentee commissioner has the right to appeal to the city council. The city council has the authority to appoint or remove any member of a commission at any time, for any or no reason, by a majority vote of the city council.

(Ord. 2002-2722 § 3 (part); August 27, 2002; Ord. 2020-2883, § 8, November 24, 2020)

12.08.180 - Decorum at meetings.

Members of the commission and persons in attendance at meetings of the commission shall conduct themselves in an orderly manner and in compliance with the commission's rules or, in the absence of such rules, with the rulings of the presiding officer respecting applause, noise making, and conduct. Any person found by the foregoing or to be disrupting the orderly progress of the meeting, shall be ordered by the presiding officer to remove himself or herself, and to remain barred, from the meeting at which such violation occurs.

(Ord. 2002-2722 § 3 (part); August 27, 2002)



NEIGHBORHOOD TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT PROGRAM

2021 Draft

Adopted by City Council
February 2004
Revised by City Council
August 2006

Department of Public Works
Engineering Division
8130 Allison Avenue
La Mesa, CA 91941
619-667-1166

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY i

ERRATA AND UPDATES SUMMARY ii

INTRODUCTION 1

GOALS 2

PROGRAM STRATEGIES 3

PROCEDURES 3

PHASE I 5

PHASE II 9

PHASE III 14

FUNDING 19

TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT PROGRAM UPDATE PROCESS/PROCEDURE
TO ADD OR DELETE NEW MEASURES OR METHODOLOGY 20

ALTERNATIVE TRAFFIC CALMING MEASURES NOT RECOMMENDED FOR USE 22

APPENDIX A - TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT PROGRAM PRIORITY SCORING WORKSHEET

APPENDIX B - TRAFFIC CALMING MEASURES REMOVAL PROCESS

APPENDIX C - PETITION—REQUEST TO REMOVE TRAFFIC CALMING MEASURE(S)

APPENDIX D – TRAFFIC CALMING TOOLBOX

APPENDIX E – SPEED HUMP INSTALLATION GUIDELINES

APPENDIX F – CURRENT (CALENDAR YEAR) WORK PLAN

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Throughout the City of La Mesa, vehicular traffic on neighborhood streets is a sensitive issue for residents. Routine speeding, abnormally high traffic volumes, and consistent failure to obey traffic control devices are examples of frustrating events that can be observed on a daily basis and cause residents to become alarmed about the safety of their neighborhoods and quality of life. When the tranquility of a residential neighborhood is disrupted regularly by drivers speeding and/or trying to find short-cuts, concerned citizens contact City officials, typically to request speed humps, a means of discouraging and slowing traffic that has been employed in recent years on neighborhood streets in the City of La Mesa.

Similar problems in California and throughout the country have inspired a group of engineering solutions called traffic calming measures, which are methods of reducing vehicle speeds or discouraging cut-through traffic, of which speed humps are one measure that has been successful in the right circumstances. With traffic calming in mind, the City Council has approved a citizen-based approach to managing traffic issues on residential streets, including the creation of a Traffic Commission and the formulation of a formal process for handling requests for traffic calming measures. The intent is to move away from a speed hump policy in response to traffic complaints on residential streets to a more comprehensive approach to neighborhood traffic calming based on similar programs in other cities.

The first requirement of the process is the support of residents in any neighborhood where such traffic calming is requested. Second, the calming measures must meet with the approval of emergency agencies concerned about response times, as well as the needs of other utilities whose large vehicles could be adversely affected by traffic calming measures. Finally, residents must be willing to live with the actual traffic calming measures designed to slow traffic and reduce cut-through traffic volumes in their neighborhood.

The program is divided into three phases: the first phase gathers data, investigates the severity of the problem through a ranking system and the implementation of some simple measures such as improved signage or striping; if the first phase does not prove effective, the second phase is a more intense study of the traffic problems and eligibility determination. In the third phase the stakeholders are met with, engineering solutions are developed, the preferred solution is chosen by the stakeholders; funding is allocated and the traffic calming measures are installed. After the measures have been installed further data is collected to assess their effectiveness.

UPDATES

1/30/2019: City Council approved the following changes to the NTMP:

1. Prohibit traffic calming on Arterial Classified Streets and add Fire Emergency Route Map requirement to NTMP process, in-lieu of individual street approval memos from the Fire Chief.
2. Except for large construction (Phase 3) items, the Annual Report shall serve as the primary approval mechanism.
3. Streets in Quadrant IV of matrix shall not receive any Phase 2 or Phase 3 Traffic Calming Measures and shall be removed from the list within five years, unless special circumstances are found to exist in the opinion of the City Engineer.
4. For Phase 3 Construction items less than \$25,000, support of Traffic Commission must be obtained, which is appealable to Council. If Phase 3 Construction cost for an individual street exceeds \$25,000, then Council approval is required.
5. Consolidated Phases II and III of the NTMP to be Design/Approval and Construction, respectively.
6. Removed second neighborhood petition from Phase 2 and instead used post Phase 1 speed and volume study as qualifier, unless it has been more than two (2) years from the date of the original petition.
7. When access to neighboring streets is not possible without driving over the speed humps, City Engineer may extend the boundary of homeowners eligible to vote to such neighboring streets.
- 8.

CITY OF LA MESA NEIGHBORHOOD TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT PROGRAM

INTRODUCTION

Increasingly, on many neighborhood streets La Mesa residents are faced with the presence of speeding vehicles and/or undesirable cut-through traffic. In the past several years, La Mesa streets have experienced escalating traffic impacts due to demographic changes and population growth in the surrounding communities. It is not surprising, therefore, that an increasing number of citizens have expressed concerns to City officials, the Police Department and Department of Public Works staff about these traffic problems. Requests for traffic calming measures and increased police enforcement of speed limits and traffic control devices are growing at a rate that is stretching the City's capacity to manage the problem effectively, which has created the need for a formal set of procedures for dealing with neighborhood traffic issues.

La Mesa residents are not unique in voicing such concerns. Cities throughout the United States have struggled with the issue of escalating traffic speeds and volumes on residential streets. As a result, citizens have reacted by asking that their neighborhood quality of life be improved through a reduction of vehicle speeds and volume and that safety thus be enhanced. At issue

are the simple pleasures of being able to walk or ride bicycles through their neighborhoods without jeopardizing their safety, a key factor in neighborhood livability.

"Livable" cannot be precisely defined as it relates to community or neighborhood. However, the residents' expectation that fewer vehicles should be speeding down neighborhood streets is an indication of their desire to reside in a livable neighborhood. Characteristics of such a desirable neighborhood include:

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY..... i

ERRATA AND UPDATES SUMMARY ii

INTRODUCTION 1

GOALS 2

PROGRAM STRATEGIES 3

PROCEDURES..... 3

PHASE I..... 5

PHASE II..... 9

PHASE III..... 14

FUNDING 19

TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT PROGRAM UPDATE PROCESS/PROCEDURE
TO ADD OR DELETE NEW MEASURES OR METHODOLOGY 20

ALTERNATIVE TRAFFIC CALMING MEASURES NOT RECOMMENDED FOR USE 22

APPENDIX A - TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT PROGRAM PRIORITY SCORING WORKSHEET

APPENDIX B - TRAFFIC CALMING MEASURES REMOVAL PROCESS

APPENDIX C - PETITION—REQUEST TO REMOVE TRAFFIC CALMING MEASURE(S)

APPENDIX D – TRAFFIC CALMING TOOLBOX

APPENDIX E – SPEED HUMP INSTALLATION GUIDELINES

APPENDIX F – CURRENT (CALENDAR YEAR) WORK PLAN

- a sense of community
- a safe place to walk or bicycle
- interaction among neighbors

- a general feeling of security and safety
- the opportunity for residents to enjoy their homes and property

Traffic calming is a term that has, in recent years, become synonymous with providing the means to slow vehicles, reduce cut-through traffic volumes and help achieve a livable community. Through the use of a variety of measures, physical or otherwise, traffic calming helps reduce the undesirable effects of the motor vehicle in residential neighborhoods. The Institute of Transportation Engineers, an international organization of transportation professionals, has defined traffic calming as:

"The combination of mainly physical measures that reduces the negative effects of motor vehicle use, alters driver behavior and improves conditions for non-motorized street users."

In response to the concerns of La Mesa residents, the City Council has established the La Mesa Neighborhood Traffic Management Program, referred to as the Traffic Management Program, based on similar programs in other cities, with an eye toward using traffic calming measures to address neighborhood concerns about unwanted traffic. The La Mesa Neighborhood Traffic Management Program is designed to have significant neighborhood involvement. City staff plans to work closely with residents to identify problems and their solutions and to gather the support necessary to ensure the success of any traffic calming plan that may merit adoption. Communication with the residents at each step is critical and the urgency of plan development will not be allowed to override the need for thorough understanding, commitment and approval by the neighborhood.

Since neighborhood involvement is the key, the program is designed to solicit and encourage residents' active participation in identifying concerns, developing reasonable solutions and supporting the final outcome. In the traffic engineering field, the manner in which this occurs is a process that contains the elements of the "5 E's" – Education, Engineering, Enforcement, Encouragement and Evaluation. Each element of the "5 E's" is traditionally incorporated into solutions to traffic problems.

By utilizing the "5E" process, which incorporates a comprehensive, integrated involvement of concerned residents, the challenge of identifying and resolving problems can successfully take place.

The basic elements of the 5E process include:

- Education: Providing resource materials and information to residents to inform them about all aspects of traffic calming.
- Engineering: Physical measures and other techniques utilized in the traffic calming program that are based upon input and concurrence by residents, engineering principles, and financial and environmental considerations.
- Enforcement: Police presence and selective enforcement of vehicle code violations.
- Encouragement: Encourage drivers to drive slowly in residential areas and to use collectors and arterial roads instead of cutting through neighborhoods using local roads.
- Evaluation: Obtain traffic data following installation of physical traffic calming measures to evaluate their effectiveness.

It is the policy of the State of California that all persons have an equal right to use public streets and that no agency may restrict the use of streets to only certain individuals. With certain exceptions provided for in the California Vehicle Code, the specific authority to regulate travel upon streets can only occur in specific instances related to:

- Implementation of the Circulation Element of the General Plan
- Criminal activity
- Regulating or prohibiting processions or assemblages
- Streets dividing school grounds to protect students attending such schools or school grounds

Requests to implement the Traffic Management Program will ultimately be considered through a process outlined in this program. Careful consideration will be given to each request to ensure that it meets State law and the criteria contained in the program.

GOALS

The City Council has established the La Mesa Neighborhood Traffic Management Program to help improve the quality of life for La Mesa residents by reducing excessive traffic and/or higher than normal vehicle speeds in their neighborhoods. With a defined traffic calming process and established procedures contained in this document, La Mesa residents will have the measures and techniques ("tools") at their disposal to avert many negative impacts associated with vehicular traffic on residential streets.

The goals of a traffic calming program include:

- Improving the quality of life in the neighborhood
- Creating safe streets by reducing the collision frequency and severity
- Reducing negative effects of motorized vehicles

To further enhance the goal of calming a street by neutralizing the negative situation causing the problem, some basic principles apply:

- Safety is the primary issue. Protection of vulnerable street users must occur through traffic calming
- Community-based planning of traffic calming must take place
- A degree of self-enforcement of regulations is needed through design
- Driver behavior must be affected by traffic calming

PROGRAM STRATEGIES

The City of La Mesa strives to achieve neighborhood livability through implementation of current standards and policies. Managing traffic is a key component in this endeavor and one that is vital in promoting characteristics of livable neighborhoods. Therefore, strategies are needed to identify and address issues revolving around speeding, excessive volumes and safety concerns on residential streets when it occurs. These strategies include:

- Developing recommendations that adhere to State law
- Satisfactorily addressing legal and liability issues

- Preserving reasonable emergency vehicle access and response time consistent with response standards
- Maintaining reasonable vehicular access
- Promoting neighborhood safety for pedestrians, bicyclists, motorists and residents
- Encouraging and incorporating citizen participation in identifying traffic calming measures and techniques
- Through prioritization of traffic calming requests, utilizing City resources efficiently
- Utilizing a combination of education, engineering, enforcement, encouragement and evaluation (5E's)
- Maintaining, encouraging and enhancing pedestrian, bicycle, transit and alternative modes of travel
- Balancing on-street needs (such as parking) with the reasonable and safe function of the street
- Considering achievable options for funding

PROCEDURES


The procedures to implement traffic calming measures and techniques are described on the following pages and are referred to as phases. In general, the established procedures are consistent with the methodology currently used in La Mesa to address any traffic-related concerns. The procedures require, and are designed to encourage, substantial neighborhood participation, following the process used by staff to formulate solutions to problem locations and the methods for proposing those solutions to the Traffic Commission and City Council for final resolution.

The La Mesa Neighborhood Traffic Management Program has been crafted as a three-phase program, consisting of the following structure approach:

- Phase I (Data, Ranking, Signage & Striping)
- Phase II (Design & Approval)
- Phase III (Construction)

The program is designed in such a way that residents of each street with identified problems, and with neighborhood support and commitment, can play a part in the program. Yearly funding is established by the City Council and a priority ranking of streets eligible for mitigation measures channels efforts and resources to those streets where traffic calming is most needed and will have the greatest beneficial effect.

PHASE I TRAFFIC REQUEST PROCEDURES



PHASE I (Data, Ranking, Signage & Striping)

When a group of residents (neighborhood) have a traffic-related concern that they believe should be addressed by the Traffic Management Program, the process will be initiated in the following manner.

Step 1 Written Request and Petition

A petition is sent to the Engineering Division of the Department of Public Works by a representative of the neighborhood requesting that staff investigate and resolves the traffic concern identified in the petition. The petition must include name, address, phone and, if available, e-mail address of the representative and the signatures of at least 10 residents or 25% of the households, whichever is greater.

Step 2 Traffic Request Procedure

Upon receipt of the correspondence, staff writes a Traffic Request that includes the information contained in the petition. The Traffic Request is an internal logging and tracking system in the Engineering Division used to initiate action and file correspondence. An engineer then is assigned to investigate and conduct an engineering study of the street(s).

Step 3 Investigation/Studies

Staff gathers preliminary data about the expressed concern and/or review the existing available data. Field reviews and appropriate traffic studies may be conducted. They may include:

- Geometric conditions of the road
- Volume counts
- Parking availability/restrictions
- Pedestrian counts
- Location of existing traffic control devices
- Collision analysis
- Speed surveys
- Other studies as determined appropriate

Traffic education, enforcement, and operational improvement strategies that are less restrictive engineering solutions will be formulated after the data is collected.

Step 4 Ranking the request using the Priority Scoring Worksheet

Referencing the collected traffic and site data, the request is ranked using the Priority Scoring Worksheet and the Matrix. The ranked streets are placed in order of priority on the Phase I traffic calming list. Each year the new requests will be incorporated into the list based on their priority scoring.

Using the Priority Scoring Worksheet, criteria and points assigned are as follows:

1. Travel Speed (maximum 40 points):
10 points for each mile per hour the 85th percentile speed is over the base speed. The base speed is defined as the prima facie speed limit plus 7 miles per hour.
2. Traffic Volumes (maximum 30 points):

One point is assigned to each 100 vehicles per day or to each 10 vehicles per peak hour. It is calculated by dividing the typical weekday average daily traffic by 100 and rounding it to the nearest whole number, or dividing the weekday peak hour volume by 10 and rounding it to the nearest whole number.

3. Collision History (maximum 10 points):
One point each will be assigned to a correctable collision on a street, including those occurring at intersections, within the past five years. A correctable collision is one that might have been prevented by the installation of a traffic control device or traffic calming measure.
4. Sidewalks (maximum 5 points):
5 points if no sidewalk or pedestrian pathway exists along at least one side of the street.
0 points if a sidewalk or pedestrian pathway is located on at least one side of the street.
5. School Proximity (5 points maximum):
5 points if school grounds abut the candidate street.
3 points if the project area of influence is within 500 feet of school grounds.
1 point if the project area of influence is located within 1,000 feet of school grounds.
6. Pedestrian Crossings (10 points maximum):
5 points if a school crosswalk (yellow crosswalk) is located on a street in the project area of influence.
10 points if a major crosswalk is located on a street in the project area of influence. A major crosswalk is defined as having 10 or more pedestrians crossing per hour during any eight hours of a typical weekday.

A maximum total of 100 points may be given for the street under consideration, using the Traffic Management Program Priority Scoring Worksheet. See Appendix A for the worksheet.

Using the Matrix, the four quadrants are determined using the following criteria:

1. Upper left quadrant is for streets where the 85th %tile speed is at least 7 mph over the speed limit AND the volume exceeds 50% of the target volume.

Step 5 Prepare Phase I Recommendations

The highest ranked streets will proceed to Step 5 of Phase I. The data collected and the existing street conditions will be utilized to determine preliminary engineering recommendations prior to selection of traffic calming measures from the traffic calming tool box. Typical recommendations will include additional signage and striping. Additional traffic enforcement will also be requested from the Police Department.

Step 6 Review by the Traffic Advisory Committee

The request, data, and Phase I recommendations will be presented to the Traffic Advisory Committee for other department's input into the issues and to fine tune the recommendations

Step 7 Approval

Since large construction is not performed during Phase I, Traffic Commission need not approve Phase I recommendations. Staff shall use the Annual Report as the primary approval mechanism.

Step 8 Issue Work Order

Work orders will be generated as approved to implement the recommendations.

Step 9 Communication with Residents


The residents will be informed of the outcome and the Phase I recommendations. They will also be told that the results will be monitored and if determined to be unsuccessful the street will proceed into Phase II.

Step 10 Monitor Results

Six to twelve months after the Phase I measures have been installed new data will be collected. The new data will be compared to the old data and if it is determined by the City Engineer that the Phase I measures have not adequately addressed the problem the street will enter into Phase II of the program.

PHASE II TRAFFIC REQUEST PROCEDURES

(Request can only proceed to Phase II after Phase I has been implemented and found to not adequately address the traffic problem.)



PHASE II (DESIGN & APPROVAL)

If Phase I options do not adequately address the problem after being in place for an appropriate amount of time as determined by the City Engineer, Phase II of the Traffic Management Program may be considered upon review and recommendation by the City Engineer consistent with current workloads. The decision to implement Phase II will be predicated upon further consultation with the Traffic Advisory Committee.

Step 1 Post Phase 1 Speed and Volume Study or Written Request

When Phase 1 has been implemented and a reasonable time has passed, a post-Phase 1 speed and volume study shall be performed. City Engineer and Staff will use this data to qualify a street for Phase 2. If two or more years have passed, then Phase II may be initiated when the affected residents send a Phase II request letter to the Engineering Division. The letter will be generated by the residents following discussions with the City Engineer, study of Police Department results of Phase I, and anticipation of what might be accomplished through further utilization of the Traffic Management Program process.

Step 2 Eligibility Determination

To participate in Phase II and ultimately Phase III of the Traffic Management Program, residents must reside on the street or streets where the concerns exist. These streets must meet the minimum qualifying criteria to be candidates for a future traffic calming project. Not all residential streets and/or residential areas will qualify to participate in the La Mesa Neighborhood Traffic Management Program. Eligibility criteria for a street are as follows:

1. Completion of Phase I of the Traffic Management Program; and
2. Posted speed limit on candidate street(s) of 25 miles per hour or less; and
3. The 85th percentile speed (critical speed) is greater than 5 miles per hour over the posted speed limit; or
4. The street is subject to cut-through traffic. Cut-through traffic on the candidate street is determined to be either greater than 30% of the daily weekday total street volume or greater than 30% of the total weekday peak hour traffic volume; and
5. The candidate street is not a primary emergency response route indicated on the Fire Emergency Route Map; and
6. The street has no more than two lanes; and
7. Residences are located on at least one side of the street or there is a school or public facility on the street; and
8. The curb-to-curb width on the candidate street is 40 feet or less; and
9. The candidate street is not an Arterial Classified street; and
10. The candidate street must be in Quadrant I unless all Quadrant I projects are completed and that street ranks all other street segments in the Matrix. Furthermore, streets in Quadrant IV of the matrix shall be removed from the street ranking Matrix if no special circumstances exist (in the opinion of the City Engineer) within five (5) years.

Each of the eight eligibility criteria must be met for a street to be considered for further processing through the Traffic Management Program. However, on a case-by-case basis the City Engineer may determine exceptions. To be considered as an exception a street must be approved by the Traffic Commission.

Streets not meeting the eligibility criteria but considered candidates for exception for traffic calming measures by the City Engineer will be scheduled for review and possible approval by the Traffic Commission. If the Commission's review leads to the conclusion that the street merits an exception, it will be processed through the Traffic Management Program as if it met all qualifying criteria.

Step 4 Determine Project Area of Influence

The street or streets impacted by neighborhood concerns or potential solutions, including all dwelling units or other land uses bordering the subject street or streets, comprise the project area of influence. The City Engineer will determine the project area of influence, with input from neighborhood representatives. It is determined by the length of street, including parallel streets and their length, that would be influenced by any Traffic Management Program installations. Residents of dwelling units or property owners of vacant land within the boundaries of the project area of influence are considered to be stakeholders.

Step 5 Neighborhood Support Petition

A Phase II petition must be signed by the stakeholders in order for the request to be advanced. Documentation of support for consideration of a project is indicated by a simple majority (50% plus one signature) of those eligible individuals located within the project area of influence that sign the petition. Non City-provided petition forms will not be accepted.

All residents of dwelling units and/or business owners and property owners of vacant land within the project area of influence are eligible to sign the support petition. However, only one signature per vacant property, business or dwelling unit will be counted and permitted in the petition process since those individuals influence, and are impacted by, street operations. All non-resident owners will be notified of all public meetings so that they have the opportunity to express their views.

Step 6 Project Priority Ranking Criteria and Scoring Process

The Phase I score will be re-used to rank the Phase II candidate streets. All streets that have been evaluated and assigned scores shall be included on the priority list. Streets with the most points will be considered the highest ranked projects, eligible for future funding by the City of La Mesa.

Step 7 Annual Review by the Traffic Commission

On a yearly basis, the Traffic Commission will review the list of all candidate streets with priority rankings based upon the priority scoring worksheet detailed in Step 6 above. The review will take place at a noticed public meeting. Further, each individual or group that initiated a project for evaluation will be notified of the meeting in writing. Upon review of the City Engineer's recommendation, and after considering all public input, the Traffic Commission will recommend a priority listing of candidate streets to be forwarded to the City Council for approval.

Step 8 City Council Approval

The City Council will review and, if in concurrence, approve the priority listing of traffic calming projects established by the Traffic Commission and this list will establish priorities for City funding in order of the projects' ranking. Funding availability will depend upon resources available in the yearly operating budget.

Step 9 Ranked Projects Remain Eligible for Three Years

Each year, new projects in the approval pipeline will be assigned points and placed on a priority list in accordance with the established process. Traffic calming projects will remain on the priority list for three years, during which time they will be eligible for funding consideration. During this period of eligibility, projects could move up or down in the ranking as new projects are added to the priority list in the order their point totals warrant.

Prior to a project's final year on the priority list, its point total will be updated according to the latest information available and it will assume a place on the priority list according to that reworked total. At the end of the third year, any project still not qualifying for funding will be removed from the list if an extension in time is not requested.

A one-time, two year extension of time for a project to remain on the priority list may be requested by the project area of influence representative. This written request should be sent to the City Engineer and must be accompanied by a City-prepared petition signed by individuals in the project area of influence. The petition, signed by a simple majority (50% plus one signature) of eligible individuals located within the project area of influence, must indicate support of having the project remain on the priority list an additional two years (for a total of five years, maximum). Without that support, the project will be removed from the priority list after three years.

A project that has not received funding after five years will be removed from the priority list. One year after a project fails to receive funding and is removed from the priority list, the community representative for that project may request that it be considered for restoration to the list. Such requests must be made at the time the next cycle of projects is submitted for the annual review by the Traffic Commission. A petition, as described above, should be resubmitted.

The street eligibility priority life cycle will follow the following timeline:

Priority list Evaluation by Traffic Commission.

Priority list Approval by the City Council.

Begin Year 1 (July 1st – June 30th) – street placed on priority list by City Council. Year 1 begins upon City Council approval.



April or May – Priority list evaluated by Traffic Commission. Points total updated prior to the end of the year, and a new priority ranking established.

June – Priority list Approval by the City Council.

End Fiscal Year (June 30th) – street remains on priority list.



April or May – same as prior year

June – same as prior year

End Fiscal Year 2 (June 30th) – street remains on priority list, points total updated prior to the end of Year 2 and a new priority ranking established.



April or May – same as prior year.

June – same as prior year.

End Fiscal Year 3 (June 30th) – street did not receive funding, dropped from the priority list, unless a one-time two year extension is requested.




April or May – Priority list evaluated by Traffic Commission. Points total updated prior to the end of year, and a new priority ranking established.

June – Priority list Approval by the City Council

End Fiscal Year 4 (June 30th) – street not on list, reviewed by the Traffic Commission. If the city Council approves, the street is restored to the priority list (Year 1 begins upon City Council approval)

**PHASE III TRAFFIC REQUEST PROCEDURES
(After completion of Phase II)**



PHASE III (CONSTRUCTION)

Upon completion of Phase II, each qualified project will have a priority ranking. Prior to the new fiscal year beginning July 1 of each year, a traffic calming funding level will be established and approved by the City Council during the annual capital improvement budget process. Some of the highest ranked projects then will be eligible for funding and construction in accordance with the following process.

Step 1 Meeting with the Neighborhood

All individuals from the project area of influence will be invited to individual neighborhood meetings. At the meeting, staff will explain to those in attendance the Phase III process that may lead to installation of the traffic calming measures proposed for their neighborhoods. Discussion will include:

- Neighborhood concerns
- Traffic data gathered
- Results from Phase I
- Potential solutions
- Funding availability
- Petition process
- Installation of temporary measures
- Traffic calming plan development process
- Before and after traffic study process

A Fire Department representative will attend the meeting to explain response needs of the emergency service providers and any concerns the Fire Department has with potential traffic calming on the candidate street. Also, a Police Department representative will attend the meeting to respond to questions about enforcement issues.

Staff will ask that a neighborhood group be formed from volunteers residing within the project area of influence. Staff and the residents attending the meeting will determine the committee membership.

Acting as the liaison with their neighborhood, this committee will be comprised of up to five residents. Committee members will meet with Engineering Division staff and appropriate representatives from other City departments to develop the conceptual traffic calming plan. The committee will be expected to present the plan to the neighborhood.

Step 2 Develop the Conceptual Neighborhood Traffic Calming Plan

By meeting and working closely with the neighborhood group, staff will be able to assist the committee in:

- Assessing their needs
- Identifying alternatives
- Developing initial plans or solutions
- Finalizing the comprehensive plan based upon
 - Sound engineering principles
 - Neighborhood input
 - State-of-the-art traffic calming practices
 - Funding availability
 - Maintenance cost

Throughout design development of the conceptual plan, all residents within the project area of influence will be provided updates and will be encouraged to offer input. The neighborhood group will be actively involved in all aspects of developing the comprehensive neighborhood traffic calming plan and will be expected to commit the time and effort needed to develop a successful plan.

The length of time needed to develop the conceptual plan is dependent upon the complexity of the issues, the level of neighborhood support, project cost and the willingness of the neighborhood group to aggressively pursue plan development. The series of meetings leading to completion of a final conceptual plan for presentation to the neighborhood could take six months or longer.

Step 3 Mail Support Survey for Final Conceptual Plan

A mail support survey will be conducted by City staff upon completion of the conceptual plan developed by the neighborhood group and evidence of a generally favorable consensus on the plan by interested residents. The purpose of the survey will be to determine if the neighborhood project area of influence is in favor of the proposed plan by a simple majority (50% plus one).

Individuals within the project area of influence will be included in the survey, essentially following the eligibility procedures addressed in Phase II, Step 5. If necessary, and as determined by the City Engineer based upon the proposed conceptual traffic calming plan, additional properties may be included by expanding the boundaries of the project area of influence. The expanded project area of influence will become the new project area of influence for purposes of the survey and other communications with residents affected by the proposed traffic calming project.

Distribution of the support survey will be conducted by the City through the mail. The survey will be considered valid if a minimum of 40% of those contacted fill out and return the survey. Staff will then analyze the returns to determine if 67% or more of the project area of influence community responding supports proceeding to the final plans, specifications and estimates (Preliminary Survey & Engineering) stage and for the installation of temporary features. Staff will notify by mail all individuals within the project area of influence of the survey results and the next steps in the process.

If 40% of the surveys are not returned, an outreach program must be developed by the neighborhood group with the assistance of staff. Re-survey will occur after all steps established in the outreach program are completed.

A re-survey will be valid if 40% or more of the surveys are returned to staff. If the plan is not approved by 67% or more of the returned surveys, the neighborhood group may develop an alternative plan or abandon their efforts. A revised conceptual plan, after an appropriate outreach program, will be tested by the support survey process in this step. If a conceptual plan fails to garner support of the residents in the project area of influence after the second survey, no further surveys will be conducted by City staff for a minimum of one year.

Step 4 Environmental Review

Upon confirming the neighborhood support for the proposed conceptual plan, staff will initiate environmental review of the proposed project through the City of La Mesa Planning Department. Generally, traffic calming improvements proposed within the existing street right-of-way are found to be exempt from detailed environmental review.

Step 5 Complete Final Design

Final design of the traffic calming plan can be started by staff concurrent with processing the environmental document. However, the final plan cannot be completed beyond the 30% stage until environmental certification is received. Depending upon the complexity of the final plan, a consultant may be hired by the City. After completion of the final design, staff may initiate installation of temporary measures to simulate the effect of the proposed permanent traffic calming measures. The Police and Fire Departments will have considerable input during the final design.

Step 6 Install Temporary Measures (if necessary)

Temporary measures may be installed to further assess community support for traffic calming and to determine the impact upon traffic. The initial installation of measures will be low cost and is not intended to necessarily be visually pleasing or improve neighborhood aesthetics. However, the temporary measures will simulate the conditions of the proposed permanent measures and will enable staff to collect traffic data after their installation for comparison with data collected prior to installation.

Temporary measures, if used, must remain in place for a sufficient time period to enable a valid assessment of their influence or impact upon traffic. A test within six months will be conducted by staff.

If it is determined that diversion of traffic to other residential streets occurs because of the temporary traffic calming measures, those properties will be included in the final approval survey. A threshold of 30% or more diverted trips to other residential streets will initiate inclusion of the properties into the "expanded" project area of influence.

Under some scenarios, it may not be appropriate or feasible to install temporary traffic calming measures. When this situation arises, the Phase III process will proceed to Step 8 in-lieu of Steps 6 and 7.

Step 7 Communicate Results of Temporary Measures (if necessary)

Upon completion of the test installation period, final results will be presented to individuals in the project area of influence. A meeting may be held with the neighborhood to share the results or results may be mailed, including any concerns expressed by the Police and/or Fire Department. Before and after traffic data and staff recommendations will be communicated to the residents.

Step 8 Mail Final Approval Survey

Staff will conduct by mail the final approval survey of the proposed traffic calming plan simulated by the temporary measures. The survey area will include the project area of influence plus other properties determined to be impacted by diverted trips, as specified in Step 6. Approval will be the go-ahead for final, permanent installation of the proposed traffic calming measures. In the final approval survey, each dwelling unit, business or vacant property owner will be entitled to one vote. Non-resident owners of residential housing will not be eligible to vote, but will be notified of the appropriate meetings at the Traffic Commission and City Council.

Significant support for the installation of the proposed traffic calming measures must be indicated by those being surveyed. Consequently, at least 67% of the eligible surveys returned must indicate acceptance for permanent installation of traffic calming measures before Step 9 is initiated.

Step 9 Final Determination by the Traffic Commission

All individuals within the project area of influence, or expanded project area of influence, will be informed of a public meeting to be held by the Traffic Commission to hear the recommendations for the traffic calming project. Public testimony will be taken. Final recommendation(s) of the Traffic Commission will be forwarded to the City Council. If the Phase III Construction cost for an individual street is less than \$25,000, then it need only be approved by Council. This is subject to appeal to Council at any time.

Step 10 Final Approval by the City Council

If the Phase III Construction cost exceeds \$25,000 then it must be approved by Council. A duly noticed public meeting will be held by the City Council to receive the recommendations of the Traffic Commission for the final traffic calming project and to hear public testimony on the matter. If Council decides the project is acceptable, it will so indicate by adopting an appropriate resolution, thus taking the first step toward installation of the project. If the Council does not support the proposal, staff may be directed to abandon the plan, or to return to the neighborhood for refinement of the plan, or to take no further action.

Step 11 Project Installation (Construction)

Construction of the approved project, in most cases, will be performed by a licensed contractor selected through the City's formal construction bidding process. After a contractor is selected by the City, individuals within the project area of influence will be notified of the construction schedule.

Step 12 Project Monitoring

Traffic calming projects that have been constructed will be monitored for effectiveness during the first year following completion of the installation. An annual report will be provided to the Traffic Commission at the end of each of the first two years of the completed traffic calming project. In the report, staff will provide traffic data results, accident history, observed deficiencies and/or impacts of the traffic calming measures, comments, suggestions or complaints received, and staff recommendations. All recommendations provided by the Traffic Commission will be forwarded to the City Council.

Individuals within the project area of influence will be notified of the availability of the annual reports for their review. If it should happen that some residents of the neighborhood believe that the traffic calming measures, impacts and results do not meet their expectations, they may request removal of the permanent measures. The request for removal must follow the Traffic Calming Measures Removal Process which is outlined in Appendix B.

FUNDING

La Mesa recognizes the different fiscal needs, priorities and abilities of residents concerned with improving neighborhood livability on public streets. In general, improvements or alterations to an existing street fully widened and improved to City standards is the responsibility of the City of La Mesa. As such, it is intended that all costs directly associated with the planning, design and implementation of the Traffic Management Program will be borne by the City.

Funds available for use in a traffic calming project will be determined through the City's annual budget process. Many different fiscal factors must be considered to establish if and to what level funds will be allocated for projects on the priority list. Staff will recommend a funding level and the City Council will consider and adopt the annual budget before fiscal year end June 30.

PRIVATE FINANCING

As an alternative to the City of La Mesa paying for installation of the approved neighborhood traffic calming plan, residents may collect funds themselves in any manner they chose equitable to pay for the project cost. This private funding must be for 100% of all construction costs associated with the approved project. Private funds must be deposited with the City prior to competitive bids being solicited to construct the project. Privately funded projects may move ahead of other projects on the approved priority list.

Traffic Management Program Update Process/Procedure to Add or Delete New Measures or Methodology

It is intended that the La Mesa Neighborhood Traffic Management Program be dynamic and subject to change. Traffic calming measures, techniques and/or methodologies continue to evolve. What was once in favor and popular to implement may have been subsequently found by agencies to be undesirable, unworkable or unacceptable to the neighborhood.

Revisions to the Traffic Management Program are expected. When revisions are suggested, a formal review and approval process of the revision(s) will be followed.

Steps in the revision/update process are as follows:

Step 1 Initiation of Revision

A change or revision may be initiated by the City Council, staff or a citizen. It is suggested that the requested revision be made in writing, with the reasons for or intent of the revision clearly stated. A compelling reason to initiate the update process or to change the process must be offered to be favorably received.

Step 2 Review by Staff

Suggested revisions will be thoroughly researched and reviewed by staff to determine if they are appropriate for inclusion in the Traffic Management Program. The Traffic Advisory Committee will be consulted and, as necessary, comments from stakeholders will be solicited. Changes to traffic calming measures, procedures or methodologies will only be considered by the Traffic Commission once a year, unless such measures, procedures or methodologies are determined to be illegal.

Step 3 Response to Initiator

Staff will respond in writing to the individual proposing the revisions, commenting on their suitability or requesting additional information as needed. Revisions deemed unacceptable by staff will not be processed further. Revisions recommended by staff for further consideration will be scheduled for discussion at a Traffic Commission meeting. Only those suggested revisions that significantly enhance the overall Traffic Management Program will be considered for acceptance and submitted to the Traffic Commission.

Step 4 Review by the Traffic Commission

All revisions proposed during any 12-month period will be reviewed by the Traffic Commission at the end of such period. The recommendations of the Traffic Commission on all such proposed revisions will be forwarded to the City Council. The Traffic Commission review meetings will be duly noticed and open to the public for their input on revisions or changes.

Step 5 Review and Approval by the City Council

In a public meeting, the City Council will consider the recommendations of the Traffic Commission. Staff may be directed by the Council either to implement the revisions to the program and the supporting documents or to take no action on the requested revision. Noticing procedures for the Council meeting will be the same as for the Traffic Commission meeting and all interested residents will be encouraged to attend the Council meeting to make their opinions known.

Proposed revisions will not interfere with or delay the processing of a neighborhood traffic calming program in progress. A neighborhood that has started development of its traffic calming program will continue the process without change.

Alternative Traffic Calming Measures Not Recommended for Use

Several traffic calming measures that have been applied elsewhere may not be appropriate for use in La Mesa. Listed following are measures not recommended for installation on public streets and, therefore, not proposed for consideration as part of a neighborhood traffic calming project.

One-Way Street

A one-way street may encourage increased speeds and may result in additional traffic volumes on a nearby street due to diverted traffic. On a residential street, confusion and wrong-way travel may result, as a one-way street is not a typical encounter for drivers when leaving a single-family residence.

STOP Signs

As a traffic calming measure, STOP signs are not appropriate. Reductions to vehicle speed only occur within about 150' - 200' of the STOP sign and there is a relatively insignificant impact on mid-block speed reduction. Increased noise and air pollution emissions occur at the STOP sign location due to vehicle braking and acceleration patterns. Frustration of residents can increase when vehicles are observed to ignore or slowly roll through the STOP sign without completely stopping.

STOP signs are intended to assign the right-of-way to vehicles and pedestrians and should only be used when meeting City of La Mesa Guidelines for STOP sign installation.

Miscellaneous Non-Standard Devices

Signs and/or striping not recognized by the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) and supplemented by the State of California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) as an official traffic control device shall not be used in the public right-of-way. These signs typically include CHILDREN AT PLAY, SLOW and others. Non-official signs are of the novelty type, many have messages that are misinterpreted by drivers, have no legal meaning and their use can expose the City to tort liability. These types of signs do not command the attention or respect of drivers that are repeat users of the street. Using signs that are not officially approved may give a false sense of security to residents. Additionally, the signs raise expectations that some degree of protection is provided through their use when, in reality, this is not the case.

Cul-de-Sacs and Road Closures

Streets have been designed and constructed to facilitate multiple points of egress for the residents and multiple ways for an emergency vehicle to respond to an incident. Basic circulation patterns are intended to remain. Streets will not be truncated through the construction of a barrier to cause a road closure or by converting the end of the street into a cul-de-sac through construction of a turnaround.

APPENDIX A

Traffic Management Program Priority Scoring Worksheet

This worksheet will be completed by City of La Mesa staff. It will be used to assign points to a street for prioritization of a potential specific neighborhood traffic calming project.

Name of neighborhood (street location): _____

	Points
<p>1. Travel Speed (40 pts. max.) For each mile per hour the 85th percentile speed is over the base speed, 10 points will be assigned. Base speed is 7 miles per hour over the prima facie speed limit. 85th Percentile Speed: _____ Date Measured: _____ Prima Facia Speed: _____ Base Speed: _____</p>	_____
<p>2. Traffic Volumes (30 pts. max.) Total weekday ADT divided by 100, rounded to nearest whole number or weekday peak hour volume divided by 10, rounded to nearest whole number (use higher number) Volume: _____ (vpd or vph) Date Counted: _____</p>	_____
<p>3. Collision History (10 pts. max.) One point for each correctable collision during the past 5 years Number of collisions: _____ Period: _____</p>	_____
<p>4. Sidewalks (5 pts. max.) No sidewalk or pedestrian pathway exists along at least one side of the street = 5 points A sidewalk or pedestrian pathway exists on at least one side of the Street = 0 points</p>	_____
<p>5. School Proximity (5 pts. max.) School grounds abut candidate street = 5 points PAOI is located within 500 feet of school grounds = 3 points PAOI is located within 1,000 feet of school grounds = 1 point</p>	_____
<p>6. Pedestrian Crossings (10 pts. max.) School crosswalk (yellow crosswalk) is located on a street in the PAOI = 5 points Major crosswalk is located on a street in the PAOI = 10 points</p>	_____
<p>Total Score:</p>	_____
<p>Comments:</p>	_____

 Evaluator Date

Traffic Calming Measures Removal Process

Individuals within a neighborhood may determine that one or more traffic calming measures should be removed. If so, a City-provided petition favoring removal and signed by 80% of the eligible individuals within the project area of influence or expanded project area of influence, if applicable, must be sent to staff. Eligibility criteria for signing the petition will be the same as for previously indicated voting procedures (one signature per household or property). A sample petition is provided on the next page for use by the neighborhood contact person to collect signatures.

Staff will review the petition, determine if the 80% threshold is met and notify all residents within the project area of influence of the results. No removal petition will be accepted by staff during the test period when temporary measures are being tested.

If the petition has 80% or more valid signatures, it will be submitted to the Traffic Commission for consideration. All individuals within the project area of influence will be notified in writing of the meeting and will have the opportunity to address the Commission with their concerns. The Traffic Commission recommendation, whether to deny or sustain the removal petition, will be forwarded to the City Council.

All residents within the neighborhood project area of influence will be notified by mail of the date when the City Council will consider their request for removal of the traffic calming measure(s). Each interested resident will have the opportunity to address the City Council. A final decision will be made by the City Council based upon staff input, Traffic Commission recommendations and citizen comments. As appropriate, staff will initiate action on the City Council's decision. All residents within the project area of influence will be notified of the City Council decision by mail.

PETITION

**REQUEST TO REMOVE TRAFFIC CALMING MEASURE(S)
LA MESA NEIGHBORHOOD TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT PROGRAM**

CONTACT PERSON: _____ DATE: _____

CONTACT PERSON ADDRESS: _____

CONTACT PERSON TELEPHONE, FAX, and E-Mail: _____

The undersigned state they that they are requesting that the City of La Mesa consider removing the traffic calming measure(s) installed on _____ (street name).

The measure or measures to be removed are: _____

The undersigned further state they have read the Travel Calming Removal Process section contained in the La Mesa Neighborhood Traffic Management Program.

Note: Eligibility criteria for signing the petition is one signature per household or property.

Name (please print)	Address (please print)	Telephone	Signature
1.			
2.			
3.			
4.			
5.			
6.			
7.			
8.			
9.			
10.			
11.			
12.			
13.			
14.			
15.			
16.			
17.			
18.			
19.			
20.			

(attach additional sheets as necessary)

2018 Ranked (Matrix Style) List of Streets for Neighborhood Traffic Management Program

Attachment A

Rank	Street (Date petition submitted)	Current Phase Completed	2019 Work Plan	Notes
Quadrant I (85th percentile speed is at least 7 mph over the speed limit AND the volume exceeds 50% of the target volume)				
1	Howell Dr. (Gregory St to Earl St) (02/07)	Phase 2	Phase 3	Petition approved (speed humps)
1	Stanford Ave. (70th to Pomona) (08/00)	Phase 2	Phase 3	Petition approved (speed humps)
2	Olive Ave. (Normal to Muriel) (09/01)	Phase 1	Phase 2	
3	El Paso St. (Lake Murray to Amarillo) (05/07)	Phase 1	Phase 2	
4	Highwood Ave. (Eastridge to Cinthia) (03/14)	Phase 1		
5	Dugan Ave. (Lk Murray to Laird) (07/15)	Phase 1		
6	Lois St. (King St to Boulevard Dr) (09/17)	None (New)	Phase 1	New Request (no existing Traffic Calming)
Quadrant II (85th percentile speed is at least 7 mph over the speed limit BUT the volume does NOT exceed 50% of the target volume)				
1	Bob St. (El Paso to Lake Murray) (10/06)	Phase 1		
2	Jessie Ave. (El Cajon Blvd to Seneca) (6/07)	Phase 1		
3	Harris St. (Pearson to Carmenita) (06/10)	Phase 1		
4	Gateside Rd. (05/12)	Phase 1		
5	Severin Dr. (Manor Dr. N to Louise) (07/18)	None (New)	Phase 1	New Request (no existing Traffic Calming)
6	Garfield Dr (Alpine St. to Alpine St.) (07/18)	None (New)	*	New Request (no existing Traffic Calming)
Quadrant III (85th percentile speed is NOT 7 mph over the speed limit BUT the volume exceeds 50% of the target volume)				
1	Glen St. (Lemon to Alpine) (03/02)	Phase 1		
2	Normal Ave. (Dale to Lemon) (09/01)	Phase 1		
3	NB Yale Ave. (Sono to Orien) (07/08)	Phase 1		
4	Sacramento Dr. (06/10)	Phase 1	***	
5	Maple Ave. (Normal to Cinnabar) (04/11)	Phase 1		
6	Violet St. (Waite to Hoffman) (03/13)	None	Phase 1	Postponed due to one resident request
7	Yale Ave. (University to Stanford) (11/13)	Phase 1		
8	Lemon Ave (Garfield to Wood) (11/17)	None (New)	*	New Request (no existing Traffic Calming)
9	El Paso St. (Cowles Mtn to Kimberly) (05/18)	None (New)	*	New Request (no existing Traffic Calming)
10	Lemon Ave (Schuyler and Grant) (09/18)	None (New)	*	New Request (no existing Traffic Calming)
Quadrant IV (85th percentile speed is NOT 7 mph over the speed limit AND the volume does NOT exceed 50% of the target volume)				
1	Hayes St./Washington Ave. (09/00)	Phase 1		
2	Marguerita Ln. (05/01)	Phase 1		
3	Ohio Pl. (Jessie to Parks) (08/01)	Phase 1		
4	Beverly Dr. (09/03)	Phase 1		
5	68th St. (Alamo to end) (11/06)	Phase 1		
6	Southern Rd. (Fletcher Parkway to Dixie) (08/08)	Phase 1		
7	Tanglerod Ln. (Cowles Mountain to Manon) (02/10)	Phase 1		
8	71st St. (Tower to Stanford) (01/11)	Phase 1		
9	Dana Dr. (Bonita to Camellia) (05/11)	Phase 1		
10	Elden St. (03/13)	Phase 1		
11	Marian St. (Hoffman to Stuart)	Phase 1		
12	Blackton/Paula (12/14)	Phase 1		
14	Olive Ave. (University to Seneca) (05/15)	Phase 1		
15	Paula St. (Pearson St to Court) (01/18)	None (New)		New Request (no existing Traffic Calming). Cul-de-sac

* Street Segment may receive Phase 1 Traffic Calming in 2019 if a scheduled 2019 work plan segment cannot be implemented

** Listed for records only. Not Part of FY19 Plan

*** Added by Council as backup street segment*

AGENDA TEMPLATE

MONTH DAY, YEAR

9:00 A.M.

CALL MEETING TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

INVOCATION – COMMISSIONER NAME

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

ADDITIONS AND/OR DELETIONS TO THE AGENDA

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS

1. TRAFFIC WORK ORDER LOG (ATTACHMENT)
2. TRAFFIC CALMING UPDATE (ATTACHMENT)
3. INFORMATIONAL ITEM – *AS NEEDED*
4. VISION ZERO (ATTACHMENT)
 - a. CIP PROJECTS
 - b. GRANTS AND APPLICATIONS
5. CLIMATE ACTION PLAN

PUBLIC COMMENTS – (TOTAL TIME – 15 MINUTES)

NEW BUSINESS (ACTION)

6. ACTION ITEM – *AS NEEDED*
7. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM PREVIOUS MOBILITY COMMISSION MEETING (ATTACHMENT)

COMMISSION INITIATED ITEMS

STAFF COMMENTS

FUTURE ITEMS

ADJOURNMENT

NEXT REGULARLY SCHEDULED MEETING IS MONTH DAY, YEAR

VISION ZERO

CIP
Citywide Fiber Upgrade
North Spring Street Phase 2
Massachusetts and Blackton Ped and Bike Improvements
Citywide Signal Upgrades
El Cajon Blvd at Jessie Crossing Improvement
Citywide Pedestrian Enhancements (Crossings)
Citywide Sign Replacement, Phase II
Grossmont Center Drive Bridge Expansion

Grants
LRSP (Local Roads Safety Plan)
Complete Streets
Shared Streets

Minutes of a Regular Meeting of the La Mesa Mobility Commission
Wednesday, February 3, 2021 at 9:00 a.m.

This meeting was conducted utilizing teleconferencing and electronic means consistent with State of California Executive Order N-29-20 dated March 17, 2020, regarding the COVID-19 pandemic.

The Agenda for this meeting was posted on January 29, 2021.

The meeting was called to order at 9:00 a.m.

CALL MEETING TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

PRESENT: Chair Calandra, Vice Chair Krulikowski, Commissioners Justice, Mueller, and Ortega

ABSENT: None

STAFF: Director of Public Works/City Engineer Leon Firsht, Engineering Project Manager Phil Kern, Engineering Project Manager Hamed Hashemian, Associate Engineer Michael Kinnard, Environmental Project Manager Hilary Ego, Administrative Office Assistant Carla Farr

INVOCATION – COMMISSIONER JUSTICE

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

ADDITIONS AND/OR DELETIONS TO THE AGENDA

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS

1. TRAFFIC WORK ORDER LOG (ATTACHMENT)

Mrs. Farr reported on the items on the Traffic Work Order Log that were approved since the December 2, 2020, *Traffic and Mobility* Commission meeting. (See Agenda Attachment – Traffic Work Order Log 2020).

2. TRAFFIC CALMING UPDATE

Mr. Kinnard gave an update on the status of traffic calming as of January 27, 2021. (See Agenda Attachment – Traffic Calming Status: Update 01-27-2021). He explained that there are two segments of El Paso St. (East and West) with requests for traffic calming. El Paso St. – East is awaiting neighborhood engagements, and El Paso St. – West has had Phase 1 traffic calming installed.

Discussion among the Commission followed.

3. HARBINSON AVE PRESENTATION BY RESIDENT

Mr. Firsht shared the police report from Lt. Greg Runge for a fatal accident that took place on Harbinson Ave. on New Year's Eve.

La Mesa resident Jane Peterson thanked City Staff, LMPD, and City Council for their timely response. She informed the Commission that she made Facebook post following the accident, which was heavily engaged with on social media. She would like to promote driver awareness, as well as the "3 E's" - engineering, enforcement, education to make La Mesa's streets safer. Referencing an LA Times article of the same name, she concluded that "after months stuck at home, we've all forgotten how to drive."

Vice Chair Krulikowski asked for the collision report, which Staff will provide to the Commission once available. The Commission expressed their sympathy for the neighborhood.

Ms. Peterson inquired about vacancies on the Mobility Commission. Mr. Firsht informed her that appointments will be made at the February 23, 2021 City Council meeting.

4. REVIEW OF PROPOSED CITY COUNCIL CLIMATE EMERGENCY RESOLUTION (ATTACHMENT) -POWERPOINT PRESENTATION BY HILARY EGO

Ms. Ego, Environmental Program Manager, provided a PowerPoint outlining the proposed City Council Climate Emergency Resolution. She asked that the Commission review the draft resolution and email comments to Ms. Farr by February 8, 2021.

Commissioner Ortega stated he favored the idea of engaging multiple commissions, having milestones, as well as the effort by Staff to engage the community.

Vice Chair Krulikowski requested that Staff send comments to the Commission once compiled.

5. VISION ZERO (ATTACHMENT)

- a. CIP PROJECTS**
- b. GRANTS AND APPLICATIONS**

Mr. Firsht provided an overview of current projects and grants, with a goal to provide more details at future meetings as they connect to Vision Zero.

Mr. Kern gave background information on the La Mesa Complete Streets grant. Mrs. Farr shared a map of the project area.

Considerable discussion among Staff and the Commission followed. Staff will provide updates, as well as a copy of the grant application to Commission when available.

PUBLIC COMMENTS – (TOTAL TIME – 15 MINUTES)

NONE

OLD BUSINESS

NONE

NEW BUSINESS (ACTION)

6. APPROVAL OF 2021 WORK PLAN

Mr. Firsh reviewed the 2021 Work Plan with the Commission, which will go before Council for approval at the February 23, 2021 City Council meeting. The Work Plan was updated to reflect three main components in addition to the regular business of the Commission:

1. NTMP
2. Vision Zero
3. Climate Action Plan – *addition*

He clarified that wording was changed slightly to convey that staff will report on items at yet to be determined dates. Chair Calandra noted that the 2021 Work Plan differed in regards to the regular business of the Commission. Mr. Firsh explained that this change was in an effort to make the Work Plan more clear and concise.

ACTION: Vice Chair Krulikowski moved to the 2021 Mobility Commission Work Plan. Commissioner Ortega seconded the motion, which carried 5-0.

AYES: Chair Calandra, Vice Chair Krulikowski, Commissioner Justice, Commissioner Mueller, Commissioner Ortega

NOES: None

ABSTAINED: None

ABSENT: None

7. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM DECEMBER 2, 2020 TRAFFIC AND MOBILITY COMMISSION MEETING

ACTION: Vice Chair Krulikowski moved to approve the minutes from the December 2, 2020 *Traffic and* Mobility Commission meeting with one revision to comments on Item 1C. Chair Calandra seconded the motion, which carried 5-0.

AYES: Chair Calandra, Vice Chair Krulikowski, Commissioner Justice, Commissioner Mueller, Commissioner Ortega

NOES: None

ABSTAINED: None

ABSENT: None

COMMISSION INITIATED ITEMS

Vice Chair Krulikowski informed the Commission that he contacted ITE for additional continuing education opportunities, after attending a recent Riverside-San Bernardino ITE meeting virtually.

He also shared new products from the meeting, including a Polara 'no-contact' accessible pedestrian push button. Staff will look into the possibility of adding these at intersections that are on recall, such as Spring St., per his request.

The Vice Chair reported that the Subcommittee recently reviewed the speed zone survey on Murray Drive. They provided a recommendation to Staff to redo the E&TS survey on the street, in an effort to create better and more enforceable speed zoning.

Commissioner Justice volunteered to do engagement on Harbinson Avenue, noting she walks daily and notices drivers disregard the stop signs frequently. Vice Chair Krulikowski retorted that stop signs do not lead to speed control, stating that those drivers likely to speed, are likely to not stop at a stop sign.

Commissioner Ortega suggested using the street as a case study.

STAFF COMMENTS

NONE

FUTURE ITEMS

Mr. Firsht briefly noted future items to go before the Commission, including the LRSP, the E&TS for Murray Drive, and the advertisement of an upcoming pedestrian and bike grant project as Massachusetts Avenue & Blackton Drive. He also informed the Commission that construction on the Citywide Fiber Project will soon be completed.

ADJOURNMENT

NEXT REGULARLY SCHEDULED MEETING IS MARCH 3, 2021.

Commissioner Mueller will lead the Invocation.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:11 a.m.