



**Traffic and Pedestrian Safety Committee
Agenda
June 17, 2009
2131 Pear Street, Pinole, CA 94564
Community Room
7:00 p.m. Regular Business Meeting**

1. **Call to Order – Pledge of Allegiance**
2. **Roll Call** Ana Morales
3. **Approval of Minutes from April 15, 2009** Ana Morales
4. **Citizens to be heard - for items not on the Agenda** Ana Morales
5. **Continued Items:**
 - A. **Specific Plan Discussion** Yanni Demitri
 - B. **Traffic Study at Pinole Valley High School** Yanni Demitri
 - C. **San Pablo Ave at Fern Crosswalk Update** Yanni Demitri
6. **New Items:**
 - A. **Speed Surveys in Downtown** Yanni Demitri
7. **Oral Reports:**
 - A. **Committee Members** Committee Members
 - B. **Staff Members: Demitri's Departure** Yanni Demitri
8. **Adjourn to the Next Meeting**
*Recommendation: Adjourn to next Regular Meeting
On August 19, 2009*

POSTED: Friday, June 12, 2009 at 10:00 a.m. at City Hall

Ana Morales, Secretary, City of Pinole



***Traffic and Pedestrian Safety Committee Meeting
Minutes (Draft)
Meeting Date: April 15, 2009***

I. Call to order by:

Doug Taylor at 7:05 p.m.

II. Roll Call:

Committee Members present:

Doug Taylor, Chairperson
Faith Dunham-Sims, Vice-Chair
John Fischbach, Member
Charles Hammack, Member

Staff Members present:

Dean Allison, Director of Public Works / City Engineer
Yanni Demitri, Associate Civil Engineer
Ana Morales, Secretary

III. Approval of Minutes from March 18, 2009:

Faith Dunham-Sims, Vice-Chair, made a motion to approve the minutes as written and John Fischbach seconded. Motion carried.

IV. Citizens to be heard for items not on the agenda:

John Bender- speeding along San Pablo Avenue on both directions.

Mr. Bender explained his concern about speeding along San Pablo Avenue which is happening more on weekends where cars are probably going 45 to 50 mph.

After some questions and discussions about the speeding situation along San Pablo Avenue among Mr. Bender and the Committee Members. Sgt. Hughes said that the Traffic Commissioner is throwing out all tickets at the Richmond Court and has not yet given the Police Officers a reason as to why he is dismissing the speeding tickets. Yanni Demitri, Associate Civil Engineer, said that the current speed survey is valid.

Mr. Hammack, Committee Member, suggested sending a letter on behalf of the Traffic and Pedestrian Safety Committee to express their concern about speeding along San Pablo Avenue and asking why the Traffic Commissioner is dismissing the speeding tickets.

Public Works Staff and Pinole Police will take action on this matter and would schedule a meeting with the Traffic Commissioner in Richmond to inquire about why he is dismissing the speeding tickets or what the City of Pinole needs to do for him to uphold speeding tickets given along San Pablo Avenue.

John Fischbach made a motion to accompany staff to Richmond Court when the meeting is set to speak to the Traffic Commissioner, Charles Hammack seconded. Motion carried 4-0.

V. Continued Items

A. Specific Plan Discussion

Ivette Ricco, President of Pinole Chamber of Commerce expressed the concerns that merchants and business owners have with the Specific Plan concerns: narrowing lanes along San Pablo Avenue, delivery vehicles access to their business, emergency vehicles access, busses and safety concerns for pedestrians when narrowing or making San Pablo Avenue a one lane on both direction. Mrs. Ricco strongly urges that before any decision is taken that the City of Pinole conducts a traffic study before any changes are made to our roads or streets. Also the traffic study should evaluate what if I-80 was shut-down, how all the traffic will be diverted onto San Pablo Avenue and how will this affect the traffic already on San Pablo Avenue?

Also the Committee Members had comments as follows (also Yanni Demitri's and Faith Dunham-Sims' comments will be attached to the minutes):

- Enhancement of a sidewalk along Shea Hill for pedestrian use.
- Sidewalk gaps should be eliminated for better pedestrian use. Examples are: the gap over the bridge to Hercules, along San Pablo Avenue North side from Pinon to Roble Avenue.
- More pathways for people to walk or use their bicycles to get pedestrians out of roadway.
- Old Town should be treated differently in its features than the rest of the City. Old Town should be pedestrian friendlier to create an identity for downtown to promote and encourage more business along downtown.
- Staff does not agree with the proposed restriction of free right turns. This issue should also be addressed in the traffic study.
- Bus turn-outs where possible to alleviate traffic congestion.

- Reducing lanes only where supported by traffic study.
- Pinole Valley Road from Shea Drive to Simas Avenue should be left as is, two lanes in both directions.
- Bike routes: making sure all trails are connected to make it easier to get from point A to point B.
- Adding a bus line to go directly to El Cerrito Bart Station to encourage people to walk to down town and catch the bus to BART.

B. Crosswalk Safety at I-80 Off-Ramp on Pinole Valley Road

Approve staff recommendations that Caltrans be contacted to make the safety improvements at the Pinole Valley Road crosswalk adjacent to the eastbound Interstate 80 off-ramp and on-ramp.

Faith Dunham-Sims made a motion to accept staff recommendation including to relocate controller's box and no right turn sign on red at signal light of the I-80 Off-ramp on Pinole Valley Road. Charles Hammack seconded the motion. Motion carried 4-0.

C. Traffic Study at Pinole Valley High School

No progress made since last meeting.

Doug Taylor made a motion to extend the meeting for another half hour to complete the agenda. Faith Dunham-Sims seconded. Motion carried 4-0.

VI. New Items:

A. Painting High Visibility Crosswalks

Rank the presented list of crosswalks in order of priority to be painted with high visibility striping.

1. Savage Avenue
2. Simas Avenue (South End)
3. Monte Verde Drive
4. 645 San Pablo Avenue
5. Meadow Street
6. Wright Avenue
7. Shea Drive
8. Walter Avenue

The above high visibility crosswalks will be done within the next few weeks.

Charles Hammack made a motion to accept the ranking of the intersections as presented and decided by Committee Members. Faith Dunham-Sims seconded. Motion carried 4-0.

VII. Oral Reports:

A. Committee Members

John Fischbach reported the following items:

- Flooding just before the freeway on Pinole Valley Road by the gas station it is hard to see early in the morning.
- Suggested for everyone on the Committee to take a look at the high visibility crosswalk located in the City of Hercules by the library, it is a really nice one.
- Some citizens have expressed concerns about speed chases along narrow and busy streets here in Pinole.
- John has concerned over the crosswalk at Fitzgerald and Appian Way the one located by gas station. He will bring someone to voice out her concerns at our next meeting.
- He suggested that for future signage we probably look at A-frame signs that say something like: Children at Play, Slow Down or Children Crossings around the schools and parks in the City of Pinole.

Faith Dunham-Sims reported the following item:

- Attended EDHAC Committee meeting and learned a few things that will be of concern to our committee as well in regards to the Specific Plan: enhancing bike lanes at San Pablo Avenue, reducing lanes and widening sidewalks through Old Town to accommodate street seating, benches and flowers crates for ornamental purposes, parking garage in Old Town and parking meters at Old Town. She was just sharing the information she received from that meeting.

B. Staff Members

- Painting a dashed white line along City of Pinole city limit on Fitzgerald overpass to Richmond Parkway. Sgt. Hughes suggested marking a line on the concrete wall of both sides of the retaining wall that says City of Pinole city limit.
- Responding to a request from the public the traffic signal at Pinole Valley Road and Estates left turn lane was looked at by several staff members and it was determined that at this time we can't validate the complaint about the light shining on the traffic signal and conflicting with the left turn arrow.
- Traffic Calming Policy will be presented at the City Council meeting on Tuesday, April 21, 2009. Doug Taylor, Chairperson, was nominated by the Committee Members to present the Traffic Calming Guidelines along with Staff member at the City Council Meeting.
- Reducing frequency of the meetings from once a month to every other month, unless there is an urgent matter will call for a meeting all other safety concerns will be taken care of immediately by staff.

Action: Faith Dunham-Sims made a motion to accept staff recommendation to meet every other month unless there is a matter that is time sensitive, than Staff will call a special meeting. John Fischbach seconded. Motion carried 4-0.

- Fern and San Pablo Avenue Project has been delayed because it is being funded by the Federal Stimulus Act and some requirements for federal projects and deadlines are needed along with requests from Caltrans as they are part of the funding process.
- This summer the overlay/slurry project will be located within the Redevelopment Area and Linda Heights (Henry, Downer and Alice) if you would like all street names please request them through Yanni Demitri, Associate Civil Engineer and he will email you a complete list of streets for the overlay/slurry project.
- WestCat will be installing signs at bus stops; these are electronic signs telling rider's information about busses and how soon before the next bus comes to the bus stop and perhaps other messages about the busses.

VIII. Adjourn to the next meeting

Adjourned to next regular meeting
June 17, 2009

Adjourned at 9:45 p.m.

***Next Meeting
June 17, 2009
Regular TAPS Meeting***



CITY OF PINOLE
TRAFFIC AND PEDESTRIAN SAFETY COMMITTEE

5A

JUNE 17, 2009

TO: TRAFFIC AND PEDESTRIAN SAFETY COMMITTEE

FROM: YANNI DEMITRI, ASSOCIATE CIVIL ENGINEER

SUBJECT: DRAFT SPECIFIC PLAN

RECOMMENDATION

Receive comments from TAPS members regarding the Draft Specific Plan. Discuss the comments and forward to the Planning Department.

DISCUSSION

The following comments were received from Faith Dunham-Sims on May 14, 2009 and forwarded to the Planning Department to be addressed and incorporated in the final document.

Comments prepared by Faith Dunham-Sims, TAPS Vice Chairperson:

- Page 10, first full paragraph – No study yet to substantiate claims.
- Page 31, diagram 5.14 – The text does not match the diagram. The text states two travel lanes in each direction but diagram shows only one travel lane in each direction.
- Page 32, diagram 5.15 – No mention of a parkway buffer. As someone who walks that stretch of road routinely, a parkway buffer would be beneficial.
- Page 34, Parking – I am of the opinion that we do not need a parking structure in Old Town.
- Page 37, first complete paragraph, Bike Lanes – A motorist/cyclist education program would be beneficial if more shared bike lanes are installed. Particularly concerned about bike lanes at locations with on-street parking.
- Page 38, Intersection Treatments – Can you please describe what “reducing the corner radii” means, as well as what a “right turn pedestrian refuge?” is?
- Page 38, “Eliminate free right turn lanes at all intersections” – Is the right turn lane on Eastbound SPA at Tennent an example of a free right turn lane? If so, I am in favor of eliminating them as they make crossings more hazardous for visually impaired pedestrians.
- Page 38, Mid-Block Crossings – I am of the opinion that mid-block crossings, i.e. uncontrolled crossings, are not safe and should not be installed period.

- Figure 5.18, Streetscape Elements – The style of tree grate shown in the photo is a preferred design in terms of preventing cane tips from getting snagged between the grates, as well as preventing ankle injuries.
- Page 45, Refuge Islands – Whereas I am very much in favor of pedestrian refuge islands where warranted, the style of refuge island shown in the photo is not desirable for several reasons, 1) the built-up seating area may pose visibility problems, 2) why do we want to encourage pedestrians to hang out in the middle of an intersection by providing seating, and 3) this type of design can be very disorienting for visually impaired pedestrians.
- Page 46, Pedestrian Crosswalk Signals – All recommendations in this section are highly desirable.
- What is an “urban heat island”?
- Page 46 – Typos in the last sentence.

Attachments: Memo from Dean Allison to the Planning Department Manager
Memo from Yanni Demitri to the Planning Department Manager

MEMORANDUM

TO: Winston Rhodes, Planning Manager
FROM: Dean Allison, Director of Public Works / City Engineer
DATE: April 23, 2009
SUBJECT: Comments to January 22, 2009 Draft Specific Plan for San Pablo Avenue, Pinole Valley Road, and Appian Way Corridors

Winston, here are my comments to the draft document dated January 22, 2009 for the corridor specific plans. I focused my attention on Chapter 5.0 Circulation, and 9.0 Infrastructure and Public Facilities.

GENERAL COMMENTS:

- The document does not clearly consider Old Town as a separate and distinct area. Old Town is a unique part of the Pinole Community and should be treated accordingly. Many planning and engineering principles included in the Draft Plan that apply to Old Town do not apply to the balance of the City; however, the document does not recognize this.

A good example of this is pedestrian standards. Pedestrian standards in Old Town should be completely different than those along Fitzgerald Drive. It is recommended that you consider an overlay district and other planning techniques to more clearly recognize the unique conditions in Old Town.

- The document needs to do a better job of educating the reader as to why the concept of reducing lanes through Old Town is proposed. It is my understanding that the concept was proposed to provide a greater portion of the limited right of way to the non-vehicular users. This was done to create a destination and enhance Old Town for the benefit of businesses, residents, and visitors.

I think many readers will conclude that the lane drop was proposed for Traffic Calming purposes, which it is not. Traffic Calming is a byproduct of the lane drop not its goal.

- The document could be a valuable tool to lead community discussion over how we can best make use of the limited right of way in Old Town. Should we go with Class 2 bike lanes as the document suggests, or wider sidewalks. Should the wider sidewalks be dedicated to pedestrians or landscaping? Should the wider sidewalks be used for outdoor dining, landscaping, benches or other street furniture?
- A second area where the document should evoke discussion is whether the medians in Old Town should be raised or simply painted. A lane drop with painted medians has the benefit of dedicating a greater portion of the right of way to the non-vehicular user, without some of the negative consequences of raised

medians like limiting left turn accessibility to Old Town properties, and inhibiting truck deliveries to our merchants

- See Fig. 5.18 The document should provide more information about unique street furniture for the Old Town area to define the future “look” that the Community seeks. One example is ornamental traffic signal hardware. This would be highly appropriate in Old Town. The Public Works Department has tried to take small steps in this direction such as the illuminated street name signs at our signals, and unique way finding and speed limit signs to help define the Old Town Area.

SPECIFIC COMMENTS:

5.0 CIRCULATION

5.2 Circulation Goals and Policies on page 5.0-2 & 5.0-3

- Circulation Policy 3 – Should be implemented only as funds become available.
- Circulation Policy 5 – Needs to be clarified. It is not clear which roadway segments this policy would apply to. More specificity is needed.
- Circulation Policy 7 – Needs to be clarified. The policy implies that there are unsafe segments. More specificity is needed.
- I would recommend we add a Policy that establishes a threshold of development in terms of peak hour trips generated when a traffic study is required to consider its impact on network circulation.

5.3 Vehicular Circulation

- The studies that generated Tables 5.1 and 5.2 should be included as an appendix.
- When were the studies prepared? For example was school in session during the time that studies were performed along Pinole Valley Road. I am surprised to see that Pinole Valley Road at Estates operates at a Level of Service A during AM peak.
- The paragraphs titled Major and Minor Arterials are awkward to read. The discussion would be more reader friendly if it would discuss roadway segments listing first the roadway name, second providing each description/discussion.
- The first complete paragraph on page 5.0-10 needs to be rewritten for clarity.

FIG 5.1 & FIG 5.2

- The minimum through lane width should be 11'. This change needs to be reflected throughout Chapter 5.0 wherever roadway cross-sections information is provided.

FIG 5. 7

- The San Pablo Avenue roadway section passing through the Old Town shows planned Class 2 bike lane. This idea needs to be studied further. This right of way might be utilized with wider sidewalks and landscaped areas rather than through striped bike lanes..

FIG 5.14

- The segment of Appian Way from San Pablo Avenue to Marlesta is shown as a single lane in each direction. This is not a good idea. This change would significantly reduce the capacity of this roadway. This segment of Appian Way carries considerable truck traffic from Sugar City and reducing lanes, particularly in the uphill direction would be a concern to me. This lane reduction needs to be reconsidered.
- The PW Department will be implementing traffic calming measures with the rehabilitation of this roadway this summer. The plans include a striped median with edge striping in an attempt to create edge friction for traffic calming purposes.

5.7 Pedestrian Facilities

- Intersection Treatment. The document is written with insufficient specificity. Page 5.0-38 provides the treatment to be taken when the crossing distance is greater than 60'. The document should state where a given treatment applies within each of the three corridors to provide greater clarify for readers.
- Reduce intersection corner radii. I do not agree with this. Larger corner radii affords better sight distance which is important regardless of traffic volumes. The document does not list any benefit or provide the rationale for smaller corner radii or include specific locations where this treatment could be beneficial.
- I do not agree with the elimination of Free Turning Right lanes at all intersections. Free right turn lanes help to reduce congestion, and would be appropriate in many parts of the community. This sentence should be rewritten to say "Consider eliminating "free" right turn lanes at"

- Mid Block Crossings – Mid block crosswalks should be avoided. They should be constructed only when supported by a traffic study. The text needs to be modified stating that this technique shall be rarely used and only when supported by a traffic study reviewed and approved by the Public Works Department.

SECTION 9 INFRASTRUCTURE AND PUBLIC FACILITIES

9.5 Storm Drainage and Hydrology

- The principal area of local flooding is in the valley area and other areas of the City where natural open space areas interface with engineered drainage devices such as pipelines and open channels.
- The area of creek flooding occurs where bridge crossing reduce the hydraulic capacity of the creek. Ramona Avenue is good examples, and this area saw significant flooding during the December 31, 2005 storm.
- The greatest potential for widespread creek flooding occurs in levee conditions; where housing pads are lower than the high water elevations in the creek. The primary area of this is the Orleans Drive area.
- The document should include excerpts from the FEMA maps which identify areas of potential flooding



CITY OF PINOLE

Public Works

2131 Pear Street
Pinole, CA 94564

Tel: (510) 724-9010
Fax: (510) 724-4921

Memorandum

To: Winston Rhodes, Planning Department Manager
From: Yanni Demitri, Associate Engineer
Date: June 8, 2009
Re: Comments on the Draft Specific Plan, Chapter 5 Circulation

The Engineering Department has completed its review of the above-referenced document and is providing the following comments for your consideration:

- General Comment: For every segment of roadway where reduction in the number of travel lanes is proposed, both traffic modeling and LOS analysis must be conducted to assess impact on traffic operation and circulation. Such analysis must take into consideration current volumes of traffic as well as future projections.
- Page 8, there's a discrepancy regarding speeds on major and minor arterials, check bottom paragraphs.
- Page 10, top paragraph, states that converting San Pablo Avenue to only one through lane of traffic in each direction would not affect its current capacity. Traffic modeling and level of service analysis need to be conducted to substantiate that assertion.
- Page 38 addresses mid-block crossings. Add one more bullet item that reads "Marked mid-block crossings shall meet minimum MUTCD pedestrian volumes for marked crosswalks". Also, on the same page, list all intersections that are eligible for the described treatments.
- Staff does not recommend restricting right turn lanes for it has the potential of creating long queues and excessive delay.
- Show an exhibit of all driveways whose access is being restricted as a result of the proposed measures and recommend ways to mitigate the impact.

- All through lanes should have a minimum of 11' width, left turn pockets can be reduced to 10.5' in width.

Distribution: TAPS Committee Members

CC: Chron/File



CITY OF PINOLE
TRAFFIC AND PEDESTRIAN SAFETY COMMITTEE

5C

JUNE 17, 2009

TO: TRAFFIC AND PEDESTRIAN SAFETY COMMITTEE

FROM: YANNI DEMITRI, ASSOCIATE CIVIL ENGINEER

SUBJECT: SAN PABLO AVENUE CROSSWALKS IMPROVEMENTS PROJECT UPDATE

RECOMMENDATIONS

Receive a report on the status of the proposed improvements on San Pablo Ave at Fern/Alvarez Street and Quinan Street.

DISCUSSION

The advertisement of this project has been placed on hold since February 2009 pending the receipt of the Authorization To Proceed With Construction "E-76" from the State Department of Transportation (Caltrans). It is anticipated that the E-76 for this project will be issued by the middle of June 2009.

City staff has completed potholing activities to locate underground utilities that may conflict with the proposed footings of the decorative poles for the pedestrian warning devices. One minor change had to be made as a result of potholing for utilities. The advance warning lights in the eastbound and westbound of San Pablo Ave had to be moved to the median-island due to utilities in the eastbound and shale hill in the westbound. The relocation of the advance warning devices will also make them more visible to drivers and therefore increasing their effectiveness.

Distribution List: Members of the TAPS Committee



CITY OF PINOLE
TRAFFIC AND PEDESTRIAN SAFETY COMMITTEE

6A

JUNE 17, 2009

TO: TRAFFIC AND PEDESTRIAN SAFETY COMMITTEE

FROM: YANNI DEMITRI, ASSOCIATE CIVIL ENGINEER

**SUBJECT: SPEED STUDIES ON SAN PABLO AVE BETWEEN EAST CITY
LIMIT TO OAKRIDGE ROAD**

RECOMMENDATIONS

Approve the speed studies prepared by City staff, which recommended raising the speed limit on San Pablo Ave between east city limit to Oakridge Road from the current 25 MPH to 30 MPH.

BACKGROUND

The California Vehicle Code (CVC) requires that Cities establish speed limits in a prescribed manner. For residential streets that have specific roadway characteristics, the prima facia speed limit may be set at 25 miles per hour. For alleyways the prima facia speed limit may be set at 15 miles per hours.

For other types of roadways (non-residential) the CVC requires that an engineering and traffic survey be conducted every seven years to justify a posted speed limit. The rationale is that speed limits on non-residential roadways must be based upon the speed at which the majority of traffic – 85% - is flowing. The CVC goes further and states that if an engineering and traffic survey is not completed every seven years, the city's ability to enforce and prosecute violations is significantly reduced. Radar enforcement is specifically prohibited on any street segment without a current engineering and traffic survey.

DISCUSSION

Under Section 627 of the CVC, an engineering and traffic survey consists of three parts. The first part is a review of reported accidents. The second part is consideration is any unusual roadway conditions or characteristics such as safe stopping sight distance, roadway grade and alignment, abutting land use, shoulder conditions, pedestrian traffic, and width of traffic lanes. The third part is a measurement of vehicle speeds in a free flow condition. The premise is that a reasonable and effective speed limit is one that conforms to the actual behavior of the majority of motorists.

According to the State Traffic Manual, the posted speed limit should be based on the 85th percentile speed. The 85th percentile is that speed at or below which 85 percent of the traffic is moving. Engineering judgment may indicate the need for a

further reduction of five miles per hour. The factors justifying such a further reduction are those factors mentioned above. Whenever such factors are considered to establish the speed limit, they should be documented on the speed zone survey or the accompanying engineering report. The establishment of a speed limit of more than five miles per hour below the 85th percentile (critical) speed should be done with great care as this may make violators of a disproportionate number of the reasonable majority of drivers.

In accordance with the above regulations, a traffic and engineering survey has been prepared for two sections in downtown. The first section is San Pablo Ave between east City limit and Pinole Valley Road. The second section is San Pablo Avenue between Pinole Valley Road and Oakridge Road. Pinole Police Department has recently had several of its citations issued within these two segments of roadway rejected by the Traffic Judge at the Contra Costa County court in Richmond. The judge believes that the current posted speeds are not supported by the current speed surveys, which are still valid until July 12, 2013. In a discussion at the previous TAPS committee meeting on April 15, 2009 it was agreed that the speed surveys for these two sections should be redone and a new speed should be recommended based on the findings of these surveys.

<u>Street</u>	Posted Speed	85th Percentile	Recommended Speed
San Pablo Ave: East City Limit to Pinole Valley Road	25 MPH	35 MPH	30 MPH
San Pablo Ave: Pinole Valley Road to Oakridge Road	25 MPH	30 MPH	30 MPH

Attachments: California Vehicle Code Sections 627, 22357, 22358, and 40802

Distribution List: Members of the TAPS Committee

Engineering and Traffic Survey, Applicable California Vehicle Code Sections

627. (a) "Engineering and traffic survey," as used in this code, means a survey of highway and traffic conditions in accordance with methods determined by the Department of Transportation for use by state and local authorities.

(b) An engineering and traffic survey shall include, among other requirements deemed necessary by the department, consideration of all of the following:

(1) Prevailing speeds as determined by traffic engineering measurements.

(2) Accident records.

(3) Highway, traffic, and roadside conditions not readily apparent to the driver.

(c) When conducting an engineering and traffic survey, local authorities, in addition to the factors set forth in paragraphs (1) to (3), inclusive, of subdivision (b) may consider all of the following:

(1) Residential density, if any of the following conditions exist on the particular portion of highway and the property contiguous thereto, other than a business district:

(A) Upon one side of the highway, within a distance of a quarter of a mile, the contiguous property fronting thereon is occupied by 13 or more separate dwelling houses or business structures.

(B) Upon both sides of the highway, collectively, within a distance of a quarter of a mile, the contiguous property fronting thereon is occupied by 16 or more separate dwelling houses or business structures.

(C) The portion of highway is longer than one-quarter of a mile but has the ratio of separate dwelling houses or business structures to the length of the highway described in either subparagraph (A) or (B).

(2) Pedestrian and bicyclist safety.

22357. (a) Whenever a local authority determines upon the basis of an engineering and traffic survey that a speed greater than 25 miles per hour would facilitate the orderly movement of vehicular traffic and would be reasonable and safe upon any street other than a state highway otherwise subject to a prima facie limit of 25 miles per hour, the local authority may by ordinance determine and declare a prima facie speed limit of 30, 35, 40, 45, 50, 55, or 60 miles per hour or a maximum speed limit of 65 miles per hour, whichever is found most appropriate to facilitate the orderly movement of traffic and is reasonable and safe. The declared prima facie or maximum speed limit shall be effective when appropriate signs giving notice thereof are erected upon the street and shall not thereafter be revised except upon the basis of an engineering and traffic survey. This section does not apply to any 25-mile-per-hour prima facie limit which is applicable when passing a school building or the grounds thereof or when passing a senior center or other facility primarily used by senior citizens.

(b) This section shall become operative on the date specified in subdivision (c) of Section 22366

22358 (a) Whenever a local authority determines upon the basis of an engineering and traffic survey that the limit of 65 miles per hour is more than is reasonable or safe upon any portion of any street other than a state highway where the limit of 65 miles per hour is applicable, the local authority may by ordinance determine and declare a prima facie speed limit of 60, 55, 50, 45, 40, 35, 30, or 25 miles per hour, whichever is found most appropriate to facilitate the orderly movement of traffic and is reasonable and safe, which declared prima facie limit shall be effective when appropriate signs giving notice thereof are erected upon the street.

(b) This section shall become operative on the date specified in subdivision (c) of Section 22366.

40802. (a) A "speed trap" is either of the following:

(1) A particular section of a highway measured as to distance and with boundaries marked, designated, or otherwise determined in order that the speed of a vehicle may be calculated by securing the time it takes the vehicle to travel the known distance.

(2) A particular section of a highway with a prima facie speed limit that is provided by this code or by local ordinance under subparagraph (A) of paragraph (2) of subdivision (a) of Section 22352, or established under Section 22354, 22357, 22358, or 22358.3, if that prima facie speed limit is not justified by an engineering and traffic survey conducted within five years prior to the date of the alleged violation, and enforcement of the speed limit involves the use of radar or any other electronic device that measures the speed of moving objects. This paragraph does not apply to a local street, road, or school zone.

(b) (1) For purposes of this section, a local street or road is defined by the latest functional usage and federal-aid system maps submitted to the federal Highway Administration, except that when these maps have not been submitted, or when the street or road is not shown on the maps, a "local street or road" means a street or road that primarily provides access to abutting residential property and meets the following three conditions:

(A) Roadway width of not more than 40 feet.

(B) Not more than one-half of a mile of uninterrupted length. Interruptions shall include official traffic control signals as defined in Section 445.

(C) Not more than one traffic lane in each direction.

(2) For purposes of this section "school zone" means that area approaching or passing a school building or the grounds thereof that is contiguous to a highway and on which is

posted a standard "SCHOOL" warning sign, while children are going to or leaving the school either during school hours or during the noon recess period. "School zone" also includes the area approaching or passing any school grounds that are not separated from the highway by a fence, gate, or other physical barrier while the grounds are in use by children if that highway is posted with a standard "SCHOOL" warning sign.

(c) (1) When all of the following criteria are met, paragraph (2) of this subdivision shall be applicable and subdivision (a) shall not be applicable:

(A) When radar is used, the arresting officer has successfully completed a radar operator course of not less than 24 hours on the use of police traffic radar, and the course was approved and certified by the Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training.

(B) When laser or any other electronic device is used to measure the speed of moving objects, the arresting officer has successfully completed the training required in subparagraph (A) and an additional training course of not less than two hours approved and certified by the Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training.

(C) (i) The prosecution proved that the arresting officer complied with subparagraphs (A) and (B) and that an engineering and traffic survey has been conducted in accordance with subparagraph (B) of paragraph (2). The prosecution proved that, prior to the officer issuing the notice to appear, the arresting officer established that the radar, laser, or other electronic device conformed to the requirements of subparagraph (D).

(ii) The prosecution proved the speed of the accused was unsafe for the conditions present at the time of alleged violation unless the citation was for a violation of Section 22349, 22356, or 22406.

(D) The radar, laser, or other electronic device used to measure the speed of the accused meets or exceeds the minimal operational standards of the National Traffic Highway Safety Administration, and has been calibrated within the three years prior to the date of the alleged violation by an independent certified laser or radar repair and testing or calibration facility.

(2) A "speed trap" is either of the following:

(A) A particular section of a highway measured as to distance and with boundaries marked, designated, or otherwise determined in order that the speed of a vehicle may be calculated by securing the time it takes the vehicle to travel the known distance.

(B) (i) A particular section of a highway or state highway with a prima facie speed limit that is provided by this code or by local ordinance under subparagraph (A) of paragraph (2) of subdivision (a) of Section 22352, or established under Section 22354, 22357, 22358, or 22358.3, if that prima facie speed limit is not justified by an engineering and traffic survey conducted within one of the following time periods, prior to the date of the alleged violation, and enforcement of the speed limit involves the use of radar or any other electronic device that measures the speed of moving objects:

(I) Except as specified in subclause (II), seven years.

(II) If an engineering and traffic survey was conducted more than seven years prior to the date of the alleged violation, and a registered engineer evaluates the section of the highway and determines that no significant changes in roadway or traffic conditions have occurred, including, but not limited to, changes in adjoining property or land use, roadway width, or traffic volume, 10 years.

(ii) This subparagraph does not apply to a local street, road, or school zone.