

City of Folsom
TRAFFIC SAFETY COMMITTEE
AGENDA
4:00 p.m., Thursday, January 26, 2023

1. MEETING CALLED TO ORDER

2. ROLL CALL:

Bailey, Bosch, Brausch, Galovich, Goddard, McGee, Washburn

3. APPROVE ACTION SUMMARY

Action Summary of the October 27th, 2022, and Dec 8th, 2022 meeting will stand approved unless any Committee member requests a revision.

4. BUSINESS FROM FLOOR/GOOD OF THE ORDER

Discuss any items not on the agenda that a member of the public wishes to bring to the Committee's attention. The Committee cannot take formal action on the item but can request that it be placed on a future agenda for further discussion if necessary.

5. ACTION/DISCUSSION ITEMS

Administrative Business

- a. Oath of Office for At-Large Representatives
- b. Selection of Chair/Vice Chair
- c. Meeting Schedule for 2023 and 2024

Neighborhood Issues

- d. Parkshore Drive RRFB request

Action Items

- e. Speed Limit on White Rock Road between East Bidwell and Prairie City Road

6. INFORMATIONAL ITEMS

- a. Retention of Traffic Safety Committee Records

7. ADJOURNMENT

City of Folsom
TRAFFIC SAFETY COMMITTEE
MEETING MINUTES
4:00 p.m., Thursday, October 27th, 2022

Effective July 7, 2022, the City of Folsom is returning to all in-person City Council, Commission, and Committee meetings. Remote participation for the public will no longer be offered. Everyone is invited and encouraged to attend and participate in City meetings in person.

1. MEETING CALLED TO ORDER

Meeting called to order 4:08 pm

2. ROLL CALL:

Bailey, Bosch, Delp, Galovich, McGee, Soulsby, Washburn
Present: Bailey, Bosch, Galovich, Soulsby Absent: Delp, Washburn

3. APPROVE ACTION SUMMARY

Action Summary of the regular September 22nd, 2022, meeting will stand approved unless any Committee member requests a revision.
Bosch moved to approve Bailey seconded. Committee unanimous.

4. BUSINESS FROM FLOOR/GOOD OF THE ORDER

Discuss any items not on the agenda that a member of the public wishes to bring to the Committee's attention. The Committee cannot take formal action on the item but can request that it be placed on a future agenda for further discussion if necessary.
A resident asked for an update regarding the new Pedestrian Signs coming on East Natoma and Bosch gave an update.

5. ACTION ITEMS

1. NEIGHBORHOOD ISSUES

a. MONTROSE DRIVE STOP SIGN

Soulsby moved and Bailey seconded, committee unanimous. Traffic safety recommends that City Council approve an all -way stop sign at the intersection of Montrose Drive and Lowe's/Trader Joe's Shopping Center and Home Goods/Target Shopping Center.

b. PARKSHORE DRIVE & PLAZA DRIVE STOP SIGN REQUEST

Bosch moved and Soulsby seconded, committee unanimous. This item was recommended to be postponed to a future agenda

c. RANDALL DRIVE & SANTANA WAY STOP SIGN REQUEST

Bailey moved and Soulsby seconded, committee unanimous. They recommend that the Public Works Department request that the petition submitter request additional signatures of support from the two homes on the corner closest to the proposed single stop sign and that they get more signatures from residents on Santana way.

6. DISCUSSION ITEMS

**a. PROJECT UPDATE FOR MEDIAN BARRIER
PROJECT ON EAST NATOMA**

Bosch provided an update and answered questions. Bosch agreed to asking TJKM to give a presentation at a future Traffic Safety Committee Meeting.

b. LIST OF FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

7. ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned at 5:52

City of Folsom
TRAFFIC SAFETY COMMITTEE
MEETING MINUTES
4:00 p.m., Thursday, December 8th, 2022

Effective July 7, 2022, the City of Folsom is returning to all in-person City Council, Commission, and Committee meetings. Remote participation for the public will no longer be offered. Everyone is invited and encouraged to attend and participate in City meetings in person.

1. MEETING CALLED TO ORDER

Meeting called to order 4:05 pm

2. ROLL CALL:

Bailey, Bosch, Delp, Galovich, McGee, Soulsby, Washburn

Present: Bailey, Bosch, Delp, McGee, Soulsby, Washburn Absent: Galovich

3. APPROVE ACTION SUMMARY

Action Summary of the regular October 27th, 2022, meeting will stand approved unless any Committee member requests a revision.

Committee decided not to approve October Action Summary and asked that discussion item 6a be amended to add the following: "Bosch agreed to asking TJKM to give a presentation at a future Traffic Safety Committee Meeting".

It was asked that the retention schedule of meeting recordings be on a future agenda.

4. BUSINESS FROM FLOOR/GOOD OF THE ORDER

Discuss any items not on the agenda that a member of the public wishes to bring to the Committee's attention. The Committee cannot take formal action on the item but can request that it be placed on a future agenda for further discussion if necessary.

5. ACTION ITEMS

1. NEIGHBORHOOD ISSUES

a. TOBRURRY WAY – SPEEDING ISSUE

Delp moved and Bailey seconded, committee unanimous. Committee recommended that neighborhood start a petition for no stopping signs. Recommended that Public Works Staff implement the staff recommendations identified in the staff report.

b. NATOMA STATION DRIVE/ASHCAT – SCHOOL SAFETY & NEIGHBORHOOD ISSUES

Bosch moved and Delp seconded, committee unanimous. Committee recommends tabling the discussion pending further analysis by the Public Works Department and the School District to devise the feasibility of a double "Hug and Go Lane" and the feasibility of bulb outs at Natoma Station Drive and Turnpike.

c. PARKSHORE DRIVE AND PLAZA DRIVE – STOP SIGN REQUEST

Bosch Moved and Delp seconded, committee unanimous. Committee recommends an all-way stop at the intersection of Parkshore Drive and Plaza Drive.

d. **CARPENTER HILL ROAD – SPEEDING ISSUE**

Bosch moved and Delp seconded, committee unanimous. Committee recommended that City Council approve an all-way stop at the corner of Owl Meadow and Carpenter Hill and relocation of the speed feedback sign contingent on the residents returning a petition that includes at least ten signatures. Included in the signatures must be the support of homes located closest to the proposed all-way stop.

6. ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned at 6:16 pm

**TRAFFIC SAFETY COMMITTEE
STAFF REPORT**

DATE: January 26, 2023
TO: Traffic Safety Committee
FROM: Public Works Department
SUBJECT: OATH OF OFFICE

BACKGROUND/ANALYSIS

Pursuant to Government Code Section 40813, the City Clerk has appointed Zach Bosch, Public Works Representative to the Traffic Safety Committee as a Deputy of the City Clerk's Office for the express purpose of administering the Oath of Office to all Traffic Safety Committee members, excepting current City employees assigned to the Committee and the FCUSD who has already been sworn in.

The Oath will be administered verbally to all At-Large representatives and then written oaths will be signed by each member and the person administering the oath.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION/TRAFFIC SAFETY COMMITTEE ACTION

None.

**TRAFFIC SAFETY COMMITTEE
STAFF REPORT**

DATE: January 19, 2023
TO: Traffic Safety Committee
FROM: Public Works Department
SUBJECT: SELECTION OF CHAIR/VICE CHAIR

BACKGROUND/ANALYSIS

Section 10.02 of the Folsom Municipal Code defines the duties of the Traffic Safety Committee, including the appointment of officers. With the start of new terms for the At-Large members, the Committee needs to appoint both a Chairperson and a Vice-Chairperson. The terms of both officers shall be two years, ending on December 31, 2024 or upon leaving office.

The responsibilities of the officers are detailed in the attached excerpt from Section 10.02.050 of the Municipal Code. Please note that the Public Works Representative cannot be appointed as an officer.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION/TRAFFIC SAFETY COMMITTEE ACTION

The Public Works Department requests that the Traffic Safety Committee nominate and appoint a Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson to serve one, two-year term which will expire December 31, 2024. Upon being nominated, the appointed officers shall assume their new positions and preside over the meeting.

Folsom Municipal Code

10.02 Traffic Safety Committee

10.02.050 Officers

- A. The officers of the committee shall be the chairperson and vice-chairperson.
- B. The chairperson and the vice-chairperson shall be elected by the committee every 2 years by majority vote of the committee members. The public works representative is not eligible to serve as an officer. An officer can be replaced by majority vote of the committee at any time. No public hearing shall be required prior to removal of the officer and no cause for removal need be shown.
- C. The chairperson and vice-chairperson of the committee, or such other members as may be presiding in the aforementioned positions, shall not be deprived of any of the rights or privileges of any member by reason of his/her occupying the chair and may move, second, and debate from the chair, subject only to such limitations of debate as are by these rules imposed on all members.
- D. The chairperson shall preside and preserve order at all regular and special meetings of the committee. The chairperson shall state every question coming before the committee, announce the decisions of the committee on all subjects, and decide all questions of order without debate, subject to an appeal to the committee on which a member shall speak but once, the chairperson having precedence in speaking on questions of order.
- E. In the absence of the chairperson, the vice-chairperson shall perform the duties and obligations of the office of chairperson.
- F. A secretary shall be assigned to the committee by the public works director. The secretary shall serve as staff support to the committee and shall be responsible for preparing agendas and agenda packets, scheduling meetings and meeting places, calling and recording roll, calling and recording votes, preparing summary minutes of the committee meetings, and other duties as required. The secretary shall not be an official voting member nor considered an officer of the committee.
- G. The terms of office of the chairperson and vice-chairperson shall be 2 years. If no successor is named by the conclusion of any officer's term, the officer shall continue in the office until a successor has been named. (Ord. 911 § 2 (part), 1999)

**TRAFFIC SAFETY COMMITTEE
STAFF REPORT**

DATE: January 19, 2023
TO: Traffic Safety Committee
FROM: Public Works Department
SUBJECT: MEETING SCHEDULE FOR 2022 AND 2023

BACKGROUND/ANALYSIS

Section 10.02 of the Folsom Municipal Code defines the duties of the Traffic Safety Committee, including the establishment of a meeting schedule. A copy of the relevant section of the Municipal Code is attached for your information.

Since its establishment, the Committee has met on either a monthly or quarterly basis, on the fourth Thursday of each month with the exception of November and December, due to potential conflicts with the Thanksgiving and Christmas holidays. A special meeting would often be held in early December to replace the November and December meetings.

Meeting times have varied over the years. From its establishment in 1994 until 1998, meetings began at 8:30 a.m. In 1998 the meeting time was changed to 4:00 p.m. in order to still occur during normal business hours but to provide a better opportunity for the public to attend. During the recession, due to fewer requests from the public and budget issues, the City often had to cancel meetings. However, in 2015 the Committee reverted to monthly meetings (on an as-needed basis). Over the two-year period ending in December 2016, of the twenty monthly meetings that were scheduled, seven were cancelled due to a lack of agenda items.

In between March 2020 until September 2020, no in person or online meetings were held out of an abundance of caution for public health, then beginning in October of 2020 online meetings were established and continued until July 2022. Since that time, all in-person City Council meetings, Commissions, and Committee meetings return to meeting in-person. Remote participation is only allowed under certain circumstances.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION/TRAFFIC SAFETY COMMITTEE ACTION

The Public Works Department recommends that the Committee consider maintaining a monthly schedule (on an as-needed basis) on the fourth Thursday of those months, at 4:00 p.m.

10.02.060 Meetings.

- A. Regular meetings of the committee shall be held at City Hall, 50 Natoma Street, Folsom, California. Regular meetings shall be held on a day and time established by the committee. There shall be no minimum number of meetings per quarter. A regularly scheduled meeting may be canceled at any time.
- B. Special meetings may be called in the manner specified by applicable state law.
- C. Four members of the committee shall constitute a quorum. When there is no quorum at a regular meeting, the chairperson, or any member of such body, shall adjourn such meeting until the next regular meeting.
- D. The chairperson or in the absence of the chairperson, the vice-chairperson, shall take the chair at the hour appointed for the meeting and shall call the committee to order. In the absence of the chairperson and vice-chairperson, the public works director or his/her representative shall call the committee to order whereupon a temporary chairperson will be elected from among the members present. Upon the arrival of the chairperson or vice-chairperson, the temporary chairperson shall relinquish the chair upon the conclusion of the item before the committee. (Ord. 911 § 2 (part), 1999)

**TRAFFIC SAFETY COMMITTEE
STAFF REPORT**

DATE: January 26, 2023
TO: Traffic Safety Committee
FROM: Public Works Department
SUBJECT: PARKSHORE DRIVE CROSSWALKS

BACKGROUND/ANALYSIS

On July 7th, 2022, Public Works received an email from a concerned resident regarding a couple of traffic safety related issues on Parkshore Drive. The first one was to address pedestrian safety crossing at the marked, uncontrolled near the entrances to the Farmhouse development. A picture of the crosswalk is attached to show the current configuration of the crosswalks and level of pedestrian design that exists.



Crossing distance is approximately 38' ramp to ramp with a center island, appropriate signage. Striping on the bridge is showing signs of wear but the crosswalks, signs, and pedestrians are highly visible in approach to the intersections.

Parkshore Drive is posted with a 35 MPH speed limit, an engineering and traffic survey was performed in 2019 as part of the Citywide Speed Survey Update Project.

Speed and Volume counts were performed at both crosswalk locations to provide City Staff and the Committee quantitative data to better evaluate driving behavior and potential vehicle/pedestrian conflicts. Unfortunately, due to the high costs of consultant fees and City Staff resources, pedestrian counts are infeasible currently. The community trail circumnavigates the community and has no direct connection to the city-wide or regional trail network but can be assumed to be frequently used by neighborhood.

Over a 3-day period spanning from Tuesday 7/19/2022 to Thursday 7/21/2022. The bi-directional data showed that there were approximately 1,700 vehicles per day travelling through the Western crosswalk and 1,800 vehicles per day travelling through the Southern Crosswalk. Average speeds fluctuated between 32-34 MPH with an 85th percentile speed between 38-39 MPH, which are consistent with the 2019 speed survey and support the posted speed limit.

The City request an estimate for one intersection's worth of RRFBs (2 signs, transmitter, buttons, etc). That cost was \$5,829.66. City Staff would be able to install the equipment.

Approved meeting minutes from the September 2022 meeting show that the Committee would consider RRFB's if a petition is submitted with then-committee member Bob Delp making the initial motion and Bosch seconded, and the remainder of the committee unanimous in approval. Resident Karen Shaffer circulated the petition and returned to the Public Works Department on October 9th 2022 with over 30 signatures. The petition is attached for the Committee's review.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION/TRAFFIC SAFETY COMMITTEE ACTION

Staff recommends that the Committee approved Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacons at both crosswalks on Parkshore Drive.

October 8, 2022

TO: City of Folsom, Traffic Safety Committee

FROM: Karen Shaffer

Committee Members,

I am submitting the attached petition in support of my request for the installation of RRFBs at two bicycle/pedestrian crossings of Parkshore Drive. My request was made to Zach Bosch, P.E., via email (attached).

I understand from reviewing the recording of the September 22, 2022 Traffic Safety Committee meeting that before considering RRFBs, the Committee members wanted to ensure the proposal had wide community support. As you will see on the attached petition, I collected 30 signatures, representing 20 households. Although the petition states signatures should be from separate households, many who signed felt it was important to show that all adults in a particular household supported the proposal. I collected the signatures after advertising on our neighborhood Facebook page. I strongly suspect that I could have gathered significantly more signatures had I gone door to door with the petition.

I very much appreciate the state-of-the-art design of our mid-block crossings. And, I appreciate the added signage on both sides of the road identifying the crossing. Your immediate attention to this issue is fantastic. However, even with the best possible design, there are still far too many cars failing to yield to people using the crosswalks. I believe there are a few causes. First, with the curve of the road and the median plantings, it is easy to miss seeing pedestrians/bicyclists on the opposite side of the road from which vehicles are traveling. In other words, vehicles traveling west-bound on Parkshore have difficulty seeing pedestrians on the south side of the crosswalk (at the western crosswalk), and vehicles traveling south-bound on Parkshore have difficulty seeing pedestrians on the east side of the crosswalk (at the southern crosswalk). Second, despite the good signage, many drivers are still failing to look for pedestrians and seem surprised when they see people at the last minute. And last, some drivers simply do not want to stop. The flashing lights will warn motorists of the presence of pedestrians and allow them enough time to safely stop when the crosswalks are in use. I believe that even motorists who are not inclined to stop will reconsider if there are flashing lights.

I believe that it was indicated at the Committee meeting that Folsom has not yet used RRFBs at any of the pedestrian crossings within the city. Our two-lane road is perfect for beacons (whereas a larger road would warrant a different treatment). We have a significant level of traffic and two mid-block crossings where we can slow traffic in a meaningful way to ensure safe passage for pedestrians and bikes. Our neighborhood would be an excellent test of these beacons!

And last, while collecting the signatures, many residents expressed concern with how many cars run the stop signs at the intersection of Parkshore Drive and Silo/Van Dyke Streets. Based on their comments, I would like to ask for your consideration of "stop ahead" warnings to be painted on Parkshore Drive.

Thank you very much for your time and attention to this matter.



Karen Shaffer

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, July 7, 2022 10:57 PM
To: zbosch@folsom.ca.us
Subject: Two traffic issues on Parkshore Drive

Hello Zach,

We talked two years ago regarding the speed limit on Parkshore Drive. You informed me that the City had conducted an engineering and traffic study, justifying a 35 MPH posted speed limit (reduced from 40 MPH), and you were just awaiting City Council approval. The lower speed limit was posted shortly after our communication. We very much appreciate the posted lower limit; however, I do have additional concerns I'd like to discuss with you.

Unfortunately, many motorists ignore the posted limit and travel much faster along the road, especially when using the street as a thoroughfare between Folsom Boulevard and Plaza Drive. Originally, Parkshore Drive was serving only businesses. But now there are two subdivisions along either side of Parkshore, with a pedestrian/bike trail circumnavigating both subdivisions. This trail crosses Parkshore twice. Between the curve of the road and median landscaping, visibility is not always optimal. Add the fact that many cars are exceeding the posted speed limit, and it is not surprising that drivers often fail to yield to pedestrians or bicyclists using the crossings. Children use these crossings and are even less visible than adults.

I am requesting the installation of a set of Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacons (RRFB) at each of the two trail crossings of Parkshore. The flashing lights will warn motorists of the presence of pedestrians and allow them enough time to safely stop when the crosswalks are in use. Unlike speedbumps, these RRFB improvements would not interfere with emergency responders or garbage trucks.

The second request I have is for a study to be conducted to determine if additional stop signs are warranted on Plaza Drive, at the intersection of Parkshore, creating a three-way stop. Traffic often backs up on Parkshore, with motorists waiting to make a left turn onto Plaza. Landscaping at the business park on the northeast corner makes it impossible to see on-coming traffic (approaching the intersection from the east) and motorists attempting to turn left from Parkshore must creep into the intersection to see if anyone is coming.

Two crosswalks, one across Parkshore and one across Plaza, are also greatly needed at that intersection as there are currently none. The addition of a crosswalk across Plaza would require the installation of a curb ramp on the south side of Plaza. Although a quick-build modular neighborhood traffic circle might accomplish the same goal as stop signs since it would slow on-coming traffic such that drivers could merge from Parkshore into the intersection, it may not work as well with the much needed crosswalks.

Please let me know if you have any questions. Thank you for your consideration of these issues related to Parkshore Drive; I look forward to your response.

-Karen Shaffer

subject of this
petition

**City of Folsom
NTMP Petition Form**



Name of Person Submitting Request form: Karen Shaffer
 Date: 10/5/2022
 Phone Number: [REDACTED]
 Address: [REDACTED]

1. Please indicate the type(s) of traffic-related concerns that are present in your neighborhood.
- Speeding Collisions Non-compliance with stop signs
 Excessive traffic volumes Pedestrian/Bicycle safety Other

If you selected other, please describe the concern below.

2. Please describe the boundaries of your neighborhood and location(s) on the given street(s) in which these traffic-related concerns occur.

Two bicycle/pedestrian crossings of Parkshore Drive, between Plaza Drive and Coolidge Drive.

3. Please list the time of day and whether the traffic-related concern primarily occurs during the week or weekend.

Weekday mornings + evenings
all day weekends

4. Please provide the names, signatures, and contact information for at least 10 residents and/or property owners 18 years and older (from separate households) who are requesting that this neighborhood be considered for selection in the next NTMP cycle.

Printed Name	Signature	Address	Phone No.
1. DAVID TENEN			
2. Laura Tenen			
3. AJAY RAMAKRISHNAN			
4. BETTY NAY			
5. Lakshmi			
6. Seth			
7. Lisa Klenberger			
8. Scott Bruggemann			
9. Elisha Bruggemann			
10. ALICIA LEGASPI			

Printed Name	Signature	Address	Phone #
11 LISA HERSCHE	<i>Lisa Hersche</i>	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
12 PAUL STUART	<i>Paul Stuart</i>	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
13 Gail Holcombe	<i>Gail Holcombe</i>	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
14 John Holcombe	<i>John Holcombe</i>	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
15 DENNIS O'CONNOR	<i>Dennis O'Connor</i>	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
16 Laurel O'Connor	<i>Laurel O'Connor</i>	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
17 Kathy Corzine	<i>Kathy K. Corzine</i>	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
18 Diana Toche	<i>Diana Toche</i>	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
19 John Velez	<i>John Velez</i>	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
20 Anthony Alters	<i>Anthony Alters</i>	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
21 Caitlin Wong	<i>Caitlin Wong</i>	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
22 Lara Roebelen	<i>Lara Roebelen</i>	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
23 Lisa Roebelen	<i>Lisa Roebelen</i>	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
24 Pam Roberts	<i>Pam Roberts</i>	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
25 Kim Adorni	<i>Kim Adorni</i>	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
26 Mark Ali	<i>Mark Adorni</i>	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
27 Karen Shaffer	<i>Karen Shaffer</i>	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
28 Bruce Shaffer	<i>Bruce Shaffer</i>	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
29 Leslie Cope	<i>Leslie Cope</i>	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
30 Joshua Brannan	<i>Joshua Brannan</i>	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]

NEW BUSINESS
Agenda Item No. 5e
TSC 23-05
1/26/23 Meeting

**TRAFFIC SAFETY COMMITTEE
STAFF REPORT**

DATE: January 18, 2023

TO: Traffic Safety Committee

FROM: Public Works Department

SUBJECT: SPEED LIMIT ADOPTION: WHITE ROCK ROAD

BACKGROUND/ANALYSIS

The City of Folsom is periodically required to review posted speed limits and conduct studies to determine if the posted limits are still valid. In cases where it is determined that the speed limit should be increased or decreased, staff is required to conduct a public hearing and obtain City Council approval in order to adopt the new limit. Pursuant to the California Vehicle Code, when a roadway is significantly re-designed it is required to conduct a new Engineering and Traffic Survey (E&TS) for the posted speed limit to become enforceable by radar and other electronic devices under California Vehicle Code Section 40802, commonly referred to as the “Speed Trap” Section.

Per California Vehicle code (CVC) Section 22349, the maximum speed limit on a multilane highway and two lane undivided roadway is 65 mph and 55 mph respectively. Agencies must conduct Engineering and Traffic surveys (E&TS) to post speed limits that are lower than these speed limits. Engineering and traffic surveys are also referred to as speed zones.

Speed limits are established by an E&TS, by considering the following:

- Prevailing speeds (or 85th percentile speeds).
- Collision History
- Highway, traffic, and roadside conditions not readily apparent to the driver.

Other factors that may be considered while developing E&TS are, business or residential density, pedestrian and bicyclist safety.

The most widely accepted method of determining the posted speed limit is to set the speed limit at what is called the “85th percentile speed”, which is the speed at or below which 85 percent of the traffic is moving.

The Public Works Department hired the engineering firm Kimley Horn to conduct a E&TS on White Rock Road to recommend an enforceable posted speed limit. Attachment A of this staff report contains Kimley Horn’s thorough technical memo regarding the existing conditions of White Rock Road from East Bidwell Street to Prairie City Road. The results and recommendations of the memo show that the 85th percentile speed on this segment was 66.3 MPH, and with use of roadside conditions not readily apparent to the driver a 60 MPH posted speed limit is recommended. Based on this report, the Police Department and the Public Works Department both agree that a posted enforceable speed limit of 60 MPH would be more beneficial than two other alternatives, 1) An unenforceable posted speed limit of 55 MPH or 2) a prima facia enforceable speed limit of 65 MPH.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION/TRAFFIC SAFETY COMMITTEE ACTION

Provide input to staff for City Council consideration at an upcoming public hearing, tentatively scheduled for February 21, 2023.

ATTACHMENT A

To: Zach Bosch, P.E.
City of Folsom

From: Robert Paderna, P.E., RSP₁
Curtis Yee, EIT
Luke Lazzarini, EIT

Re: White Rock Road Speed Survey (Task Order No. 5)

Date: January 3, 2023

The purpose of this memorandum is to document the results of the speed survey conducted along the White Rock Road segment between Prairie City Road and East Bidwell Street, and to present recommended speed limit based on the data collected and the evaluation completed.

Introduction and Background

An Engineering and Traffic Survey (E&TS) was conducted to serve as the basis for the establishment and future enforcement of the speed limit along the White Rock Road segment between Prairie City Road and East Bidwell Street in the City of Folsom. This survey was independently conducted by Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc. (Kimley-Horn).

Engineering and Traffic Surveys for establishment of speed limits are regularly conducted, at least once every five (5) years, by governing municipalities for the purpose of complying with Section 40802(a) of the California Vehicle Code (CVC) and the national Uniform Vehicle Code. E&TSs may be extended to every seven (7) years if criteria is met, or every ten (10) years if a registered engineer evaluates the section of the highway and determines that no significant changes in roadway or traffic conditions have occurred as specified in Section 40802(c) of the CVC. In addition, an E&TS should be conducted on newly constructed roadways or roadways where the roadway conditions have significantly changed, which is the case along the study segment of White Rock Road.

Regulations and Guidelines

Division 11, Chapter 7, of the 2018 CVC defines the California Speed Laws. Section 22352 of the CVC indicates that prima facie speed limits are 15 miles per hour (mph) at unprotected railroad grade crossings, highway intersections with site restrictions, and on any alley. In addition, the prima facie speed limit is 25 mph in residential and business districts, when approaching or passing a school building or grounds thereof or when passing a senior center or other facility primarily used by senior citizens. Division 1 of the CVC defines a business district and residence district in Section 235 and 515, respectively.

“A "business district" is that portion of a highway and the property contiguous thereto (a) upon one side of which highway, for a distance of 600 feet, 50 percent or more of the contiguous property fronting thereon is occupied by buildings in use for business, or (b) upon both sides of which highway, collectively, for a distance of 300 feet, 50 percent or more of the contiguous property fronting thereon is so occupied. A business district may be longer than the distances specified in this section if the above ratio of buildings in use for business to the length of the highway exists.”

“A "residence district" is that portion of a highway and the property contiguous thereto, other than a business district, (a) upon one side of which 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, or (b) upon both sides of which 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. A residence district may be longer than one-quarter of a mile if the above ratio of separate dwelling houses or business structures to the length of the highway exists.”

Section 22357(a) permits the establishment of speed limits greater than 25 mph based on the following text:

“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.”

Therefore, the CVC allows local authorities to increase or decrease the prima facie limits by ordinance or resolution to appropriate limits as determined by an E&TS. Posted speed limits not defined in the CVC or established by ordinance are not valid. The CVC requires that speed surveys must be performed with the use of radar or other electronic devices at locations where speed limits are to be enforced with the use of radar. The current survey must be completed within five years as specified in Section 40802(a); seven years as specified in Section 40802(c), or ten years as specified in Section 40802(c), of the date of the preceding survey. A survey allowed to expire passed the valid duration of the previous survey would constitute a speed trap as defined in Sections 40802(a) and 40802(b) of the CVC:

“(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 one that is functionally classified as "local" on the "California Road System Maps," that are approved by the Federal Highway Administration and maintained by the Department of Transportation. When a street or road does not appear on the "California Road System Maps," it may be defined as a "local street or road" if it 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."

Requirements and Methodology of an Engineering and Traffic Study

Speed zones are primarily established to protect the public from the unreasonable behavior of reckless, unreliable, or otherwise dangerous drivers. Speed limits are generally established at or near the 85th percentile speed, which is defined as the speed at or below which 85 percent of traffic is moving. Speed limits established on this basis conform to the consensus of those who drive on the roadways as to what speed is reasonable and safe, and are not dependent on the judgment of one or a few individuals.

The E&TS, as defined in Section 627 of the CVC, must consider the prevailing speeds, collision records, pedestrian and bicycle activity, and roadway traffic and roadside conditions not readily apparent to the driver. Speed zones are also established to advise motorists of road conditions or hazards, which may not be readily apparent to a reasonable driver. For this reason, a field review of related roadway and traffic variables was conducted which is considered in combination with the statistical data and collision history of a particular roadway segment to determine a safe and reasonable speed limit. The specific procedures used in the performance of an E&TS are outlined in the 2014 California MUTCD (CA MUTCD). The statistical factors used to analyze the collected speed survey data and additional factors as noted in the CA MUTCD to consider are defined in the following section.

Speed Survey Evaluation

One segment of White Rock Road, between Prairie City Road and East Bidwell Street was evaluated by Kimley-Horn and are included in this memorandum. This roadway section and limits of this section are listed in **Table 1** and presented in **Exhibit 1**.

Field Review

Speed data was collected using manual radar surveys performed by NDS, a subconsultant to Kimley-Horn. Each of the radar speed surveys were conducted from an inconspicuously parked, unmarked vehicle. An effort was made to ensure that the presence of the vehicle in no way affected the speed of the traffic being surveyed. Field information from these speed surveys and other roadway characteristics were recorded on field data forms and utilized in this evaluation. Chapter 2B of the CA MUTCD indicates that it is desirable to have a minimum sample of 100 vehicles for a speed zone survey for an arterial street, or a minimum observation time of two hours if the minimum sample size cannot be met due to low traffic volumes. This requirement is acknowledged to result in excessive survey periods for low volume roadways. However, a survey should not contain less than 50 vehicles. In addition, average daily traffic (ADT) counts were collected at all study locations and are presented in **Table 1**.

Examples of the field data observed and collected for the purposes of analyzing related roadway characteristics as they pertain to the determination of appropriate speed limits are listed below.

1. Segment length, width and alignment;
2. Level of pedestrian, bicycle, neighborhood electric vehicles (NEV), and truck activity;
3. Traffic flow characteristics;
4. Number of lanes and other channelization/stripping factors;
5. Frequency of intersections, driveways, uncontrolled crossings, on-street parking, bike/NEV lanes;
6. Locations of stop signs, traffic signals, and other regulatory traffic control devices;
7. Pavement condition;
8. Obstructions to driver/pedestrian visibility;

9. Land use and proximity of schools, parks/recreation areas, and senior centers;
10. Uniformity with existing speed zones in adjacent jurisdictions; and,
11. Any other unusual conditions or hazards not readily apparent to the driver.

Table 1 – Survey Locations and Limits

No	Street	Limits		ADT*
1	White Rock Road	Prairie City Road	East Bidwell Street	7,913

* ADT data collected on December 7, 2022

Statistical Analysis Factors

Significant factors used to analyze the collected survey data are summarized below:

1. **85th Percentile Speed.** The Critical Speed, or the 85th Percentile Speed, is defined as that speed at or below which 85 percent of the traffic is moving. This factor is the primary guide in determining what speeds the majority of safe and reasonable drivers are traveling. Therefore, the practice is to set the speed limit to the nearest 5 mph increment from the critical speed unless other factors require a lower limit. Speed limits set on this basis provide law enforcement officials with a means of controlling reckless or unreliable drivers who will not conform to what the majority finds reasonable.
2. **The 10-mph Pace.** The 10-mph Pace is the 10-mph increment range, which contains the largest number of recorded vehicles. The pace is a measure of the dispersion of speeds within the sample surveyed. Speed limits should normally be set to fall within the 10-mph pace. However, conditions not readily apparent to the driver or adhering to State mandated limits such as in Residence Districts may require setting speed limits below the 10-mph pace.
3. **50th Percentile Speed.** The Median Speed, or 50th Percentile Speed, represents the mid-point value within the range of recorded speeds for a particular roadway location. In other words, 50 percent of the vehicles travel faster than and 50 percent travel slower than, the median speed. This value is another measure of the central tendency of the vehicle speed distribution. Typically speed limits should not be set below the 50th Percentile Speed, since it would result in greater than 50-percent of the drivers exceeding the speed limit.
4. **15th Percentile Speed.** The 15th Percentile Speed is that speed at or below which 15 percent of the vehicles are traveling. This value is important in determining the minimum allowable speed limit, given that the vehicles traveling below this speed tend to obstruct the flow of traffic, thereby increasing the collision potential.
5. **Percent of Vehicles in Pace Speed.** The percent of vehicles in the 10-mph pace speed is an indication of the grouping of vehicular speeds. Ideally, if all vehicles were traveling at or about the same speed, there would be a reduced likelihood of vehicular collisions. In speed limit analysis, the higher the percent of vehicles within the pace speed, the more favorable the speed distribution. The percent of the 10-mph pace is often between 60 and 90 percent.

Based on the 2014 CA MUTCD¹, the guidance for establishing speed limits has been modified and the new documentation indicates that speed limits “shall be established at the nearest 5 mph increment of the 85th-percentile speed of free-flowing traffic.” In matching existing conditions with the traffic safety needs of the community, engineering judgment may indicate the need for a reduction of the posted speed limit by 5 mph due to specific factors such as road characteristics, adjacent land uses, presence of bike

¹ 2014 California MUTCD Guidance between Adjacent Segments

routes/lanes, the pace speed, roadside development and environment, parking practices and pedestrian activity, and collision history.

Collision History

The speed survey worksheet summarize the available collision information for the study segment. The collision information was obtained from the Transportation Injury Mapping System (TIMS) from January 1, 2015 to December 31, 2021. For this analysis, only collisions during the 3-year period between January 1, 2019 and December 31, 2021 were considered.

Results and Recommendations

The speed limit recommendation contained in this memo is intended to establish the appropriate posted speed limit along the study segment. The recommended speed limit was developed based on data analysis results of a thorough evaluation of the study segment which was surveyed. A summary of the data analysis, along with recommended speed limit, is presented in **Table 2**. The supporting speed survey worksheet is provided in **Attachment 1**.

Table 2 – Speed Survey Recommendations

Street Segment	Existing Speed Limit (mph)	Recommended Speed Limit (mph)	85% Speed (mph)	Median Speed (mph)	10 mph Pace Range (mph)	% of Veh. In Pace
White Rock Road between Prairie City Road and East Bidwell Street	Not Posted	60*	66.3	61.6	55-64	57

Note:

* 5 MPH reduction applied

Attachments:

Exhibit 1 – Project Vicinity Map

Attachment 1 – Speed Survey Worksheets



NOT TO SCALE



Attachment 1

Speed Survey Worksheets

Street: White Rock Road Location: White Rock Rd 2,300 ft E/O Oak Ave Pkwy

Segment: White Rock Rd between Prairie City Rd & E Bidwell St

Segment #: 01 Direction: Eastbound & Westbound

SPEED SURVEY

Date: 11/10/2022 Day: Thursday Time: 11:15-12:10

Weather: Clear/Dry Observer: NDS

Speed (mph)	Number of Vehicles						Total Volume
	5	10	15	20	25	30	
85 or higher							0
80							0
75							0
70							0
65							0
60							0
55							0
50							0
45							0
40							0
35							0
30 or lower							0
NB/EB shown in Red, SB/WB shown in Blue							Total Number of Vehicles: 230

SPEED DATA

Posted: Not Posted

85th %: 66.3 MPH

50th %: 61.6 MPH

Pace: 55-64 MPH

% in Pace: 57% MPH

% Below Pace: 20% MPH

% Above Pace: 23% MPH

COLLISION HISTORY

YEAR	2019	2020	2021
PDO	0	0	0
INJURY	2	4	1
FATAL	0	0	0
TOTAL	2	4	1

ROADWAY CONDITIONS

Recommended Speed Limit: 60 mph
(applied 5 MPH reduction from 65 MPH)

Roadway Segment Conditions:
Rural roadway segment running east-west adjacent to open fields. Segment is adjacent to future residential development (in construction). Roadway is four-lane divided expressway with two lanes in each direction separated by wide landscaped median. No bike lanes provided in either direction. Collision history summarized above is representative of conditions prior to the road improvements constructed (conversion of two-lane undivided arterial to a four-lane divided expressway).

DECLARED SPEED LIMIT: 60 MPH

Zach Bosch, P.E. DATE
Senior Civil Engineer, Traffic
Resolution # _____ Adopted: _____