

**City Council Meeting, March 6, 2019
Public Comments, Agenda Section F**

**Submitted by: Gary Osterhout
Position: Neutral
Received: 03-05-2019 03:18 PM**

Agenda Item:

F. PUBLIC COMMENTS (3 MINUTES PER PERSON)

Comment:

I commented below on the lack of aesthetic concerns about the Blanche Road traffic sign placement. As another example of your Traffic Engineer's aesthetic myopia, on Highland Rd there is a 30 mph sign (1) just a few feet before the flashing speed detection sign (2), also indicating 30 mph (as well as the speeds of the cars). Brought that to Erik's attention months back, and he said no way would he remove sign (1), although it is clearly redundant, unnecessary and aesthetically displeasing.

**City Council Meeting, March 6, 2019
Public Comments, Agenda Item No. 7**

**Submitted by: Gary Osterhout
Position: Oppose
Received: 03-05-2019 01:11 PM**

Agenda Item:

7. 19-0127 Consider Approving a Comprehensive Citywide Salary Schedule for all City Positions and Adjustments to Salary Ranges (Human Resources Director Jenkins). ADOPT RESOLUTION NO. 19-0026

Comment:

Council should view salaries in conjunction with all related costs, including pensions, vacation/sick, medical insurance, comp time, cash-outs, buy-backs, early retirement, shadow credits, etc., and compare all the PRIVATE sector (which is paying these costs). Our pensions are unsustainable because they are excessive. So you need to adjust other components to adjust to sustainable--like no salary increases. Then consider that reserves are increased in proportion to these extra costs per policy.

**City Council Meeting, March 6, 2019
Public Comments, Agenda Item No. 8**

**Submitted by: Gary Osterhout
Position: Oppose
Received: 03-05-2019 01:56 PM**

Agenda Item:

8. 19-0133 Consider Adopting Resolution No. 19-00024 Establishing the Manhattan Beach City Logo and Authorizing and Directing Staff to Take All Related Actions to Implement and Trademark the City Logo (Parks and Recreation Director Leyman). ADOPT RESOLUTION NO. 19-0024

Comment:

Unnecessary corporatization of M.B., and will likely result in unsightly proliferation like the "Parks Make Life Better" signs. Takes away from the historical seal. Was told by the mayor this will all be free and would not use staff time. I interpret different.

**City Council Meeting, March 6, 2019
Public Comments, Agenda Item No. 10**

**Submitted by: Gary Osterhout
Position: Neutral
Received: 03-05-2019 01:13 PM**

Agenda Item:

10. 19-0094 Approve the Selection of the New City Website Domain Name: manhattanbeach.gov (Information Technology Director Taylor). APPROVE

Comment:

Another change to something I thought was weird from inception.

**City Council Meeting, March 6, 2019
Public Comments, Agenda Item No. 11**

**Submitted by: Gary Osterhout
Position: Oppose
Received: 03-05-2019 01:53 PM**

Agenda Item:

11. 19-0108 Consider Introduction of Ordinance Nos. 19-0007 and 19-0008 Amending the Zoning Code and Local Coastal Program to Reinforce the Prohibition on Renting Residential Property for Less Than 30 Days, Except Under Limited Circumstances (Community Development Director McIntosh). a) CONDUCT PUBLIC HEARING b) INTRODUCE ORDINANCE NOS. 19-0007 AND 19-0008

Comment:

I think the council has a lot of gall, and not leadership, in scheduling this matter this way. The January meeting outlined a good process going forward, and did not need pre-empted. I suggest you back off, continue a 100% ban, and join with other cities with a current 100% ban to see what is practical going forward, including Coastal Commission challenges. Then assemble some good factual material with appropriate alternatives, and present to the residents for guidance and cogent feedback.

**City Council Meeting, March 6, 2019
Public Comments, Agenda Item No. 11**

**Submitted by: Stephanie Monash
Position: Oppose
Received: 03-04-2019 10:30 AM**

Agenda Item:

11. 19-0108 Consider Introduction of Ordinance Nos. 19-0007 and 19-0008 Amending the Zoning Code and Local Coastal Program to Reinforce the Prohibition on Renting Residential Property for Less Than 30 Days, Except Under Limited Circumstances (Community Development Director McIntosh). a) CONDUCT PUBLIC HEARING b) INTRODUCE ORDINANCE NOS. 19-0007 AND 19-0008

Comment:

This proposed ordinance is nothing but a thinly veiled bequest to Airbnb and other platforms that have demonstrated contempt for our existing ban and will create an even-greater regulatory nightmare. As council already knows well, opening the door to STR's regardless of restrictions within the "coastal zone" area will cede our authority to the Coastal Commission, which supports the proliferation of STR's. Serve your constituents and not special interests by enforcing the existing ban!

**City Council Meeting, March 6, 2019
Public Comments, Agenda Item No. 11**

**Submitted by: Eileen Neill
Position: Support
Received: 03-02-2019 11:37 AM**

Agenda Item:

11. 19-0108 Consider Introduction of Ordinance Nos. 19-0007 and 19-0008 Amending the Zoning Code and Local Coastal Program to Reinforce the Prohibition on Renting Residential Property for Less Than 30 Days, Except Under Limited Circumstances (Community Development Director McIntosh). a) CONDUCT PUBLIC HEARING b) INTRODUCE ORDINANCE NOS. 19-0007 AND 19-0008

Comment:

I served as resident representative on the Sepulveda working group and helped craft this change. As a resident that was involved in the struggle to make the Gelson's development project more palpable to our neighborhood, I wish this ordinance had been in effect earlier. I personally would have welcomed a boutique hotel in my neighborhood. That would have been a much bigger revenue contributor (food sales are tax exempt) to the City. The proposed increased height is modest, no canyon effect.

**City Council Meeting, March 6, 2019
Public Comments, Agenda Item No. 15**

**Submitted by: Gary Osterhout
Position: Oppose
Received: 03-05-2019 02:04 PM**

Agenda Item:

15. 19-0146 Request by Mayor Napolitano and Councilmember Lesser to Review Two Safe Routes to School (SRTS) Pedestrian Improvements: 1) Solar Powered Flashing Beacons, In-Road Warning Lights and a High Visibility Crosswalk at Blanche Road and 29th Street; and 2) a Solar Powered Radar Speed Awareness Sign Located 130 Feet North 29th Street on the West Side of Blanche Road (Public Works Director Katsouleas). RECEIVE REPORT

Comment:

Hoping to send a separate e-mail to you. I saw the 29th St. installation 2 Sundays ago and immediately recognized it as out of scale and proportion. Later that day, neighbors Randy and Lissen Schnack stopped to bring this to my attention and express their concerns (i.e., "more than one complaint"). My home's side yard is along Blanche from 31st to 30th. Please consider replacing such signs with something more appropriate, the acceptance of which will be first vetted by the neighborhood.

**City Council Meeting, March 6, 2019
Public Comments, Agenda Item No. 15**

**Submitted by: Lissen Schnack
Position: Oppose
Received: 03-05-2019 05:14 PM**

Agenda Item:

15. 19-0146 Request by Mayor Napolitano and Councilmember Lesser to Review Two Safe Routes to School (SRTS) Pedestrian Improvements: 1) Solar Powered Flashing Beacons, In-Road Warning Lights and a High Visibility Crosswalk at Blanche Road and 29th Street; and 2) a Solar Powered Radar Speed Awareness Sign Located 130 Feet North 29th Street on the West Side of Blanche Road (Public Works Director Katsouleas). RECEIVE REPORT

Comment:

16-foot tall FLASHING speed signs and 16-foot tall FLASHING cross walk signs commonly seen on commercial corridors are inappropriate in tight residential neighborhood settings when less invasive alternative measures can achieve the safety required. The impacted residents were not given any opportunity for input before construction began. This is setting a bad precedent and is not in keeping with the "small town character" in the City of Manhattan Beach's Mission Statement.

(Attachment)

3-6-19 Manhattan Beach Safe Routes to School Construction

My name is Lissen Schnack and I live at Blanche Road and 30th Street. Thank you to the City Council for allowing the residents to talk about the Safe Routes to School measures being implemented in the City. I am concerned that the aesthetic impact that the implementation of large scaled flashing signs is not in fitting with the “small beach town character” that the City prides itself on- and is written into the City Mission- when other less visually invasive and safe solutions could be implemented and tested that are more fitting to the character in the tight neighborhoods.

Although this has been in planning for 10 years, other than Grand View School the residents were never notified of the work nor full scope – that large flashing signs would be installed - and were not given the opportunity for input. The residents only became aware after the construction was already started.

Let me be clear that none of us are opposed to implementing a safe route to school – and when I say WE there are not just “a couple of people”- many of the people we have been talking with in the neighborhood have school aged children- however we are very concerned that the City is installing flashing stop signs, **permanent** flashing speed signs and flashing cross walks on small residential streets where the homes are close to the road-- instead of implementing solutions such as cross walks, signs and school crossing guards. The usual application of these types of large signs and flashing lights is typically seen more in commercial and heavily traveled corridors than in the tight residential neighborhoods where many of these are being installed.

The example is at Blanche and 29th Street where a **flashing** cross walk is being installed with 16 foot tall large **flashing** solar signs. Further, an also tall and large 16 foot tall **permanent flashing** speed sign noting the car’s speed will be installed on Blanche outside of our and neighbor’s homes. Is this what the residents of Manhattan Beach really want to see?

There is presently a large reflective speed limit sign that has been installed at this same location that was installed at this location AFTER speed studies were taken 10 years ago. How do we even know that a flashing speed sign is currently necessary or will be more effective?

There is no street parking along Blanche so no opportunity for people or school children to dart out between cars. Further, the crosswalk being installed dead-ends into a wall on the East side of Blanche so there is not even a safe place to stand to wait to cross the street. This doesn’t appear to be fully thought out.

I am not only concerned with my own neighborhood, but the City as a whole. In the 27 years that I have lived in Manhattan Beach, I have never done something like this, but it is only because I care about the City and its residents.

As I mentioned when I spoke at the last City Council meeting, why weren’t less invasive alternatives either implemented or considered? It seems that the City is letting this Safe School

Route Program flashing light program dictate the City's aesthetic. I think that this is setting a bad precedent when there are so many alternatives. Is this the way you want **your** City to look?

Thank you.

**City Council Meeting, March 6, 2019
Public Comments, Agenda Item No. 15**

**Submitted by: Randall Schnack
Position: Oppose
Received: 03-05-2019 05:01 PM**

Agenda Item:

15. 19-0146 Request by Mayor Napolitano and Councilmember Lesser to Review Two Safe Routes to School (SRTS) Pedestrian Improvements: 1) Solar Powered Flashing Beacons, In-Road Warning Lights and a High Visibility Crosswalk at Blanche Road and 29th Street; and 2) a Solar Powered Radar Speed Awareness Sign Located 130 Feet North 29th Street on the West Side of Blanche Road (Public Works Director Katsouleas). RECEIVE REPORT

Comment:

The residents and City Council of Manhattan Beach have been misled as the City violates local, state and federal laws. The City has failed to comply with Safe Routes to School grant terms, the local municipal code, state laws, and federal laws. This failure, along with the failure to follow engineering principles and conduct traffic investigations has led to installation of the projects that are excessive and have resulted in waste of taxpayer funds exposing the City to liability. See attached

(Attachment)

Honorable Mayor and Councilmembers

My name is Randy Schnack. I am commenting on the 2011 and '12 Safe Routes to School grants. Thank you for placing the matter on the General Business Agenda and thank you to City staff for information provided.

I support safety measures. More importantly as a licensed attorney and retired officer of the federal court, I have taken an oath to support and abide the law. It is for that reason I am compelled to inform you of the disturbing finding of my investigation of the available documentation related to the grants.

The residents and City Council of Manhattan Beach have been misled as the City violates local, state and federal laws. The City has failed to comply with terms of the federal and state grants, the local municipal code, state laws, and federal laws. This failure, along with the failure to follow engineering principles and conduct traffic investigations has led to installation of the projects that are excessive and have resulted in waste of taxpayer funds exposing the City to liability.

MISLEADING INFORMATION

Having reviewed the documentation, it is clear that as early as July 9, 2011 during the regular meeting of the Parking and Public Improvements Commission,

misleading information was being provided by the Traffic Engineer regarding the description, location, and number of proposed installations. The Traffic Engineer also pointed out that while the Safe Routes to School program was unique in its overriding emphasis on community participation in the development and implementation of a project, residents/business around the schools were not notified or included in the discussions because according to him there were no controversial items being discussed.

This and additional misleading information continued to be disseminated as evident in the March 12, 2012 Staff Report to the Council on the subject "Resolution No. 6343 Authorizing the Submission of a Safe Routes to School (SR2S) Grant Application for Pedestrian and Bicycle Improvements for Manhattan Beach Schools Grades K through 8"). It was reported that in-roadway warning lights would solely be installed at school crossings to allow City staff to evaluate their feasibility and effectiveness. It was also noted that all pedestrian projects must comply with the Americans Disabilities Act (ADA).

USE OF PARTICULAR DEVICES

Both the federal and state Safe Routes to School grants are designed to reduce injuries and fatalities to school children. The grants list eligible project

components and devices with the California Traffic Manual providing guidelines for the design and application of traffic control devices in school areas. The Traffic Manual states, “The decision to use a particular device at a particular location shall be made on the basis of an engineering and traffic survey.” **The City has not conducted the requisite engineering and traffic surveys to justify the use of any device and thus has violated mandated Manhattan Beach Municipal Code § 14.12.01(C) and California Vehicle Codes §§ 21372 and 21373.**

AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT (ADA) & UNIFORM FEDERAL
ACCESSIBILITY STANDARDS (UFAS)

Title II of the ADA requires state and local governments to make pedestrian crossings accessible to people with disabilities. (28 C.F.R. §§ 35.150(d)(2), 35.151(2) (e)) To comply with ADA requirements, specific standards must be met for width, slope, cross slope, placement, and other features. (28 C.F.R. Part 36, Appendix A, § 4.7; 41 C.F.R. Part 101 - 19.6, Appendix A, § 4.7.) In constructing pedestrian crossings, state and local governments can choose between two sets of standards – the ADA Standards for Accessible Design (ADA Standards) and the Uniform Federal Accessibility Standards (UFAS). (The ADA Standards are located at 28 C.F.R. Part 36, Appendix A. They are also available on the ADA Home Page at www.ada.gov. UFAS is located at 41 C.F.R. Part 101 - 19.6,

Appendix A, and at the Access Board's website at www.access-board.gov/ufas/ufas-html/ufas.htm) **The crosswalk at Blanche and 29th Street does not meet the specific standards required to make it accessible to people with disabilities in direct violation of Title II of the ADA .**

As the elected officials of the City it is incumbent upon you as well as required by your fiduciary duties to immediately address this matter.



Randall Schnack <randallschnack@gmail.com>

Re: 29th St and Blanche Rd Pedestrian Safety Improvements UPDATE

1 message

Randall Schnack <randallschnack@gmail.com>

Sun, Mar 3, 2019 at 7:59 PM

To: Gilbert Gamboa <ggamboa@citymb.info>

Cc: Lissen Gregory Schnack <lissengregory@gmail.com>, Hal Croft <HalCroft7444@gmail.com>, Eric Steller <steller.eric@gmail.com>, "esther.hutchison@gmail.com" <esther.hutchison@gmail.com>, "kemplem@gtlaw.com" <kemplem@gtlaw.com>, MORGAN <mmccall@usc.edu>, "kobitin@me.com" <kobitin@me.com>, Richard Montgomery <rmontgomery@citymb.info>, Steve Napolitano <snapolitano@citymb.info>, Nancy Hersman <nhersman@citymb.info>, David Lesser <dlesser@citymb.info>, Amy Thomas Howorth <ahoworth@citymb.info>, Bruce Moe <bmoe@citymb.info>, "Stephanie Katsouleas, P. E." <skatsouleas@citymb.info>, Prem Kumar <pkumar@citymb.info>, Erik Zandvliet <ezandvliet@citymb.info>, "Anastasia Seims, P. E." <aseims@citymb.info>, Gary Osterhout <GaryOsterhout@yahoo.com>

Gil,

Thank you for the effort to be as responsive as possible regarding my request for information. The information is very enlightening.

Of utmost importance and the primary purpose of this email is to dispel the misconception that because the crosswalk at Blanche Road and 29th Street is not required under California Vehicle Code ("CVC") § 21368 to be marked in yellow that the City does not have to comply with CVC § 21372 which requires the City to "establish and promulgate warrants to be used as guidelines for the **placement of traffic control devices near schools for the purpose of protecting students going to and from school.**" (See CVC §21372) . The Solar Speed Awareness Sign, Flashing Beacons and a High Visibility Crosswalk with in-road Warning Lights projects on Blanche Road are improvements being reimbursed through the federal (SRTS) and state (SR2S) Safe Routes to School grants designed "to reduce injuries and fatalities to school children and to encourage increased walking and bicycling among students." (See June 21, 2011, Staff Report on the subject "Consideration of the Parking and Public Improvements Commission Recommendation to Proceed with the 2011 Federal Safe Routes to School Grant Application" and March 12, 2012, Staff Report on the subject "Resolution No. 6343 Authorizing the Submission of a Safe Routes to School (SR2S) Grant Application for Pedestrian and Bicycle Improvements for Manhattan Beach Schools Grades K through 8").

Your email response, "No reportable documents of warrants or studies for traffic control devices related to the grant projects." is prima facie evidence of the City's failure to comply with state law.

I take this opportunity to point out additional matters of interest.

1) Both the federal and state grants are intended to reduce injuries and fatalities through capital (engineering) projects that improve safety for children in grades K-8 who walk or bicycle to school yet for the only period surveyed (21 months in 2006 - 2008), no fatalities, injuries or accidents were reported on Blanche Road between 24th Street and Rosecrans Avenue.

2) No evidence has been presented of any measure initiated in the past 15 years to address the reduction of injuries and fatalities along Blanche Road. No plan to measure success of improvements. No baseline data.

3) From the March 12, 2012, Staff Report on the subject "Resolution No. 6343 Authorizing the Submission of a Safe Routes to School (SR2S) Grant Application for Pedestrian and Bicycle Improvements for Manhattan Beach Schools Grades K through 8"

a) "All pedestrian projects must comply with the Americans Disabilities Act (ADA)" (See page 2).

The High Visibility Crosswalk with in-road Warning Lights project is non-compliant with the ADA.

b) "In-Roadway Warning Lights are reserved for use where it is desirable to alert motorists that they are approaching a condition on or adjacent to the roadway that might not be readily apparent and might require the road users to slow down and/or come to a stop. This includes, but is not necessarily limited to, situations warning of marked school crosswalks, marked midblock crosswalks, marked crosswalks on uncontrolled approaches, marked crosswalks in advance of roundabout intersections and other roadway situations involving pedestrian crossings.

...

This grant proposes installing in-roadway warning lights at six (6) locations near schools throughout the City. By pursuing the first installation of these devices in Manhattan Beach **solely at school crossings**, this provides an opportunity for residents to become familiar with their operation as well as allow **Staff to evaluate their feasibility and effectiveness**. Due to their relatively high cost (\$40,000 each), the grant process provides a funding source to install these devices that may not otherwise be available to the City." (See page 4)

4) From the June 9, 2011 minutes of the regular meeting of the City of Manhattan Beach Parking and Public Improvements Commission ("Commission"), item 4. 2011 Federal Safe Routes to School Grant:

a) "Traffic Engineer Rydell mentioned that the Safe Routes to School program is unique in its overriding emphasis on community participation in the development and implementation of a project. During this presentation there were several questions asked by Commissioners and addressed by the Traffic Engineer.

Traffic Engineer Rydell also mentioned that although the schools were in favor of the installation of in-roadway warning lights at a few crosswalk locations, there still needs to be some policy discussions on locations for such treatments, and that he will include in-roadway warning lights in the next grant application, if applicable.

Commissioner Vigon asked if notifying was done around the areas adjacent to schools. Traffic Engineer Rydell replied that residents/business around the schools were not notified as there were no controversial items being discussed.

Commissioner Vigon inquired about the size of the radar feedback signs. In response Traffic Engineer Rydell said that there are several different sizes. He also mentioned that these signs would be moved around to continually engage the driver. Commissioner Vigon would like residents notified if the use of these machines comes to fruition.

Commissioner Fournier thanked staff and Traffic Engineer for all their hard work but noted that these projects include a lot of signage and was concerned about the anticipated reaction to all of this from the community. Traffic Engineer Rydell reiterated that there is little about the proposed projects that are controversial, that the electronic radar signs much smaller now, and that he would continue to investigate different types of equipment. He also mentioned that none of the proposed bulb outs would eliminate any existing parking spaces. Commissioner Fournier mentioned that he was concerned about the number of signs proposed. Traffic Engineer Rydell stated that there are only seven signs proposed so far and

[this number could be reduced as they continue to work with the City engineer."](#)

5) From Manhattan Beach Municipal Code § 14.12.010(C)

14.12.010 - Authority to install traffic control devices.

C. The City Traffic Engineer may also place and maintain or cause to be placed and maintained such additional traffic control devices as he may deem necessary or proper to regulate traffic or to guide or warn traffic, but **he shall make such determination upon the basis of traffic engineering principles and traffic investigations** and in accordance with such standards, limitations, and rules as may be set forth in this chapter or as may be determined by ordinance or resolution of Council.

In closing, clear and convincing evidence exists to support that the City has failed to comply with the terms of the federal and state grants, the local municipal code, state laws, and federal laws. This failure along with the failure to follow engineering principles and conduct traffic investigations has lead to installation of the projects that are excessive and have resulted, or will result, in waste of taxpayer funds.

Very Truly Yours,

Randall W. Schnack

On Fri, Mar 1, 2019 at 12:04 AM Gilbert Gamboa <ggamboa@citymb.info> wrote:

Randy,

In an effort to be as responsive as possible, here is what we found regarding your request for information below:

- 1) The Grand View School Route Plan; **See attached Grandview Routes**
- 2) The Grand View School Traffic Control Plan; **It was unclear on specific document requested. See attached Traffic Safety brochure from 2007 for school traffic circulation.**
- 3) The composition and membership of the Grand View School Pedestrian advisory committee tasked with serving the needs of the school including students enroute to and from school; **Unknown. No reportable documents.**
- 4) Copies of any and all traffic related issues about pedestrians on the approaches to the school by Grand View or the local school district; **See staff reports dated June 21, 2011 (Item #14) and March 20, 2012 (Item #9). No other reportable documents related to grant projects.**
- 5) Copies of any and all reports or documentation including engineering and traffic surveys and/or studies, resulting from the investigation, if any; **See staff reports dated June 21, 2011 (Item #14) and March 20, 2012 (Item #9). No other reportable documents related to grant projects.**
- 6) Copies of any and all recommended appropriate traffic control measures and supporting documentation resulting from the above investigation of all locations along the school route? **See staff reports dated June 21, 2011 (Item #14) and March 20, 2012 (Item #9). No other reportable documents related to grant projects.**
- 7) I hereby make a formal request of any and all warrants and supporting documentation as set forth in California Vehicle Code § 21372 prepared in the past 15 years that address placement of traffic control devices near Grand View Elementary School for the purpose of protecting students going to and from school; **No reportable**

documents of warrants or studies for traffic control devices related to the grant projects. Please note that the flashing beacons at Blanche Road and 29th Street are NOT at a yellow school crosswalk, therefore, the school beacon warrants (CA-MUTCD 2010 Section 4K.103) per CVC 21372 do not apply.

All staff reports can be found on the City's website:

<https://www.citymb.info/government/city-council/city-council-meetings-agendas-and-minutes>

Please note, that Staff is committed to working with the residents toward a resolution. This may include supplemental equipment, etc.

Thank you,

From: Randall Schnack [mailto:randallschnack@gmail.com]

Sent: Thursday, February 21, 2019 6:35 PM

To: Gilbert Gamboa <ggamboa@citymb.info>

Cc: Lissen Gregory Schnack <lissengregory@gmail.com>; Hal Croft <HalCroft7444@gmail.com>; Eric Steller <steller.eric@gmail.com>; esther.hutchison@gmail.com; kemplem@gtlaw.com; Stephanie Katsouleas, P. E. <skatsouleas@citymb.info>; Shawn Igoe <sigoe@citymb.info>; Richard Montgomery <rmontgomery@citymb.info>; Bruce Moe <bmoe@citymb.info>; Steve Napolitano <snapolitano@citymb.info>; Nancy Hersman <nhersman@citymb.info>; David Lesser <dlesser@citymb.info>; Amy Thomas Howorth <ahoworth@citymb.info>; Randall Schnack <randallschnack@gmail.com>; Prem Kumar <pkumar@citymb.info>; Michael Guerrero <mguerrero@citymb.info>; Anastasia Seims, P. E. <aseims@citymb.info>; Erik Zandvliet <ezandvliet@citymb.info>; MORGAN <mmccall@usc.edu>; kobitin@me.com

Subject: Re: 29th St and Blanche Rd Pedestrian Safety Improvements UPDATE

Dear Gil,

Thank you again for reaching out with the update from the City Council meeting. I understand from your email, the direction of the Council was for the work to continue. Was there any other direction from the Council? More specifically, was a request for any of the following made:

- 1) The Grand View School Route Plan;
- 2) The Grand View School Traffic Control Plan;
- 3) The composition and membership of the Grand View School Pedestrian advisory committee tasked with serving the needs of the school including students enroute to and from school;
- 4) Copies of any and all traffic related issues about pedestrians on the approaches to the school by Grand View or the local school district;
- 5) Copies of any and all reports or documentation including engineering and traffic surveys and/or studies, resulting from the investigation, if any; and
- 6) Copies of any and all recommended appropriate traffic control measures and supporting documentation resulting from the above investigation of all locations along the school route?

I hereby make a formal request of any and all warrants and supporting documentation as set forth in California Vehicle Code § 21372 prepared in the past 15 years that address placement of traffic control devices near Grand View Elementary School for the purpose of protecting students going to and from school. I also request all items listed above in 1) through 6).*

Please let me know when the requested items are available.

Thank you,

Randy Schnack

*Below is information in support of this request.

California Code, Vehicle Code - VEH § 21372

The Department of Transportation and local authorities shall, with respect to highways under their respective jurisdictions, establish and promulgate warrants to be used as guidelines for the placement of traffic control devices near schools for the purpose of protecting students going to and from school. Such devices may include flashing signals. Such warrants shall be based upon, but need not be limited to, the following items: pedestrian volumes, vehicle volumes, width of the roadway, physical terrain, speed of vehicle traffic, horizontal and vertical alignment of the roadway, the distance to existing traffic control devices, proximity to the school, and the degree of urban or rural environment of the area. (Emphasis added)

California Code, Vehicle Code - VEH § 21373

The governing board of any school district may request the appropriate city, county, city and county or state agency to install traffic control devices in accordance with the warrants established pursuant to Section 21372 . Within 90 days thereafter, the city, county, city and county or state agency involved shall undertake an engineering and traffic survey to determine whether the requested crossing protection meets the warrants established pursuant to Section 21372. The city, county, city and county, or state agency involved may require the requesting school district to pay an amount not to exceed 50 percent of the cost of the survey. If it is determined that such requested protection is warranted, it shall be installed by the city, county, city and county or state agency involved. (Emphasis added)

California Code, Vehicle Code - VEH § 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.

California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices, Part 7: Traffic Control for School Areas

Engineering measures alone do not always result in the intended change in student and road user behavior.

Guidance:

A school route plan for each school serving elementary to high school students should be prepared in order to develop uniformity in the use of school area traffic controls and to serve as the basis for a school traffic control plan for each school.

The school route plan, developed in a systematic manner by the school, law enforcement, and traffic officials responsible for school pedestrian safety, should consist of a map (see Figure 7A-1) showing streets, the school, existing traffic controls, established school walk routes, and established school crossings.

The type(s) of school area traffic control devices used, either warning or regulatory, should be related to the volume and speed of vehicular traffic, street width, and the number and age of the students using the crossing.

School area traffic control devices should be included in a school traffic control plan...

School walk routes should be planned to take advantage of existing traffic controls.

On Thu, Feb 21, 2019 at 12:29 AM Gilbert Gamboa <ggamboa@citymb.info> wrote:

Randy, Lissen and Hal,

Thank you for your participation in the Public Comment portion of last night's meeting.

I wanted to reach out to give you all a brief recap from last night's City Council meeting regarding your concerns about the pedestrian improvements proposed for the intersection of 29th Street and Blanche Road.

During the Future Agenda Items portion at the end of the meeting, two of the Councilmembers requested for your item be placed on a future agenda tentatively scheduled for March 6, 2019.

In the meantime, the direction of the Council was for the work to continue.

If you would like to discuss further feel free to give me a call.

Thank you,

Gilbert Gamboa
Senior Civil Engineer

P: (310) 802-5356

E: ggamboa@citymb.info



Please consider the environment before printing this email.

Office Hours: M - Th 7:30AM - 5:30 PM | Alternate Open Fridays 8:00AM - 5:00 PM | Closed Alternate Fridays | Not Applicable to Public Safety

Reach Manhattan Beach Here for you 24/7, use our click and fix it app
Download the mobile app now



Gilbert Gamboa
Senior Civil Engineer

P: (310) 802-5356

E: ggamboa@citymb.info



Please consider the environment before printing this email.

Office Hours: M - Th 7:30AM - 5:30 PM | Alternate Open Fridays 8:00AM - 5:00 PM | Closed Alternate Fridays | Not Applicable to Public Safety

Reach Manhattan Beach Here for you 24/7, use our click and fix it system
Download the mobile app now

