

Martha Alvarez, MMC

From: Mark Fielder <mark@fielder.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 13, 2023 12:06 PM
To: citycouncil@hermosabeach.gov; council.mailbox@santamonica.gov;
councilmember.park@lacity.org; List - City Council; CityCouncil@TorranceCA.gov
Subject: [EXTERNAL] E-bike - Safety issues

EXTERNAL EMAIL: Do not click links or open attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

Good Day,

By way of introduction my name is Mark Fielder.

My Email is included above and you can call me at 818 429 5665, should you need to.

Issue: I visit your beach cities a lot - Spend money - Ride bikes - et al.

I also ride the strand stretching from Will Rogers St. Bch to Torrance - you're all familiar with these biking and walking paths...(BTW - love the recent improvements around and north of SM Pier ! ... good job!)

BUT here's the issue, folks - there are now lotsa E-bikes on this bicycle path.

This is extremely dangerous, and something must be done before some is killed or seriously hurt. Perhaps, it has happened already.

Understand this;

E-bikes generally weigh 50-80 lbs and are getting larger, as batt tech improves.

Many look like full blown motorcycles now.

Whereas, a typical manual-powered bike weighs only 13-17 lbs.

E-bike are fast - standard speeds are up to 30 MPH and modifications by owner's make them even faster.

When you place a person on same - you now have an approx. total weight at anywhere from 150 lbs to 300 lbs + (depending on rider size) traveling at 25-30 miles an hour on the strand - inches from regular bike riders - side by side and oncoming.

EX: I weigh 185 - If I added an 80 lbs E-bike and then the panniers - (which are common storage bags attached to ebikes), we're talking 270-275 lbs traveling at 25-30 mph... If I hit someone at that speed... come on... not good.

Now imagine the potential head on collision factors using the on-coming non-ebike rider - who travels at generally 9-13 mph (normal speed) - then hitting an ebiker. So, we're talking upwards of a 40 MPH potential head on collision!

Not sure many folks would walk away unscathed on that...

This past weekend, we witnessed and encountered several HUGE e-bikes (again, motorcycle size bikes) speeding up and down the strand.

These were dangerous encounters - the high speed, the silence of the battery (can't hear them coming from behind), passing unsafely, etc.

Had I or anyone else been struck by these riders, the damage is incomprehensible - potentially life altering.

Suggestions:

Go out and see for yourself and experience the safety compromise.

Draft some legislation - if not done already - to curb the growing problem and use of these on the strand.

Put some teeth in it with law enforcement / signage / etc.

Look, not a complainer, BUT.... seriously, something needs to be done - and soon.

Take a min to query E-bike accident statistics.

Lack of action will result in the inevitability of more accidents, more city-response related expenses, et al.

Last: Bike with motors... just like the one the guy who threw the fire-cracker into the silence dancers a few weeks ago was riding on.... The are mini-bikes ! Fast - loud - also super dangerous and on the strand all the time. No good.

Thanks for the consideration.

Sincerely,

Mark Fielder

CC:

Hermosa City Council <citycouncil@hermosabeach.gov>

Santa Monica City Council <council.mailbox@santamonica.gov>

Traci Park <councilmember.park@lacity.org>

Manhattan Beach City Council <citycouncil@manhattanbeach.gov>

Torrance City Council <CityCouncil@TorranceCA.gov>

Sincerely,

Mark Fielder

Phone: 1-818-841-5540

Email: mark@fielder.com

Web: www.fielderfinancial.com

Mailing Address:
Fielder Financial Mgmt., Ltd.
918 Amherst Drive
Burbank, CA. 91504-3003



Martha Alvarez, MMC

From: Laurie McCarthy <rgngrl1@aol.com>
Sent: Saturday, July 15, 2023 10:31 AM
To: List - City Council
Subject: [EXTERNAL] New White Street Signs

EXTERNAL EMAIL: Do not click links or open attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

Hello City Council Members:

I am writing to comment on the new white-background signage that has been implemented on portions of MBB. As a Parks and Rec commissioner, I have been approached by quite a few friends recently commenting on the lack of crisp visibility of this signage. I chose to investigate myself by driving at various times of day to check it out.

The signage is a problem in my opinion. Here are my strong observations:

- 1) Our skies are often grey/cloudy/foggy, particularly in the morning and late afternoon. The white color simply vanishes into the sky color much of the time. This is especially true when coming up or down some of the inclines/small hills on the roads. When driving, I was practically on some of the signs before I could decipher them due to the blending of sign and sky. There is simply insufficient color contrast with the usual sky color and glare. This was never a problem with the blue signs.
- 2) In several places going East on MBB, the side street signs literally blend into the grey/white/light-colored paint of the buildings behind them. The paint colors function like a backdrop, reflecting light and leaving nothing for the sign to stand out against. Again, no color contrast to make the sign readily identifiable.
- 3) I had several moments in my excursions, particularly going East on MBB, when it was clear that the car in front of me deciphered the sign late, braking late to make its intended right turn. This is a form of safety hazard.

My conclusions:

These signs are not adequately visible under our normal weather conditions in MB. There is insufficient color contrast. And when people are trying to navigate their way and identify when to turn on a street they are searching for, it becomes a form of safety hazard.

I would strongly recommend that Council reconsider reverting to the original or similar blue color which stood out so well and fit our beach town sensibility. The basic purpose of a sign is rendered useless and a potential hazard if you can't see them well or in sufficient time while driving.

Thank you.

Sincerely
Laurie McCarthy

Martha Alvarez, MMC

From: Gary Osterhout <garyosterhout@verizon.net>
Sent: Sunday, July 16, 2023 6:16 PM
To: List - City Council
Subject: [EXTERNAL] UFMP: Consent Agenda Item 8

EXTERNAL EMAIL: Do not click links or open attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

Councilmembers:

Note that I brought the topic of an unavailable full-set UFMP to you in March 2023. It has taken you this long to ratify the complete Master Plan to then get this broadly available. And even with that you put this current item on Consent seemingly to avoid public accountability of the lapse and review instead of on the General Agenda, where public discussion on the UFMP was supposed to have occurred back in 2020. **I think this lack of attention to public involvement is a fine example of the lack of attention I believe you give to the city canopy on an ongoing basis.**

Having now been able to read through all 66 pages of the UFMP, I propose that instead of ratifying this full document I suggest you condemn it and demand a redo that would be both actionable and accountable. The principles are being ignored, it lacks accountability, and its text and support surveys are dated compared to today's climate exigencies. I would hate to have the City hold this up to be an adequate document of our tree preservation and promotion efforts.

Note that I was a participant in the Tree Ordinance update in 2009, as well as the inadequate community meetings and outreach that seemed to provide the foundation for this document, so I probably have more insight than many on this topic. Note that due to a lack of effective outreach the "survey" was only 35 people (page 26) and only 22 people attended the meetings. Note that those meetings were held in 2015 and it took until 2020 for even an abbreviated UFMP to even be considered.

Consider the content of my email to Tony D'errico 6/2/16, which I believe meets the test of time:

I was a member of the MB Tree Canopy Committee before it was dissolved by David Lesser through diverting the committee's oversight to the Environmental Services Committee, then disbanding the latter.

I was at the first community meeting in this series, which for the most part was window-dressing (please--- charts for us to say for what reasons why we love trees the best?).

What was clear at that meeting, but not clear in the reports you received, is that the community consensus, when allowed to stray from the pre-formatted questions, was that persistent, consistent, and pervasive outreach, education and enforcement are essential for a viable program. That, and a good pragmatic, flexible program such that people are not going to plant or take care of trees if they know that the city will not work with them, or that in their trying to adhere to the objectives of the program such desired behaviors won't result to their detriment.

Capture those two elements (as well as have the City keep to their own rules in respect to tree maintenance), and you will have a good program. Anything short of that is wasted money. Unfortunately, the reports you received seem to spend more time trying to convince the Council that trees are good (which we know), than on gap analysis on why our current program doesn't work.

Here's some of the major flaws in this document, or at least then items that have been egregiously ignored:

Palm Trees.

Page 20 states: "For aesthetic reasons, palm trees are often a popular choice. However, broadleaf trees provide higher per-tree environmental and aesthetic benefits. With an established palm population that is over 26% of the community forest, there is an opportunity for future tree planting to emphasize non -palm species."

Page 21 states: "Many palm trees, especially Washingtonia species, require annual pruning to manage fruit production, and to ensure that dead fronds do not fall and injure people or damage property."

Page 31 states: "Manhattan Beach's community tree resource includes more than 180 unique species with good diversity among non-palm species. Maintaining this high diversity and reducing planting of palm species will be important as increased urban density provides less space for high-benefit medium to large canopy non-palm species."

If you Google "Is a Palm Tree a Tree", the preponderance of the returns are "No." Palm trees shouldn't even be included in this report except for calling for a systematic substitution program. Palm trees provide little to no environmental benefit such as carbon sequestration or shade (such as "heat island" amelioration). Maintenance of palms is costly. Yet 26% of our canopy was palm trees when the UFMP was introduced.

However, when trees were to be selected for the North Manhattan Beach streetscape, the selection was palm trees "so that the chosen trees would not obscure the banners." Seems ironic that the current limited interest banner not being obscured reads "Go Green."

Tree Canopy by Park

This section (page 18) is what I would term a "factoid" too often present in the City's publications. Information, but not useful information. First, where is "Five Points Park?" Why isn't Water Wise Park listed? Second, what use is percentage "Tree Canopy by Park" useful information, when a good quantity of each park is designed not to have trees? You aren't going to put a tree in the middle of a soccer or baseball field, or on the jogging trail, or on the Sand Dune. It would be more helpful to list the acreage in our parks where trees are suitable but not planted (particularly in Veterans Parkway and Polliwog). Note that in the recent discussion of traffic calming on Valley Drive, you ignored the benefit of planting trees on the parkway to reduce the perception of wide open space--and there is a lot of suitable space in that section.

Maintenance

Page 2 says: "The City's commitment to maintenance of the tree resource is apparent from the ongoing contracted regular maintenance of trees, on a 1-2-year cycle."

Page 18 says: "Areas of high use, such as the Veteran's Parkway, receive annual inspections and trees in need of pruning are tended to promptly. All other trees are on a 2-year pruning cycle."

We know that the above is not true if only based on the number of times I have to bring maintenance needs to your attention, and that what little attention the Parkway gets is even further reduced at the slightest concern about finances."

Currently there are a number of trees on the Parkway being suffocated by ice plant (do I really need to send you pictures?). Again, no supervision to this condition despite a Maintenance Supervisor and Urban Forester.

Accountability and Reporting

Page 20: Currently, there are no formalized planting programs or partnerships to plant additional trees.

Page 21: "Stable and predictable funding is critical to effective and efficient management of the urban forest."

Page 42 says: "The UFMP calls for the City's Urban Forester to deliver a State of the Urban Forest Report every 5 years" and "The UFMP intends to update the canopy and land cover analysis on a 10-year basis."

Under listed objectives as provided in the original 2015 process as developed by Juan Price, it says "Develop an **annual** State of Urban Forest Report." I agree with that objective. I believe the City would be better served by an annual report (five years is too long), with the GIS analysis to be done every 5 years. I would also suggest that the new UFMP call for the annual budget process to include an affirmative discussion of the tree projects for the upcoming, and to include the Tree Canopy Restoration Fund." Currently you have no relevant mention of trees in your entire budget document.

There still isn't a formalized program to plant additional trees. And we don't need "partnerships" to do so.

Tree Replacement

Page 14: "Recommendations include: Remove and replace failing trees as they are identified."

Page 20: "Tree Planting. As trees are removed, the City maintains a 1:1 replacement policy. With an establishing population in good condition, the priority for tree planting should aim to replace trees as they are removed 1:1."

We all know this isn't happening. And although I believe the attention to the size of a "box tree" for residential property is overemphasized and used more for negotiation than effectiveness, when the city does replace a tree it seems that it is more likely than not to die soon or be of an inadequately small size.

Education and Enforcement

P. 3. "In gathering this information, several common themes were apparent. Increased communication and clarity, continued and enhanced tree maintenance and preservation, and planting the right tree in the right place were identified as important to many key stakeholders."

P. 21 "On neighborhood streets, where it is the adjacent property owner's responsibility to prune trees, a tree trimming permit is required. ANSI A300 pruning standards are required to be followed. These include but are not limited to:

- Generally no more than twenty-five percent (25%) of living foliage should be removed annually
- Topping of trees is generally prohibited

There is an opportunity for more uniform application of these standards through public outreach, and by working with permitted tree trimmers to standardize care."

How often do you drive by to see trees topped and trimmed over 25%? You're not looking if you don't see this. The City has done very little in respect to community-wide education of the rules and best practices. This would seem essential to a UFMP. The ordinance is still confusing--I'm not certain myself what is considered a street-tree, a right-of-way tree, and a front-yard tree.

There should be at least high-level periodic data regarding enforcement and fines, and in what categories. The city should educate the public on what the tree preservation ordinance rules are. And all rules that apply to city-maintained trees should apply to resident-maintained trees, and vice versa.

Enforcement should apply to the property owner or renter as well as any hired company. There should be continual physical inspection of tree maintenance activities, both concurrent and subsequent, without any resident having to make a complaint. The sound of a tree saw or chipper is obvious and easily tracked down (although this might require weekend work). It is short-sighted to only work with "permitted tree trimmers" when there are so many bandit trimmers. It is unfair that some residents spend a lot of money to properly trim their trees, where others get away with doing on the cheap and hurting the tree and the neighborhood in the process. Remember--the City is considered to have a vested interest in all trees--there is no reason proactive enforcement would not be appropriate.

Master Plans in General

One of the sitting councilpersons once wrote to me that they don't like master plans. I wrote back to say that I disagreed with that statement in concept but agreed with the sentiment when Master Plans are used as they are in Manhattan Beach--as performative governance that are ignored after adoption. Sort of a "Let's Not and Say We Did" marketing approach.

As an example outside the UFMP (and I won't even touch the Facilities Master Plan), consider that the Veterans Parkway Master Plan says that the Carrotwood Allee section should be planted with Coastal Scrub. Yet the last planting in that section included extensive planting of Bird of Paradise plants. When that was brought to Public Works' attention, those plants should have been immediately replaced voluntarily, but Public Works knows that no one on City Council cares, and there they are today.

Thank you for your consideration.
Gary Osterhout

Martha Alvarez, MMC

From: debaets@aol.com
Sent: Sunday, July 16, 2023 7:58 PM
To: List - City Council
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Street Signs item 23-0276

EXTERNAL EMAIL: Do not click links or open attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Councilmembers.

The new design for street signs is too hard to read. The white background fades into the sky and are not visible until you are right next to them. The font is too thin and hard to read. The federal and state governments tested many different sign/color combinations and found that green background with white letters were the colors that were easiest to read. Countries around the world use the green/white combination for their highway and freeway signs. The street signs that are currently being installed in Manhattan Beach are unsafe.

Steve De Baets
310-480-1529

Martha Alvarez, MMC

From: Michael Ty <creadvty@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, July 17, 2023 11:03 AM
To: List - City Council
Cc: Stella Ty
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Comment for 7/18/23 meeting re: city inspectors are not responding
Attachments: Email 2.pdf; Email 1.pdf; Email 4.pdf; Email 3.pdf

EXTERNAL EMAIL: Do not click links or open attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

Honorable Council,

My name is Michael Ty. I'm a resident and I'd like to request your help with finalizing Solar permit 23-00595. I've tried contacting Ryan Heise but **he's not replying to my emails.**

The solar permit passed inspection on June 15 but the city doesn't want to finalize because they said we have too many open permits.

In that regard, we cleared permit 09-02777 on June 15. We cleared permit 21-00922 on July 3. **This Solar permit can also be cleared and is just waiting for the city.**

I emailed Ryan Heise on July 12 to explain and request the solar permit to be finalized. I didn't get a reply. I followed up July 13, 14, and 17. **Four emails with no response.** Attached are copies of the emails.

It's really simple. The city complained that we have too many open permits so we are closing them one by one. **If the city can finalize this, we can clear this one off the list.**

I hope the council can help so we can at least benefit from the summer heat and reduce pollution. Thank you very much.

Sincerely,
Michael & Stella Ty

--

Sent from iPhone



Mic Ty <creadvty@gmail.com>

SOLR-23-00595: request to release hold

Michael Ty <creadvty@gmail.com>

Wed, Jul 12 at 11:13 AM

To: Charles Buckley <charles@solaroptimum.com>, Ryan Heise <rheise@citymb.info>, Stella Ty <stellamariety@yahoo.com>

Dear Mr. Heise,

We are writing to request our permit SOLR-23-00595 to be finalized. The inspection was completed but there was a hold because "we have too many open permits."

We had 5 permits, 2 of which have finalized. And the solar can also be made final if you release the hold on it.

BLDR-09-02777 for a remodeling: final permit on 6/15/23

BLDR-21-00922 for a master bath: final permit on 7/3/23

BLDR-21-01065 for a guest bathroom: drywall passed. We already have all the materials, so we are hoping it can be finished in a month.

BLDR-21-01013 for an addition: 93% complete. Just needs to pass final public works inspection.

SOLR-23-00595 for a solar permit: inspection passed but permit held because of other open permits.

Given that we have since gotten the final on 09-02777 and 21-00922, can you allow **SOLR-23-00595** to be final?

Sincerely,
Michael & Stella Ty
[Quoted text hidden]



Mic Ty <creadvty@gmail.com>

SOLR-23-00595: request to release hold

Michael Ty <creadvty@gmail.com>

Thu, Jul 13 at 8:08 AM

To: Charles Buckley <charles@solaroptimum.com>, Ryan Heise <rheise@citymb.info>, Stella Ty <stellamariety@yahoo.com>

Dear Mr. Heise,

I'm following up on my email below. The city wants us to finalize our permits. This is one of those that can be finalized but for the city itself withholding its approval.

- You asked us to clear at least 2 permits, which we have done.
- The solar is a third permit that we can clear but the city is ironically complaining that they don't want to final it because we have too many open permits. By preventing approval, the city is feeding the problem that it is complaining to us about.
- Other than the solar, we only have two other permits. One of them is at 93%, held up at the last minute by the city even though we complied with what the permit required. We're trying to resolve with Garrett today.

The panels have been ready for use for a month. But because the city withheld its final approval, the solar panels have been inactive. Not only did this waste our money, but this also contributed to pollution as we were forced to use electricity from conventional sources rather than the panels with zero emissions.

Pls release the hold and allow the solar panels to operate.

[Quoted text hidden]



Mic Ty <creadvty@gmail.com>

SOLR-23-00595: request to release hold

Michael Ty <creadvty@gmail.com>

Fri, Jul 14 at 7:13 AM

To: Charles Buckley <charles@solaroptimum.com>, Ryan Heise <rheise@citymb.info>, Stella Ty <stellamariety@yahoo.com>

Dear Mr. Heise,

This is my third request to follow up on our solar permit.

You asked us to clear our open permits and this is one of them. We've cleared two permits (09-02777 and 21-00922). Please release the hold so that we can clear one more permit.

[Quoted text hidden]



Mic Ty <creadvty@gmail.com>

SOLR-23-00595: request to release hold

Michael Ty <creadvty@gmail.com>

Mon, Jul 17 at 6:00 AM

To: Charles Buckley <charles@solaroptimum.com>, Ryan Heise <rheise@citymb.info>, Stella Ty <stellamariety@yahoo.com>

Dear Mr. Heise,

This is my fourth request to follow up on our solar permit. You want us to clear our open permits and that's what we're doing. Again, we cleared 09-02777 and 21-00922. We can clear this one too if you release the hold. Hoping for your favorable reply.

Sincerely,
Michael & Stella Ty
[Quoted text hidden]