



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

