

**COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
HIGHWAY SAFETY COMMISSION
MINUTES OF APRIL 1, 2009**

The meeting was held in Conference Room B at the Department of Public Works (DPW) Headquarters.

1) Call to Order

The meeting of April 1, 2009, was called to order at 9:15 a.m.

2) Pledge of Allegiance

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

3) Roll Call

Present: Chair Robert Ringler
 Vice-Chair Thurston Reese
 Commissioner Guillermo Villalobos
 Commissioner Marvin Estey
 Commissioner Rhett Price

Absent: Commissioner Praful Kulkarni
 Commissioner John Watkins

Also in attendance were the following:

Mr. William Higley, Deputy Director; Mr. William Winter, Assistant Deputy Director; . Scott Schales, Assistant Division Engineer; Mr. James Chon, Senior Civil Engineer; Mr. Paul Barbe, Civil Engineer; Ms. Jalaine Madrid, Associate Civil Engineer; and Mr. Sarkis Ogasakian, Senior Civil Engineering Assistant

4) Approval of March 4, 2009, Minutes

The Minutes of the March 4, 2009, Highway Safety Commission (HSC) meeting were approved.

5) Citizen Appeal of Traffic Control Requests denied by Public Works.

a) Appeal for traffic signal on Del Mar Avenue at Montrose Avenue:

Appellant: Nigel Burns

Ms. Jalaine Madrid presented a power point presentation to the HSC. In this presentation, she stated that Ms. Susan Fite, Principal of Holy Redeemer School, requested DPW to install a traffic signal at the intersection of Del Mar Road at Montrose Avenue. She indicated that there had been a recent collision at the intersection.

As a result of this request, Ms. Madrid stated that DPW did the following:

- Counted the number of vehicles and pedestrians at the intersection.
- Measured the speed of vehicles.
- Reviewed the reported collision data.
- Observed pedestrian and vehicular traffic.
- Conducted a traffic signal study.
- Conducted a crossing guard study.

Ms. Madrid explained DPW determines whether a traffic signal is needed at a location by the following means:

- LA County DPW follows the signal warrants in the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) to determine when a signal should be installed.
- Most Cities and Counties also follow the MUTCD Traffic Signal Warrants.

Ms. Madrid explained that traffic signals take into account the following:

- Vehicle & Pedestrian Volumes (12 hour)
- Collision History (most recent year)
- Speed of Motorists
- Delay
- Existing Field Conditions

Ms. Madrid summarized the traffic signal warrants with the following table:

Warrant	Not Applicable	Satisfied	Not Satisfied
1. Seven Hour Vehicular Volume			Condition A - 32% Condition B - 39%
2. Four Hour Vehicular Volume			X
3. Peak Hour			X
4. Pedestrian Volume			X
5. School Crossing			X
6. Coordinated Signal System			X
7. Collision Warrant			X
8. Roadway Network			X

Ms. Madrid stated that DPW determined a traffic signal was not recommended. Ms. Madrid stated that DPW also conducted a Crossing Guard study at the subject intersection. She stated that DPW uses the following criteria when considering recommending a crossing guard:

- Minimum of 20 elementary school-aged pedestrians per hour using the crosswalk.
- Minimum of 500 vehicles per hour.

Ms. Madrid stated that neither of the crossing guard criteria was met.

Ms. Madrid summarized DPW's overall findings of the studies as follows:

- None of the traffic signal warrants were satisfied.
- Field observations revealed sight distance is adequate for motorists and pedestrians to safely enter or cross the intersection without conflict or undue delay when using normal caution.
- Neither of the warrants for crossing guard service were met.

Ms. Madrid concluded her presentation by stating DPW's recommendations were as follows:

- Since none of the warrants were satisfied, we are not recommending a traffic signal or a crossing guard.
- It was recommended to install a Stop Ahead Sign in conjunction with “STOP AHEAD” pavement markings in advance of the intersection for westbound motorists (completed in January 2009).
- It was recommended to install “All Way” supplemental plaques beneath the existing Stop Signs for all directions at the intersection to satisfy the current federal guidelines (completed in January 2009).

At that point, Mr. Nigel Burns and some other community members made their presentation. They mainly emphasized that their concerns were with the pedestrians crossing the north approach leg of Montrose Avenue as opposed to Del Mar Avenue. They indicated that there may be a need for red curb on the north side of Montrose Avenue east of Del Mar Avenue for the turning movement. They also mentioned that the flashing red light at the intersection is not always visible during the daytime. Mr. Burns presented a petition signed by 400 citizens requesting that DPW provide some traffic enhancements at the subject intersection

After hearing the testimony of DPW, the appellant (Mr. Nigel Burns) and some other community members, the HSC made the following Motion:

- 1) Review the existing street lighting along Montrose Avenue.
- 2) Review the existing overhead flashing red beacon at the intersection.
- 3) Upgrade the existing school zone signage in the area to FYG.
- 4) Contact CHP for increased enforcement of speeding vehicles.
- 5) Review the northeast corner of the intersection to determine if additional red curb is necessary to increase visibility of the crosswalk at the north approach of the intersection.

The vote went as follows:

Chair Robert Ringler:	Aye
Vice-Chair Thurston Reese:	Aye
Commissioner Guillermo Villalobos:	Aye

Commissioner Marvin Estey: Aye
Commissioner Rhett Price: Abstain

The motion was approved.

6) Report on business other than appeals

There was no business other than appeals.

7) Public Comments on any matter not on agenda

There were no public comments on any matters not on agenda.

8) Reports from special committees.

There were no special committee's announcements.

9) Special Orders

There were no special orders.

10) Unfinished Business

a) Update on appeal for traffic signal at Indiana Street and 5th Street

The HSC was informed that a letter had been sent on behalf of the HSC to Ms. Rita Robinson, General Manager for the Los Angeles Department of Transportation (LADOT), informing her that an additional nighttime study was being conducted at the intersection of Indiana Street and 5th Street. The letter also emphasized the need for a cooperative study for the consideration of In-roadway Warning Lights (IRWL's).

b) Pedestrian Safety Task Force

Mr. Winter referred the HSC to the March 5, 2003, memo to each member of the Board of Supervisors from the Public Works Director, James A. Noyes. In this memo, the Director states that DPW has completed their review of the current Public Works' practices and policies for the installation of flashing beacons. Also attached was DPW's Practice on the use of warning beacons (January 2003). The intention of these handouts was for the HSC to keep these practices in mind when making recommendations related to flashing beacons or IRWL's.

11) New Business

There was no new business.

12) Date for next meeting announced and adjournment

Chair Ringler informed the HSC that the next meeting of the HSC is tentatively scheduled for May 6, 2009. The meeting was adjourned at 11:30 a.m.

A recording of the discussions held at this meeting is on file at Public Works.

Respectfully submitted,



IRENA GUILMETTE
Executive Officer
Highway Safety Commission

IG:ig

P:\t\pub\GENERAL\INVEST\Irena G\HSC\HSC MINUTES\2009 MINUTES\HSC040109MIINUTES.doc