



Placentia Traffic Safety Commission

401 E. Chapman Avenue
Placentia, CA 92870

7:00 P.M. COMMUNITY MEETING ROOM

AGENDA

MEETING DATE: Regular Meeting, March 18, 2013

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

ROLL CALL: CHAIRPERSON STAFFORD
VICE CHAIR BRUSCHKE
COMMISSIONER CHADHA
COMMISSIONER GORMAN
COMMISSIONER HERNANDEZ
COMMISSIONER HUTAIN
COMMISSIONER LABRECHE

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: Regular Meeting November 21, 2011 (need quorum)
Regular Meeting November 19, 2012

PUBLIC COMMENTS: At this time the public is invited to address the Traffic Safety Commission concerning any item on the agenda, which is not a public hearing item, or on matters within the jurisdiction of the Traffic Safety Commission.

REPORTS:

I. **TRAFFIC CONTROL:** Adult School Crossing Guard Placement Policy
TSC NO. 13-01 Requested by City Administrator Butzlaff

INFORMATION/COMMUNICATIONS:

1. POLICE DEPARTMENT TRAFFIC SUMMARY
Statistical update on accident and enforcement information provided by the Placentia Police Department.
2. DISCUSSION ITEMS BY TRAFFIC ENGINEER
Presentation of other items of interest.

3. RESPONSE TO PRIOR MEETING ITEMS
Update of items discussed at prior meetings.

NON AGENDA ITEMS:

ADJOURNMENT

Special Accommodations:

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, if you need special assistance to participate in this meeting, please contact the Engineering Office at (714) 993-8131. Notification 48 hours prior to the meeting will generally enable City staff to make reasonable arrangements to ensure accessibility.
(28 CFR 35.102.35.104 ADA Title II)

In compliance with California Government Code § 54957.5, any writings or documents provided to a majority of the Traffic Safety Commission regarding any Item on this agenda that are not exempt from disclosure under the Public Records Act will be made available for public inspection at the City Clerk's office at City Hall, 401 East Chapman Avenue, Placentia, during normal business hours.

*****CERTIFICATION OF POSTING AGENDA*****

I, Ruth Smith, Traffic Engineer/Secretary to the Traffic Safety Commission for the City of Placentia, hereby certify that the Agenda for the meeting of January 29, 2013 of the Traffic Safety Commission of the City of Placentia was posted on January 24, 2013.



Ruth Smith, PE
Traffic Engineer

**PLACENTIA TRAFFIC SAFETY COMMISSION
MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING
November 19, 2012**

The Regular meeting of the Placentia Traffic Safety Commission of November 19, 2012 was called to order at 7:02 p.m. in the Community Meeting Room, 401 E. Chapman Avenue Placentia by Commissioner Stafford.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE: Led by Commissioner Hernandez

ROLL CALL: Present: Chairperson Stafford
Vice Chairperson Brusckke
Commissioner Gorman
Commissioner Hernandez
Commissioner Stafford

Absent: Commissioner Chadha
Commissioner Hutain

STAFF PRESENT: Ruth Smith, Traffic Engineer
Scott Millsap, Traffic Sergeant
Sara Salazar, Administrative Assistant

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Minutes of November 21, 2011

The approval of the November 21, 2011 minutes was tabled to the next regular meeting due to lack of quorum.

Minutes of July 16, 2012

MOTION by Commissioner Hernandez to approve the minutes of July 16, 2012 as submitted; **SECOND** by Vice Chairperson Brusckke and **CARRIED** by a **3-0-2-2 VOICE VOTE** (Chadha, Hutain Absent, Gorman, Labreche Abstain).

SWEARING IN OF COMMISSIONER:

Ms. Salazar conducted the swearing in of Commissioner Gorman who was re-appointed to serve until July 1, 2016.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Chairperson Stafford invited public comments on items which are not public hearings but none were offered.

REPORTS:

**TRAFFIC CONTROL: TSC NO. 12-03
Resident-Only Permit Parking on Madison Avenue**

Ms. Smith advised the Commission that the item did not meet the guidelines for Permit Parking and therefore she could not make a recommendation to approve the request. She offered to answer any questions from the Commission.

Commissioner Labreche commented that school was not in session when the study was conducted in July and therefore it is not an accurate representation. Ms. Smith responded that she addressed the same concern with the residents, and was assured that the parking problem still existed at the time of the study. Commissioner Labreche reviewed the report and commented that even though school was not in session, nonresident parking appears to be substantial.

Chairperson Stafford asked if there is a solution to preventing cars from parking in front of driveway aprons. Ms. Smith responded that one solution is to paint the apron portion red which is expensive and high maintenance and therefore she does not recommend it, the other solution is enforcement by Police.

Sgt. Millsap commented that parking in front of someone's driveway apron is a marginal yet citable offense, usually done at the officers' discretion.

Commissioner Labreche commented that once homeowners place trash cans out for trash day, there is even less room for parking.

Chairperson Stafford opened the Public Hearing.

Ms. Sarah Guidi, 531 W. Madison Avenue addressed the Commission. She stated that she has lived on Madison Avenue for 16 years. She has not been able to put her trash cans out many nights and the street is unable to be swept because of the parked cars.

Mr. Rick Eekin, 534 W. Madison Avenue stated he has lived on Madison for 22 years and echoes everything Ms. Guidi said. He was of the opinion that since the City installed the signal at Bradford Avenue speeding has increased. He stated that he has a very difficult time backing out of his driveway due to the cars parked on the street blocking his sight.

Ms. Sandra Quintero, 1003 Diane Avenue. She has lived on the corner of Diane Avenue and Madison Avenue for 18 years. Her driveway faces Madison and it is very difficult to back out onto Madison.

Chairperson Stafford closed the Public Hearing.

Commissioner Labreche agreed with the residents about the speeding on Madison Avenue.

Commissioner Hernandez asked what the speed limit on Madison is and when it was established.

Ms. Smith responded that it has been 35 MPH since 2006 however the City will be doing a speed survey next year.

Chairperson Stafford asked Sgt. Millsap if he had any input on the item. Sgt. Millsap initially indicated that he did not. After a brief discussion among the Commission, he added that he

would recommend that either the parking analysis study be re-done or that the Commission approve the request for permits.

Commissioner Brusckhe asked how many homes are included in the request area. Ms. Smith responded that there are 12.

Commissioner Hernandez commented that traffic safety should be a consideration. The Commission agreed.

Vice Chairperson Brusckhe posed the question of whether parking should be allowed at all in the proposed permit area. The Commission agreed that once permits are required, parking should be under control.

MOTION BY COMMISSIONER LABRECHE TO RECOMMEND TO CITY COUNCIL THAT PERMIT PARKING BE GRANTED; SECOND BY COMMISSIONER BRUSCHKE AND CARRIED BY A 5-0-2-0 (CHADHA, HUTAIN ABSENT).

**TRAFFIC CONTROL: TSC NO. 12-04
Traffic calming measures on Rospaw Way**

Ms. Smith advised the Commission that residents of Rospaw Way are seeking a solution to speeding on their street. They are hoping for changes to be made when scheduled street improvements are performed.

Vice Chairperson Brusckhe asked what options they might consider. Ms. Smith indicated there are striping options, as well as signage options.

Chairperson Stafford opened the Public Hearing.

Mrs. Pam Uribe, 2006 Ipsen Way stated he lives near the turn of Rospaw and Ipsen Way. She said that vehicles take the turn in front of her home extremely fast. She said the vehicles also take the turn from Placentia Avenue to Rospaw very fast. She asked that something be done to slow down traffic.

Commissioner Labreche asked Mrs. Uribe if there have been any accidents on her street. She stated that she could not recall.

Mr. Jerry Jorgensen, 434 Rospaw Way lives on the corner. He echoed what Mrs.Uribe said about traffic coming too fast from Placentia Avenue onto Rospaw Way. He requested an island be installed or speed humps or the large raised dots.

Mr. Vuryl Klassen, 400 Rospaw Way has lived in Placentia 42 years. He expressed concern about the drainage on Rospaw Way and stated that when it rains, the water level sometimes comes up to his front door. He does not want the City to install a traffic device that will affect the drainage on Rospaw or Ipsen Way.

Mr. Tom Uribe, 2006 Ipsen Way addressed the Commission. He stated that the neighborhood just hopes the City can find a solution that makes everyone happy.

Chairperson Stafford closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Hernandez asked what will be involved with the street rehabilitation work. Ms. Smith responded that the work on each street is different depending on the condition of the pavement.

Ms. Smith stated that the City's deadline for the Street Rehabilitation Project will not allow for the procedures required for improvements to the street design at this time.

Mr. Klassen offered a comment which the Commission allowed. His suggestion is paint turning arrows on Placentia Avenue between Mystic and Rospaw. Ms. Smith agreed and stated the City would have to work with the City of Fullerton for cooperation.

Vice Chair Brusckke asked if an island could be painted on the street. Ms. Smith responded that it could, however usually vehicles ignore them.

Ms. Smith suggested a lane line at the stop sign could be helpful for vehicles turning onto Rospaw from Placentia.

Vice Chair Brusckke asked if the street is long enough for speed humps. Ms. Smith responded that the City is currently not installing speed humps.

The Commission briefly discussed striping and the timeline with the street construction. Ms. Smith informed the Commission that normally striping plans would not be taken to the Commission for approval. The Commission acknowledged this. Ms. Smith advised the Commission that she would provide an update on this item at a future meeting and the Commission was not required to make a motion.

No motion was taken.

**TRAFFIC CONTROL: TSC NO. 12-05
School Bus Loading Zone on La Jolla Street at Valadez Middle School Academy**

Ms. Smith gave the staff report.

After a brief discussion the Commission took action.

**MOTION BY COMMISSIONER HERNANDEZ TO APPROVE THE RECOMMENDATION;
SECOND BY COMMISSIONER LABRECHE AND CARRIED BY A 5-0-2-0 (CHADHA,
HUTAIN ABSENT).**

INFORMATION/COMMUNICATIONS:

Police Department Traffic Summary –

Sergeant Millsap notified the Commission that the OTS Grant application was denied. However, after Lt. Pascarella requested the State reconsider, they re-allocated \$62,000 to

Placentia. This will allow the City to hold one checkpoint per month thru October 2013. Additional checkpoints will be held during the upcoming holidays. He advised about a pedestrian fatality that occurred on September 29, in front of Emerald Isle on Rose Drive.

Commissioner Labreche asked if a decrease in traffic was seen when the OCTA Grade Separation construction began. Sgt. Millsap responded, no. The construction date for Rose Drive has been pushed to end of 2013 due to current traffic conditions.

Sergeant Millsap notified the Commission of the recent passing of a Placentia Police Officer, Phil Bush. He had been with the City since 1997.

Chairperson Stafford asked about the increase in D.U.I. arrests. Sgt. Millsap advised that the officer who used to work Commercial Enforcement now works traffic week nights and averages one (1) D.U.I. arrest per night.

Discussion items by Traffic Engineer

Ms. Smith reported that the City has entered a contract for traffic signal maintenance with a new company by the name of Siemens. She also reported traffic signal coordination is ongoing on Yorba Linda Boulevard, Bastanchury Road and Rose Drive is currently being designed. The traffic management equipment is being updated by Albert Grover & Associates with software by Econolite.

Response to prior meeting items

Bus loading signage approved at a previous meeting will not be installed at Valencia High School after all as it was determined that the buses were a sight distance problem for the driveways. City Council approved the recommended signal installation at Richfield Road and Orchard Drive. The City is seeking funding from OCTA as part of the detour for the OC Bridges project.

NON AGENDA ITEMS:

Chairperson Stafford asked about the Street Rehab Project signage that was posted and then removed on her street. Ms. Smith indicated that she was not involved in the project. Mrs. Salazar offered that the contractor had removed previously posted construction notifications in anticipation of rain.

Commissioner Stafford asked for an update on the unqualified signage in front of Valencia High School. Ms. Smith indicated that all school signage will be reviewed as part of the Safe Routes to School project.

Commissioner Labreche asked when the next meeting will be held since the January 2013 meeting falls on a holiday closure. Ms. Smith advised that staff will advise the Commission after meeting room availability is determined.

Vice Chairperson Brusckke announced that she will be moving out of the City and therefore need to resign from the Traffic Safety Commission.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business, **MOTION** by Commissioner Labreche to adjourn to Monday, January 21, 2013 regular meeting; **SECOND** by Commissioner Gorman and **CARRIED** by a **5-0-2-0 VOICE VOTE** (Chadha, Hutain absent). Meeting adjourned on November 19, 2012 at 8:40 p.m.

RUTH SMITH, P.E., Traffic Engineer
Secretary to the Traffic Safety Commission

**PLACENTIA TRAFFIC SAFETY COMMISSION
MINUTES OF THE SPECIAL MEETING
November 21, 2011**

The Regular meeting of the Placentia Traffic Safety Commission of November 21, 2011 was called to order at 7:10 p.m. in the Community Meeting Room, 401 E. Chapman Avenue Placentia by Vice Chair Chadha.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE: Led by Commissioner Labreche

ROLL CALL: Present: Vice Chair Chadha
Commissioner Brusckke
Commissioner Hutain
Commissioner Labreche

Absent: Commissioner Stafford
Commissioner Gorman
Commissioner Hernandez

STAFF PRESENT: Ruth Smith, Traffic Engineer
Scott Millsap, Traffic Sergeant
Sara Salazar, Administrative Assistant

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

The approval of the May 16, 2011 minutes was tabled to the next regular meeting.

SWEARING-IN OF COMMISSIONERS:

Bruce Hutain was sworn in prior to the start of the meeting.

ELECTION OF OFFICERS:

The election of Chair and Vice Chair was tabled to the next regular meeting.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Vice Chair Chadha invited public comments on items which are not public hearings.

Mr. and Mrs. George and Sarah Guidi, 531 W. Madison Avenue, addressed the Commission concerning the lack of parking available in their neighborhood, the poor condition of the surface of Madison Avenue as well as the low frequency of street sweeping due to cars not being moved on sweeper days.

Commissioner Brusckke asked Mrs. Guidi if she preferred permit parking or parking restrictions. Mrs. Guidi responded that she prefers no overnight parking. Sgt. Millsap stated there are currently no overnight parking restrictions in the City. Mrs. Guidi asked if she was allowed to paint her curb red. Commissioner Labreche responded no, residents are not allowed to paint their curbs red.

Commissioner Bruschke advised Mr. and Mrs. Guidi of two (2) options, to request a parking restriction or to request permit parking. Mrs. Guidi indicated she would like permit parking.

Commissioner Labreche asked Mrs. Guidi if other neighbors are complaining about this issue. Mrs. Guidi responded, no, not that she knows of. One of her neighbors previously had the permit parking rescinded.

Commissioner Labreche asked if the problem existed prior to the previous permit parking being established. Mrs. Guidi responded yes.

Commissioner Hutain asked what is on the other side of the street. Mr. Guidi responded that there are more houses on the other side of the street.

Commissioner Bruschke added in response to concerns about street sweeping frequency, that the City does not post street sweeping signage on arterial streets; therefore cars do not get moved. Mrs. Guidi expressed some frustration. Ms. Smith stated she would speak with the City's maintenance crew about a solution.

Mrs. Guidi asked when Madison Avenue will be re-paved and asked if it was in the budget. Commissioner Bruschke advised that those decisions are not made by the Traffic Safety Commission.

Vice Chair Chadha closed the public comments.

REPORTS:

I. TRAFFIC CONTROL: TSC NO. 11-04 Bradford Avenue at Valencia High School Requested by Steve Umber, PYLUSD

This is a request to install "No Stopping 7 to 8 AM, 2 to 4 PM, School Days, Buses Exempt" signage on the east side of Bradford Avenue north of Anned Drive to establish a bus loading zone for Valencia High School (see Exhibit 1).

Ms. Smith gave the staff report and the follow recommendation was made:

1. Creation of a bus loading zone by installing "No Stopping 7 to 8 AM, 2 to 4 PM, School Days, Buses Exempt " signs on the east side of Bradford Avenue to 1,750 feet north of Anned Drive.

Ms. Smith invited Mr. Umber to address the commission on the item. Mr. Steve Umber, Director of Transportation for PYLUSD 1301 E. Orangethorpe Avenue, stated that loading and unloading as well as parking has been a problem at Valencia High School for many years. These signs will allow the buses to more easily load and unload.

Commissioner Hutain asked if the proposed loading zone is wide enough. Ms. Smith responded that the lane is wide enough to accommodate the buses and will aid in calming traffic as vehicles will slow down to pass. Commissioner Hutain proposed having buses unload in the school parking

lot. Mr. Umber stated that all available parking spaces are needed and that buses are not conducive to the parking lot.

MOTION BY COMMISSIONER LABRECHE SECOND BY COMMISSIONER BRUSCHKE TO APPROVE STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS FOR TSC NO. 11-04; PASSED 4-0-3 (GORMAN, HERNANDEZ AND STAFFORD ABSENT).

PRESENTATION:

O.C. Bridges Grade Separation Project Status

Presenters: City Project Manager Roy Stephenson and OCTA Staff

Ms. Tresa Oliveri, Public Communications External Affairs at OCTA 550 S. Main St Orange, 92863 began the presentation. She presented renderings of what Placentia Avenue and Kraemer Boulevard will look like when complete.

Commissioner Labreche asked how long the project would take for completion. Ms. Oliveri responded approximately two (2) years.

She stated that Kraemer Blvd. and Placentia Ave. will be constructed at the same time because the Burlington Northern Santa Fe railroad requires a 'shoofly', or a temporary train track, to allow trains to continue running. However, the quiet zone will not be in effect during this time due to construction activity. Night work will occur up to 150 evenings at Kraemer Blvd. because BNSF will dictate when OCTA can work in their right of way.

Commissioner Bruschke asked if the quiet zones would still be effect during daytime construction. Ms. Oliveri replied that the quiet zones will not be in effect at all and therefore contractors will take measures to avoid causing excessive horn blowing by the train engineers.

Commissioner Labreche asked where Placentia Avenue would be closed. Ms. Oliveri passed out maps which detailed road closures and designated detours.

Commissioner Bruschke asked if the State College Boulevard closure has been coordinated with the Placentia Avenue closure. Ms. Oliveri responded that the work on Placentia Avenue will be almost finished when State College Blvd. construction begins in 2013.

Commissioner Hutain asked if the work on Rose Drive will occur simultaneously with Kraemer Blvd. Ms. Oliveri responded that yes it will, but Rose Drive will have a bypass road that will remain open during construction.

Commissioner Labreche asked about the closure of the shopping center at the North East corner of Rose Drive and Orangethorpe Avenue. Ms. Oliveri stated the connector of the overpass will be constructed at that location.

Commissioner Hutain asked if the timing of the traffic signals will be adjusted. Mr. Stephenson responded that the City has control of the signal timing.

Ms. Oliveri then showed a simulation video from OCTA's website of what the Grade Separations will look like once they are complete.

Mr. Stephenson advised the Commission that both the Kraemer Blvd. and the Placentia Avenue Grade Separations projects have been awarded to contractors by OCTA. The City, along with neighboring cities, will issue OCTA an Encroachment Permit with terms and conditions for the construction. Extensive traffic management plans have been prepared in an attempt to address any traffic issues that arise. The City will retain the responsibility for traffic signal timing.

Mr. Umber asked if the passing trains will slow down for the construction. Mr. Stephenson responded that it will depend on the judgment of the train engineer.

Mr. Stephenson expressed concern over the designated detour routes and the impact it will have on surrounding streets if traffic does not follow them. Cameras will be installed in the downtown area to monitor peak hour congestion and funds are available in the case that additional enforcement is needed by the Police Department. The traffic management plan is extensive; however OCTA will be reactive to whatever modifications are necessary. Construction is scheduled to begin after the 1st of January, 2012 with the closure of Kraemer Blvd. estimated around June 2012. Placentia Avenue is scheduled to remain open except for a period of 54 total days.

Mr. Umber asked if the school district and other affected entities could be given 60 days notice of the closure of Kraemer Blvd. once a date is known. Mr. Stephenson responded that it is possible. Ms. Oliveri added that currently OCTA is receiving schedules from the contractor, which must be received before the Notice to Proceed will be given.

Commissioner Labreche asked if the contractors are local or out of state. Ms. Oliveri responded that both contractors are local and came in under the engineers estimates. Part of the Grade Separations Project funding will come from Proposition 1b funds which are first come first served.

Commissioner Hutain asked if there are any bike lanes in the plans. Mr. Stephenson responded that the plans do not include bike lanes however there are bike routes around the projects. Commissioner Hutain asked about the bike routes from North to South. Mr. Stephenson advised the bike route around Placentia Avenue is Santa Fe Avenue to Melrose Street and around Rose Drive would be Jefferson Avenue.

INFORMATION/COMMUNICATIONS:

Police Department Traffic Summary

Sergeant Millsap presented the Police Department Traffic Summary.

Accidents are down 5% from last year with no Fatal Accidents year to date. Personal injuries are up 14% which could be a result of more carpooling vehicles. Property damage collisions are down 14%. Pedestrians injured are up 100%. Bicyclists injured are up 46% and Hit and Run Accidents and still going down, currently by 18%. Total Citations are down 10% from last year, D.U.I. Accidents are up 7% and D.U.I. Arrests are down by 9%. He went on to say that the Police

Department was not able to get the D.U.I. grant renewed due to more applications from other Agencies and improved D.U.I. rates.

Commissioner Chadha asked how much the D.U.I. grant typically is for. Sgt. Millsap replied that it is usually for a few hundred thousand dollars.

Sgt. Millsap indicated the City of Placentia will be participating in the North County Avoid Grant with the Anaheim Police Department which includes a checkpoint, a multi-agency checkpoint and five (5) saturation patrols.

Commissioner Hutain asked which intersections pedestrians are getting injured at. Sgt. Millsap responded that there are no intersections in particular; pedestrians are injured all over the City.

Ms. Smith asked if the statistics include the pedestrians injured at Golden Avenue and Valencia Avenue earlier in the year. Sgt. Millsap responded that those statistics will be included in next month's report.

Sgt. Millsap spoke about the monies that OCTA will contribute for enforcement in the downtown area and the video monitors that will be set up. He stated that until the roads are closed and construction begins they don't know what to expect.

DISCUSSION ITEMS BY TRAFFIC ENGINEER

Ms. Smith advised the Commission of upcoming meeting items. A request was received from residents on Harmony Lane for permit parking due to the high volume of college students using the street. Commissioner Brusckke stated the City of Fullerton has just implemented two (2) hour parking which may be pushing more students to find parking in Placentia. Another item is to close a pedestrian gate on Seville Drive to re-route parents who are dropping off students, to the pedestrian gate on Trumpet Avenue. Ms. Smith advised the Commission that the General Plan Circulation Element is in the process of being updated. Traffic counts are being conducted in the City for the General Plan update, citywide speed limit updates as well as grant applications. Sgt. Millsap asked if a speed survey will be conducted at the newly signalized intersection of Bradford Avenue and Madison Avenue for speed enforcement. Ms. Smith stated that she would work on having a city-wide speed survey done in the next 12 months.

ADJOURNMENT:

Vice Chairman Chadha adjourned the Traffic Safety Commission meeting at 8:40 p.m. to the next regularly scheduled meeting on January 16, 2012 at 401 East Chapman Avenue, Placentia.



RUTH SMITH, P.E., Traffic Engineer
Secretary to the Traffic Safety Commission

TRAFFIC SAFETY COMMISSION REPORT

ADULT SCHOOL CROSSING GUARD POLICY

TSC NO.: 13 - 01

MEETING DATE: March 18, 2013

REQUEST:

City Administrator Butzlaff has requested that the Traffic Safety Commission review the City's current *Policy No. 606, Crossing Guards: Standards for Placement*. *Policy No. 606* is used to determine whether or not an adult school crossing guard should be placed/retained at a particular school crosswalk.

DISCUSSION:

The state of California has the ultimate authority to determine which traffic control devices can be used in the state and under what conditions. This authority includes adult school crossing guards. The state standards for traffic control devices, including crossing guards, are set forth in the *California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices* (CA MUTCD).

The criteria for adult school crossing guards in the CA MUTCD are guidelines and, as such, local agencies are not required to follow them and may adopt their own guidelines, as long as they are not more restrictive than the CA MUTCD guidelines. It should be noted, however, that any deviations from the CA MUTCD guidelines must be substantiated, in writing, with supporting documentation. Otherwise, the local agency loses the protection from liability that is provided through compliance with the CA MUTCD (commonly called "design immunity").

The City of Placentia has developed its own policy regarding the conditions under which an adult school crossing guard may be placed at a school crosswalk. This policy was adopted by the City Council as *Policy No. 606, Crossing Guards: Standards for Placement*. We are unable to determine exactly when the policy was developed and adopted, however, it is our understanding that the policy was developed by a special committee of the Traffic Safety Commission, perhaps as early as 1997, to address concerns that the state's guidelines were too restrictive.

The CA MUTCD guidelines and the City's *Policy No. 606* are each discussed in the sections below.

CA MUTCD Guidelines

The CA MUTCD's Chapter 7, Traffic Control for School Areas, addresses adult crossing guards in Sections 7D.01 through 7D.05, with the criteria for placing adult crossing guards noted in Section 7D.02 (see attached). The sections that are in blue italics are specific to California and are not included in the federal MUTCD.

The CA MUTCD states the following regarding adult school crossing guards:

- They may be used to provide gaps in traffic at school crossings where an engineering study has shown that adequate gaps need to be created.
- They should be considered when special situations make it necessary to assist elementary school pedestrians in crossing the street.

The CA MUTCD guidelines for placing adult crossing guards are divided into three different conditions:

- Uncontrolled crosswalks
- Stop sign-controlled crosswalks
- Traffic signal-controlled crosswalks

The guidelines are based on the number of students who are crossing in the crosswalk and the number of vehicles that are in conflict with them. Traffic and pedestrian counts are taken at the proposed crossing guard location during peak school pedestrian use. The two hours in a given day with the most pedestrians are evaluated. These two hours are typically the school's morning peak, when students are going to school, and the afternoon peak, when students are leaving school.

Since stop signs and traffic signals afford more protection to pedestrians by stopping traffic for pedestrians in the crosswalk, their guidelines are more difficult to meet than those for uncontrolled crosswalks. On the other hand, extenuating circumstances are provided for traffic signal-controlled crossings, but not for the other two. The current CA MUTCD guidelines for each condition are summarized below:

Uncontrolled Crosswalk

- No alternate controlled crosswalk within 600 feet, and
- At least 40 school pedestrians for each of two hours, and
- In urban areas, the vehicular volume exceeds 350 during each of the same two hours or
- In rural areas, at least 30 school pedestrians for each of two hours and the vehicular volumes exceeds 300 during each of the same two hours, with this also applying to urban areas where the 85th percentile approach speed exceeds 40 mph.

Stop Sign-Controlled Crosswalk

- Crosswalk is on an undivided highway of four or more lanes, and
- At least 40 school pedestrians for each of two hours, and
- The vehicular volumes exceed 500 for each of the same two hours.

Traffic Signal-Controlled Crosswalk

- At least 40 school pedestrians for each of two hours, and
- The vehicular turning movement volumes through the school crosswalk exceed 300 during each of the same two hours or
- If justified through analysis of the operations of the intersection.

City Policy No. 606

The City's policy appears to have used, as it's basis, the state's adult school crossing guard guidelines that were in place at the time the City's policy was developed. However, the City's policy reduced the minimum required school pedestrian volumes and vehicular traffic volumes, then applied sliding scales to them. As the number of conflicting vehicles increases, the number of children needed to qualify decreases. It is also based on one hour of counts instead of two. Another difference is that the City's policy does not differentiate between stop sign-controlled crossings and traffic signal-controlled crossings. The City's policy also applies only to elementary school children and not to middle school and high school children as in the state's policy. The City's *Policy No. 606* criteria for assigning a crossing guard are summarized below.

Uncontrolled Crossings

- No alternate controlled crossings within 300 feet, and
- For one hourly period in a day, with the following:

Children	Vehicles in Conflict 85th percentile speed less than or equal to 35 mph	Vehicles in Conflict 85th percentile speed greater than 35 mph
40	100	85
35	200	170
25	400	320
15	600 or more	510 or more

Controlled Crossings

- For one hourly period in a day, with the following:

Children	Vehicles in Conflict
100	120
80	150
60	200
40	300
30	400
20	600 or more

Extenuating Circumstances

- Insufficient Sight Distance
- Crosswalk is more than 80 feet long
- An abnormally high percentage of commercial vehicles
- Significantly high total vehicle count

It should be noted that the CA MUTCD guidelines have changed over the years and that the City's policy includes guidelines, such as the extenuating circumstances, that are not included in the current CA MUTCD guidelines.

Analysis of Existing Adult School Crossing Guard Locations

The City has evaluated the existing 16 school crossing guard locations using both the CA MUTCD guidelines and *City Policy No. 606*. Of the 16 locations, three are uncontrolled, two are stop sign-controlled and the remaining 11 are traffic signal-controlled. The results for each set of guidelines are summarized and compared in Table 1.

Based on the CA MUTCD guidelines, only two locations would currently qualify for a school crossing guard:

- Alta Vista/Angelina, which is stop sign-controlled
- La Jolla/Melrose, which is traffic signal-controlled

At most of the other locations, there were too few pedestrians to qualify (minimum of 40 student pedestrians required), with six of the locations having fewer than 30 pedestrians per hour, and three of those having 15 or less (see Table 2).

Based on *City Policy No. 606*, nine locations would currently qualify for a school crossing guard and seven would not. All of the crossing locations that would not qualify are traffic signal-controlled and do not qualify because of too few school pedestrians(see Table 3). It is possible that more would qualify if extenuating circumstances were considered or counts were conducted on more than one day. On

the other hand, the number of qualifying locations could be reduced if only elementary school children were included in the counts.

Issues and Concerns

There are two key concerns with *City Policy No. 606*:

- There is no analysis or data available to substantiate the deviations from the CA MUTCD guidelines
- It is based on out-dated California guidelines

If *City Policy No. 606* were used to place crossing guards at new locations or to justify the retention of existing locations, the City would not have “design immunity” to protect it from liability. The City *would* have “design immunity”, however, if the CA MUTCD guidelines were followed.

Effect of Following the CA MUTCD Guidelines

If the City were to replace *Policy No. 606* with the CA MUTCD guidelines, there would not necessarily be any immediate changes to the current assignment of crossing guards. The City is not obliged by the CA MUTCD to re-evaluate or reconsider existing crossing guard locations. The new policy would apply to any future considerations of new crossing guard locations or any future reviews of existing crossing guard locations, unless the section of the policy is retained that requires the Traffic Safety Commission to make a recommendation to the City Council by March 31st each year regarding the disposition of the crossing guard locations. This section of the policy has not been followed for a number of years, however.

RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that the City rescind *Policy No. 606* and adopt the guidelines in the *California Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices, Chapter 7D*, as the official policy to determine the placement of adult school crossing guards.



Ruth Smith, P.E.
Traffic Engineer

Attachments: *California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices, Chapter 7D*
City of Placentia Policy No. 606
Table 1 – Crossing Guard Location Analysis & Comparison
Table 2 – Crossing Guard Location Analysis Summary (CA MUTCD)
Table 3 – Crossing Guard Location Analysis Summary (Policy No. 606)

CHAPTER 7D. CROSSING SUPERVISION

Section 7D.01 Types of Crossing Supervision

Support:

- 01 There are three types of school crossing supervision:
 - A. Adult control of pedestrians and vehicles by adult crossing guards,
 - B. Adult control of pedestrians and vehicles by uniformed law enforcement officers, and
 - C. Student and/or parent control of only pedestrians with student and/or parent patrols.
- 02 Information regarding the organization, administration, and operation of a school safety patrol program is contained in the "AAA School Safety Patrol Operations Manual" (see Section 1A.11).

Section 7D.02 Adult Crossing Guards

Option:

01 Adult crossing guards may be used to provide gaps in traffic at school crossings where an engineering study has shown that adequate gaps need to be created (see Section 7A.03), and where authorized by law.

02 Adult Crossing Guards may be assigned at designated school crossings to assist school pedestrians at specified hours when going to or from school. The following suggested policy for their assignment applies only to crossings.

Guidance:

03 *An Adult Crossing Guard should be considered when:*

- A. *Special situations make it necessary to assist elementary school pedestrians in crossing the street.*
- B. *A change in the school crossing location is being made, but prevailing conditions require school crossing supervision until the change is constructed and it is not reasonable to install another form of traffic control or technique for this period.*

Criteria for Adult Crossing Guards:

Support:

04 Adult Crossing Guards normally are assigned where official supervision of school pedestrians is desirable while they cross a public highway, and at least 40 school pedestrians for each of any two hours (not necessarily consecutive) daily use the crossing while going to or from school.

Option:

05 Adult crossing guards may be used under the following conditions:

1. At uncontrolled crossings where there is no alternate controlled crossing within 600 feet; and
 - a. In urban areas where the vehicular traffic volume exceeds 350 during each of any two hours (not necessarily consecutive) in which 40 or more school pedestrians cross daily while going to or from school; or
 - b. In rural areas where the vehicular traffic volume exceeds 300 during each of any two hours (not necessarily consecutive) in which 30 or more school pedestrians cross daily while going to or from school.Whenever the critical (85th percentile) approach speed exceeds 40 mph, the guidelines for rural areas should be applied.
2. At stop sign-controlled crossing:

Where the vehicular traffic volumes on undivided highways of four or more lanes exceeds 500 per hour during any period when the school pedestrians are going to or from school.
3. At traffic signal-controlled crossings:
 - a. Where the number of vehicular turning movements through the school crosswalk exceeds 300 per hour while school pedestrians are going to or from school; or
 - b. Where justified through analysis of the operations of the intersection.

Legal Authority and Program Funding for Adult Crossing Guards:

Option:

06 Cities and counties may designate local law enforcement agencies, the governing board of any school district or a county superintendent of schools to recruit and assign adult crossing guards to intersections that meet approved guidelines for adult supervision.

Support:

⁰⁷ There are various methods for funding a school adult crossing guard program. One of these methods is through the use of fines and forfeitures received under the Penal Code. Disposition of these fines and forfeitures is defined in CVC Sections 42200 and 42201.

⁰⁸ An example of these dispositions by cities and counties is as follows:

- A. Disposition by cities (CVC 42200). Fines and forfeitures received by cities and deposited into a "Traffic Safety Fund" may be used to pay the compensation of school crossing guards who are not regular full-time members of the police department of the city.
- B. Disposition by county (CVC 42201). Fines and forfeitures received by a county and deposited in the road fund of the county may be used to pay the compensation of school crossing guards, and necessary equipment and administrative costs. The board of supervisors may adopt standards for crossing guards and has final authority over the total cost of the crossing guard program.

Section 7D.03 Qualifications of Adult Crossing Guards

Support:

⁰¹ High standards for selection of adult crossing guards are essential because they are responsible for the safety of and the efficient crossing of the street by schoolchildren within and in the immediate vicinity of school crosswalks.

Guidance:

⁰² *Adult crossing guards should possess the following minimum qualifications:*

- A. *Average intelligence;*
- B. *Good physical condition, including sight, hearing, and ability to move and maneuver quickly in order to avoid danger from errant vehicles;*
- C. *Ability to control a STOP paddle effectively to provide approaching road users with a clear, fully direct view of the paddle's STOP message during the entire crossing movement;*
- D. *Ability to communicate specific instructions clearly, firmly, and courteously;*
- E. *Ability to recognize potentially dangerous traffic situations and warn and manage students in sufficient time to avoid injury.*
- F. *Mental alertness;*
- G. *Neat appearance;*
- H. *Good character;*
- I. *Dependability; and*
- J. *An overall sense of responsibility for the safety of students.*

Training Programs for Adult Crossing Guards:

Guidance:

⁰³ *Adequate training should be provided in adult crossing guard responsibilities and authority. This function can usually be performed effectively by a law enforcement agency responsible for traffic control.*

⁰⁴ *Training programs should be designed to acquaint newly employed crossing guards with their specific duties, local traffic regulations, and crossing techniques. Training workshops may be used as a method of advising experienced employees of recent changes in existing traffic laws and program procedures. For example, crossing guards should be familiar with the California law which provides that any person who disregards any traffic signal or direction given by a non-student school crossing guard authorized by a law enforcement agency, any board of supervisors of a county or school district shall be guilty of an infraction and subject to the penalties of Section 42001 of the CVC (Section 2815).*

Section 7D.04 Uniform of Adult Crossing Guards

Standard:

⁰¹ **Law enforcement officers performing school crossing supervision and adult crossing guards shall wear high-visibility retroreflective safety apparel labeled as ANSI 107-2004 standard performance for Class 2 as described in Section 6E.02.**

Section 7D.05 Operating Procedures for Adult Crossing Guards

Standard:

01 Adult crossing guards shall not direct traffic in the usual law enforcement regulatory sense. In the control of traffic, they shall pick opportune times to create a sufficient gap in the traffic flow. At these times, they shall stand in the roadway to indicate that pedestrians are about to use or are using the crosswalk, and that all vehicular traffic must stop.

02 Adult crossing guards shall use a STOP paddle. The STOP paddle shall be the primary hand-signaling device.

03 The STOP (R1-1) paddle shall be an octagonal shape. The background of the STOP face shall be red with at least 6-inch series upper-case white letters and border. The paddle shall be at least 18 inches in size and have the word message STOP on both sides. The paddle shall be retroreflectorized or illuminated when used during hours of darkness.

Option:

04 The STOP paddle may be modified to improve conspicuity by incorporating white or red flashing lights on both sides of the paddle. Among the types of flashing lights that may be used are individual LEDs or groups of LEDs.

05 The white or red flashing lights or LEDs may be arranged in any of the following patterns:

- A. Two white or red lights centered vertically above and below the STOP legend,
- B. Two white or red lights centered horizontally on each side of the STOP legend,
- C. One white or red light centered below the STOP legend,
- D. A series of eight or more small white or red lights having a diameter of 1/4 inch or less along the outer edge of the paddle, arranged in an octagonal pattern at the eight corners of the STOP paddle (more than eight lights may be used only if the arrangement of the lights is such that it clearly conveys the octagonal shape of the STOP paddle), or
- E. A series of white lights forming the shapes of the letters in the legend.

Standard:

06 If flashing lights are used on the STOP paddle, the flash rate shall be at least 50, but no more than 60, flash periods per minute.

Option:

07 The 24 x 24 inch size of the STOP (C28A(CA)) paddle may be used where greater emphasis is needed and speeds are 30 mph or more.

Support:

08 See Section 6E.03 for details on STOP paddles and rigid staff.

CROSSING GUARDS: STANDARDS FOR PLACEMENT

Requests for the placement of adult crossing guards at locations used primarily by children attending schools of the Placentia Yorba Linda Unified School District must come through the District Superintendent's office. This process would involve the School District in the planning of suggested routes to school and would be especially helpful if it became necessary to relocate or add guards as necessary.

Requests for guards at locations serving parochial schools involving elementary school age children should come directly to the Police Department. All other parts of the standards for placement shall apply to parochial schools.

Upon receipt of a written request, the Traffic Engineer and the Police Department will investigate conditions at the requested location.

A hearing will be set before the Traffic Safety Commission. At this hearing, staff will present the results of the studies conducted and make recommendations as to the establishment of a guard.

If the Commission recommends placement of a guard, this recommendation would be presented to Council for approval. If the Commission determines that an adult crossing guard is not advisable, this determination is final, unless appealed by the School District to the Council.

If necessary, City Council will hold hearing on appeal.

STANDARDS FOR PLACEMENT

Placement of adult crossing guards is normally considered at locations where elementary school children cross public streets and at uncontrolled crossings located 300 feet or more from a controlled crossing. Crossing guards will be considered only at locations on the "Suggested Routes to Schools".

A Controlled Crossing is defined as follows:

- a. A crossing where motor vehicles are controlled by either traffic signals or stop signs on the street across which adult crossing guards will be used, or
- b. A crossing where motor vehicles are separated from pedestrians by a pedestrian tunnel, bridge or where other adequate pedestrian protection exists.

Assignment of adult crossing guard protection may be warranted under the following conditions:

1. Uncontrolled Crossings:

Where elementary school children cross while traveling to or from school and satisfy the minimum number of children/vehicle counts for one hourly period.

Children	Critical Speed*	Critical Speed*
	Less than or equal to 35 m.p.h. Vehicles in Conflict	Greater than 35 m.p.h. Vehicles in Conflict
40	100	85
35	200	170
25	400	320
15	600 or more	510 or more

* Critical Speed equals the 85% speed.

2. Controlled Crossings:

Where elementary school children cross while traveling to or from school and satisfy the minimum number of children/vehicle counts for one hourly period.

<u>Children</u>	<u>Vehicles in Conflict</u>
100	120
80	150
60	200
40	300
30	400
20	600 or more

3. Crossings with extenuating circumstances are where elementary school children cross while traveling to or from school and cannot do so safely because of unusual conditions that may exist and rerouting is not practical. Such conditions (but not limited to) may be the following:

- a. Insufficient sight distance.
- b. Crosswalks more than 80 feet long, measured along their longest distance.
- c. Abnormally high percentage of commercial vehicles with operating characteristics different from those of the passenger vehicle.
- d. Significantly high total vehicle count.

Crosswalk lengths will be field measured and verified by the City Engineer. Traffic counts will be made on more than one weekday, preferably on Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday to insure a representative count of children and vehicles at a particular location. It is understood that adult crossing guards will

be utilized only for those hours of the day when school children are crossing to and from school. School children may be attending either public or private schools.

Adult crossing guards are authorized by the City Council, after consideration by the Traffic Safety Commission. The Traffic Safety Commission will recommend to the City Council by March 31 of each year the disposition of the crossing guard locations.

TABLE 1

**CROSSING GUARD LOCATION ANALYSIS & COMPARISON
BASED ON THE CA MUTCD & CITY POLICY NO. 606**

SITE	INTERSECTION / LOCATION	XWALK CONTROL	PED VOLUMES ¹		CA MUTCD WARRANT MET? ²			CITY POLICY MET? ³		
			AM	PM	AM	PM	TOTAL	AM	PM	TOTAL
1	Bastanchury / Brookhaven	Signal	28	44	NO	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES
2	Bastanchury / Kraemer	Signal	27	14	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
3	Golden / Valencia	Signal	23	32	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
4	Golden / Chickasaw	NONE	28	49	NO	NO	NO	YES	YES	YES
5	Alta Vista / Angelina	Stop	64	182	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
6	Alta Vista / Kraemer	Signal	30	103	NO	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES
7	La Jolla / Melrose	Signal	419	220	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
8	Morse east of Kraemer	NONE	51	34	NO	NO	NO	YES	NO	YES
9	Chapman / Melrose	Signal	51	60	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
10	Bradford / Madison	Signal	30	27	NO	NO	NO	YES	YES	YES
11	Ruby / Twilight	Stop	89	89	NO	NO	NO	YES	NO	YES
12	Placentia / Lewis	Signal	68	35	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
13	Placentia / Bastanchury	Signal	12	10	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
14	Kraemer / Patrician	Signal	66	59	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
15	Chapman / Central	Signal	11	7	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
16	Yorba Linda / Kilt	NONE	15	15	NO	NO	NO	YES	YES	YES
TOTAL					YES = 2	NO = 14		YES = 9	NO = 7	

¹ Red number = Fewer than the minimum 40 school pedestrians required to meet the CA MUTCD guidelines.

² Green highlighting = Location meets the CA MUTCD guidelines for a crossing guard.

³ Blue highlighting = Location meets City Policy No. 606 requirements for a crossing guard.

TABLE 2

**CROSSING GUARD LOCATION ANALYSIS SUMMARY
BASED ON THE CA MUTCD**

INTERSECTION / LOCATION		XWALK CONTROL	PED VOLUMES ¹		VEHICLE VOLUMES ¹		CA MUTCD WARRANT MET? ²			REASON(S) NOT MET ³
			AM	PM	AM	PM	AM	PM	TOTAL	
1	Bastanchury / Brookhaven	Signal	28	44	826	779	NO	YES	NO	AM Peds
2	Bastanchury / Kraemer	Signal	27	14	459	302	NO	NO	NO	AM/PM Peds
3	Golden / Valencia	Signal	23	32	301	204	NO	NO	NO	AM/PM Peds & PM Vehs
4	Golden / Chickasaw	NONE	28	49	409	329	NO	NO	NO	AM Peds & PM Vehs
5	Alta Vista / Angelina	Stop	64	182	779	712	YES	YES	YES	N/A
6	Alta Vista / Kraemer	Signal	30	103	1,119	233	NO	YES	NO	AM Peds & PM Vehs
7	La Jolla / Melrose	Signal	419	220	521	607	YES	YES	YES	N/A
8	Morse east of Kraemer	NONE	51	34	120	58	NO	NO	NO	PM Peds & AM/PM Vehs
9	Chapman / Melrose	Signal	51	60	296	188	NO	NO	NO	AM/PM Vehs
10	Bradford / Madison	Signal	30	27	523	868	NO	NO	NO	AM/PM Peds
11	Ruby / Twilight	Stop	89	89	207	134	NO	NO	NO	AM/PM Vehs
12	Placentia / Lewis	Signal	68	35	66	56	YES	NO	NO	PM Peds & AM/PM Vehs
13	Placentia / Bastanchury	Signal	12	10	448	453	NO	NO	NO	AM/PM Peds
14	Kraemer / Patrician	Signal	66	59	165	114	NO	NO	NO	AM/PM Vehs
15	Chapman / Central	Signal	11	7	104	171	NO	NO	NO	AM/PM Peds & Vehs
16	Yorba Linda / Kilt	NONE	15	15	888	853	NO	NO	NO	AM/PM Peds

¹ Red number = Fewer than the minimum school pedestrians/conflicting vehicles required to meet the CA MUTCD guidelines.

² Green highlighting = Location meets the CA MUTCD guidelines for a crossing guard.

³ Signalized locations were not evaluated to see if a crossing guard would be justified through analysis of intersection operations. Signalized locations might possibly meet warrants if this is considered.

TABLE 3
CROSSING GUARD LOCATION ANALYSIS SUMMARY
BASED ON CITY POLICY NO. 606

SITE	INTERSECTION / LOCATION	XWALK CONTROL	PED VOLUMES ¹		VEHICLE VOLUMES ¹		CITY POLICY MET? ²			REASON POLICY NOT MET ³
			AM	PM	AM	PM	AM	PM	TOTAL	
1	Bastanchury / Brookhaven	Signal	28	44	826	779	YES	YES	YES	
2	Bastanchury / Kraemer	Signal	27	14	459	302	NO	NO	NO	Too few peds
3	Golden / Valencia	Signal	23	32	301	204	NO	NO	NO	Too few peds
4	Golden / Chickasaw	NONE	28	49	409	329	YES	YES	YES	
5	Alta Vista / Angelina	Stop	64	182	779	712	YES	YES	YES	
6	Alta Vista / Kraemer	Signal	30	103	1,119	233	YES	YES	YES	
7	La Jolla / Melrose	Signal	419	220	521	607	YES	YES	YES	
8	Morse east of Kraemer	NONE	51	34	120	58	YES	NO	YES	
9	Chapman / Melrose	Signal	51	60	296	188	NO	NO	NO	Too few peds
10	Bradford / Madison	Signal	30	27	523	868	YES	YES	YES	
11	Ruby / Twilight	Stop	89	89	207	134	YES	NO	YES	
12	Placentia / Lewis	Signal	68	35	66	56	NO	NO	NO	Too few peds
13	Placentia / Bastanchury	Signal	12	10	448	453	NO	NO	NO	Too few peds
14	Kraemer / Patrician	Signal	66	59	165	114	NO	NO	NO	Too few peds
15	Chapman / Central	Signal	11	7	104	171	NO	NO	NO	Too few peds
16	Yorba Linda / Kilt	NONE	15	15	888	853	YES	YES	YES	

¹ Red number = Fewer than the minimum school pedestrians required relative to number of vehicles to meet City Policy No. 606.

² Blue highlighting = Location meets City Policy No. 606 requirements for a crossing guard.

³ These locations were not evaluated for extenuating circumstances, so it is possible they could meet the City requirements if these conditions were considered. Also, counts were only made for one day, not more than one day, as recommended, which could also affect the results. However, count: also include middle school and high school children, which are excluded from City Policy No. 606, which could reduce the number of qualifying locations