

**CITY OF MANHATTAN BEACH
DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT**

TO: Parking and Public Improvements Commission

FROM: Richard Thompson, Director of Community Development
Nhung Madrid, Management Analyst

DATE: July 26, 2012

SUBJECT: Aviation Boulevard Bicycle Lane Preliminary Engineering Study - Final Report

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends that the Parking and Public Improvements Commission conduct a public hearing and provide comments regarding the Aviation Boulevard Bicycle Lane Preliminary Engineering Study – Final Report.

BACKGROUND:

The provision of bicycle lanes on Aviation Boulevard is a project of the Healthways/Blue Zones Vitality City initiative. The purpose of the initiative is to improve the well-being of the Beach Cities by optimizing the physical environment, policy and social connections (city, restaurants, schools, businesses). The initiative aims to make the Beach Cities more walkable, bicycle friendly, healthy, and socially engaged, with an overall goal of improving citizens' health. The Cities of Manhattan Beach, Hermosa Beach and Redondo Beach are choosing to create a community where people can live longer and better by encouraging simple lifestyle changes that will make lasting changes in physical, mental and social health. The Vitality City Program will run from 2011 to 2013.

Bicycle lanes on Aviation Boulevard were identified as a future need in the South Bay Bicycle Master Plan, which was approved by this Commission and the City Council in 2011. Although Aviation Boulevard did not score high in the Plan's prioritized projects, this corridor was strongly recommended as a result of feedback received at workshops held by Vitality City. Aviation Boulevard is one of only a few streets that provide a continuous north-south connection, and bicycle lanes on this roadway would create a highly visible bicycle facility along a major roadway corridor within each of the participating Beach Cities.

DISCUSSION:

On February 23, 2012, representatives from Vitality City and their consultant, Michael Moule with Nelson/Nygaard Consulting Services, Inc., presented the Aviation Bicycle Lane Preliminary Engineering Study to the Parking and Public

Improvements Commission (Exhibits A and B). Based on input received at that meeting as well as Vitality City's other meetings with the Public Works Commission for Hermosa Beach and Redondo Beach, Vitality City staff and Nelson/Nygaard revised the Study's recommendations and included additional supporting information to produce the Final Report (Exhibit C) and an accompanying FAQ (Exhibit D).

The Study has been reviewed by the City's Traffic Engineer and he has provided his comments and concerns regarding how the proposed recommendations and options would impact traffic flow, parking, turn movements, the prohibition of turn movements, the effect it would have on residents and businesses along this corridor, and the long term implications to travel patterns and habits in the area. It has been stated throughout the study that this entire process will require substantial public outreach and public participation.

Tonight's meeting was noticed in The Beach Reporter during the weeks of July 12th and 19th as well as a mailed postcard notice to all addresses east of Redondo Ave to the City limit (Exhibit E). All public comments that has been received from interested parties have been provided for the Commission to review (Exhibit F). These concerns, as well as any others that may be brought up tonight will need to be addressed, if this project is pursued.

The Preliminary Engineering Study Final Report provides a good starting point to determine whether or not bicycle lanes on Aviation Boulevard are feasible. As shown in this report, a substantial amount of parking and traffic impact analyses is still required as well as public input throughout the entire process. This Final Report was presented to the Redondo Beach Public Works Commission on June 26, 2012 and to the City of Hermosa Beach Public Works Commission on July 25, 2012. Both Commissions have been asked to provide comments on the study as well. At this time, staff is recommending the Commission conduct a public hearing and provide comments on the Preliminary Engineering Study.

- Exhibit
- A. PPIC Staff Report for February 23, 2012 (without attachments)
 - B. Minutes of the February 23, 2012 PPIC Meeting
 - C. Aviation Boulevard Bicycle Lane Preliminary Engineering Study – Final Report
 - D. FAQ
 - E. The Beach Reporter Ad and Mailed Postcard Notice
 - F. Public Comments

**CITY OF MANHATTAN BEACH
PARKING AND PUBLIC IMPROVEMENTS COMMISSION
MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING
JULY 26, 2012**

A. CALL TO ORDER

The regular meeting of the Parking and Public Improvements Commission of the City of Manhattan Beach, California, was held on the 26th day of July, 2012, at the hour of 6:30 p.m., in the City Council Chambers of City Hall, 1400 Highland Avenue, in said City.

B. ROLL CALL

Present: Stabile, Nicholson, Fournier, Silverman, and Chair Adami.
Absent: None.
Staff Present: Madrid, Rydell, and Haaland.
Clerk: Kennedy.

C. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

7/26/12-1 - Minutes: March 27, 2012

1. A motion was MADE and SECONDED (Fournier/Silverman) to approve the minutes of March 27, 2012 regular meeting with the following amendment:

Chair Adami wanted to clarify that on page 4, paragraph 6, the Hyperion Treatment Plant is one of the most successful and effective plants in the *United States*, not the *world*.

D. AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

None.

E. GENERAL BUSINESS

7/26/12-2 - Recognition of Outgoing Chair Gary Stabile and Rotation of New Chair and Vice Chair

Chair Adami commended and thanked outgoing Chair Stabile for his hard work, service, dignity, and commitment to the Parking and Public Improvements Commission.

7/26/12-3 - Consideration of an Encroachment Appeal to Approve a Raised Yard in the Public Right-of-Way – 519 21st Street

Chair Adami introduced the consideration of an encroachment appeal to approve a raised yard in the public right-of-way located at 519 21st Street.

Management Analyst Madrid introduced Associate Planner Eric Haaland.

Associate Planner Haaland presented a PowerPoint presentation and summarized the staff report.

Associate Planner Haaland shared that in addition to the one public comment that was attached to the staff report, that he received two additional emails which were provided to the Commissioners before the meeting.

Associate Planner Haaland asked that the PPIC accept public testimony, review the appeal request and recommend that the City Council deny the request. Staff did not support the request for the raised right-of-way grade and retaining wall because it is not consistent with the encroachment standards.

Associate Planner Haaland also stated that should the PPIC recommend approval of the raised grade, that conditions be imposed requiring restoration of the original grade, and removal of the retaining wall, whenever the existing building is demolished in the future, and that any City costs (future street work) that may result from the retaining wall and raised grade be paid by the property owner, as stated in the staff report.

Commissioner Stabile questioned the applicant's intended use of the encroachment area.

Mr. Haaland responded that the applicant is not required to provide that information in detail, but Staff expected the use to be outdoor play or dining area. Mr. Haaland explained that staff is not able to approve an exception like this; that only the PPIC and City Council are able to approve these exceptions.

Commissioner Fournier raised concerns about a loss in parking.

Mr. Haaland explained that granting the encroachment appeal would not impact parking since there are no parking pads in this street segment because there is a roadway curb.

Commissioner Fournier verified that this is a grading issue, not a fence issue and the fence would not go over three feet.

Mr. Haaland affirmed Commissioner Fournier's assertion; raising the grade is what is in conflict with the code and the fence, including the grade, would not be taller than three feet.

Commissioner Nicholson asked about the additional requirements for a fence.

Mr. Haaland explained that the fence must be identified in the encroachment permit application, but staff is able to approve fencing, up to 42 inches.

Commissioner Nicholson asked if there were any utilities in the right-of-way. He pointed out the manhole cover in the applicant's neighbor's driveway.

Mr. Haaland explained issues with utilities in the right-of-way are usually found in walk street situations, he was unsure of any utilities in this particular case. Mr. Haaland stated that staff does not usually review drive streets in the same manner that walk streets are reviewed.

Commissioner Nicholson asked if there was a need to go into the sewer and it was under an encroachment area, if it would be at the owner's expense.

Mr. Haaland stated that if such a condition were approved, the additional cost would be borne by the property owner.

Chair Adami asked who assumes liability if the encroachment area is permitted?

Mr. Haaland explained that with any encroachment permit, the property owner must provide the City with insurance liability coverage.

Commissioner Fournier asked what the objection is to raising the grade; why is that written into the code.

Mr. Haaland explained he believes the concerns for raising the grade are perceived as privatization of the public right-of-way, and conflicts with future City street projects.

Commissioner Stabile asked if the City foresees street work in the near future.

Mr. Haaland explained he was unaware of any future planned projects in the area.

Commissioner Nicholson explained he thinks the rationale for not raising the grade is that we would like people to be able to walk in the right-of-way. The code allows the space to be usable for everyone; its purpose is meant to be a sidewalk or parking place.

Chair Adami asked how a "significant alteration of the right-of-way" (A – attachment b 7.36.150 – section D) should be interpreted.

Mr. Haaland stated a six inch curb height could be done by staff approval.

Chair Adami opened the item for audience participation.

Management Analyst Madrid suggested the applicant have a chance to speak before the issue was opened for audience participation.

Mr. David Watson, the architect for the applicant, thanked Mr. Haaland for his presentation. He further explained that the grade change is to make a user friendly space for the applicant and their children to play in the front yard and possibly share a meal. He stated the modest grade increase would allow for additional steps down to the lower yard.

Commissioner Stabile asked if the encroachment area would be user friendly for the public.

Mr. Watson explained that the owners are within their rights to put a fence in the same retaining wall location.

Commissioner Stabile asked if the applicants intend to do so.

Mr. Watson stated that the applicants do intend to put a fence on the retaining wall.

Commissioner Stabile clarified that the applicants plan to raise the grade, incorporate it into their private yard, and then fence it off.

Mr. Watson stated that with a fence installed, that the public would not be able to access the encroachment area without stepping over it.

Commissioner Nicholson asked if the fence needed to be two feet back from the curb.

Mr. Watson stated he believes they are back two feet from the curb.

Chair Adami asked to see the drawing/plan that was submitted as part of the application.

Mr. Haaland brought up the site plan from the presentation and pointed out the top view sight plan; he explained the wall would be two foot in from the curb which is different from many of the existing fences in the neighborhood.

Chair Adami inquired about the height of the wall.

Mr. Watson explained the wall would be one foot high on the right side and two foot high on the left side.

Commissioner Stabile asked from what point?

Mr. Haaland explained it is measured from the top of curb.

Chair Adami suggested that at two feet high, the fence/wall could pose a danger to children.

Mr. Watson explained there would be a fence on top of the wall – a total of 42 inches high. Ultimately, there could be a low wall with a low fence or just a taller fence.

Chair Adami thanked Mr. Watson and opened the audience participation portion.

There was no audience participation.

Chair Adami opened the discussion for the Commissioners.

Commissioner Fournier asked what the actual size of the encroachment would be.

Mr. Haaland confirmed that the encroachment area is seven and a half feet from property line to the wall and an additional two feet from the wall to the curb, making it a total of nine and a half feet.

Chair Adami explained that would make the raised area approximately 300 square feet.

Commissioner Nicholson explained that the two foot setback is from the curb and the modest wall and fence is a total of 42 inches in height. He has visited the street several times and believes having a two foot setback is good because it creates room for a pedestrian when a car is driving down the street.

Mr. Haaland agreed and stated any fence or wall needs to be set back two feet from the curb.

Commissioner Nicholson noticed that in the surrounding neighborhood if the homeowner has taken possession of the encroachment area it is not usually usable as a walkway.

Commissioner Stabile asked if thorny bushes that render an encroachment area unusable are allowed.

Mr. Haaland explained that rose bushes and similar plants are common in encroachment areas.

Commissioner Stabile mentioned it is clear to him the applicants are interested in the encroachment area in order to create a space for the kids to play. He further mentioned he does not see it as an adversarial area.

Chair Adami explained he drives and walks that area, there are many families in the area and he understands the want to add more area for the kids to play.

Commissioner Stabile explained his concern: the PPIC granted an encroachment at 301 28th street; he voted against the encroachment because he felt the PPIC would be setting a bad precedent. The owner wants to incorporate right-of-way into his personal property; an exception to the code is not met, therefore, he does not think it is appropriate. He believes the PPIC should adhere to the requirement. He explained his inclination to support staff's recommendation to deny the encroachment appeal.

Commissioner Silverman also explained the PPIC recently recommended approval of a right-of-way grade raising request at 301 28th Street, which was ultimately approved by the City Council. The purpose in that case was to create level decorative planter terraces on a long steep side-street slope, rather than a useable front yard area in this case. These are two different stories. Commissioner Silverman shared his reluctance to set a precedent, but supports the appeal in the one individual case. He decided he was more inclined to go with what staff recommended in second part; should PPIC recommend approval of the raised grade, staff suggests conditions be imposed requiring restoration of the original grade, and removal of the retaining wall, whenever the existing building is demolished in the future, and that any City costs (future street work) that may result from the retaining wall be paid by the property owner.

Commissioner Fournier asked if Commissioner Silverman was in favor or not.

Commissioner Silverman answered he would support the encroachment with those conditions.

Commissioner Nicholson asked to include the phrase "change in grade" so that the City would be indemnified in dealing with the property owners. He also explained he has a similar situation at this home; there are utilities running through the right-of-way. He recommended approval with staff's language.

Commissioner Stabile clarified the property owners would be financially responsible.

Commissioner Fournier asked if the PPIC had the capacity, as a Commission, to make that recommendation as suggested by Commissioner Stabile.

Chair Adami, Commissioner Stabile, and Management Analyst Madrid all answered in the affirmative; that the Commission can make the recommendation.

Mr. Haaland explained the encroachment permit would place the burden of any costs upon the applicant.

Commissioner Fournier asked what happens when there is a change of ownership.

Mr. Haaland said the related encroachment agreement is recorded with the title of property; therefore, it stays with the property.

A motion was MADE and SECONDED (Silverman/Nicholson) to recommend approval of the raised grade, including the conditions suggested by staff including requiring restoration of the original grade, and removal of the retaining wall, whenever the existing building is demolished in the future, and that any City costs (future street work) that may result from the retaining wall be paid by the property owner. The motion passed with a 4-1 vote, with Commissioner Stabile dissenting.

7/26/12-4 – Aviation Boulevard Bicycle Lane Preliminary Engineering Study – Final Report

Management Analyst Madrid introduced the item, stated that this is a follow-up report and public hearing to discuss the Aviation Boulevard Bicycle Lane Preliminary Engineering Report-Final Study. Ms. Katie McClure is here to present the Study and City Traffic Engineer Jack Rydell is available to answer any questions. The Commission is to hold a public hearing and receive comments from the public.

Commissioner Fournier asked Management Analyst Madrid to clarify the responsibility of the Commission.

Management Analyst Madrid explained that the Commission is not approving the Engineering Study but merely holding a public hearing and accepting public comment. Depending upon the public comments that are received, the study may go before the City Council.

Ms. McClure explained the City of Manhattan Beach City Council was recently recognized for their efforts to promote a more livable, walkable, bikable community. Ms. McClure highlighted the following accomplishments:

- City staff attended a Living Streets Workshop to embrace principles to build road networks that are safer, more livable, and welcoming to everyone;
- The City adopted a Bicycle Master Plan and the implementation process has begun on Redondo and Pacific Avenues;
- The City has been actively seeking funding to create a Pedestrian and Bicycle Enhancement Program and is currently developing a Mobility Plan to include improvements that are consistent with Complete Streets;
- The City has policies that promote outdoor dining creating activity and drawing people into the space in a social atmosphere;
- The City has policies that restrict mobile vending of unhealthy foods near schools and public playgrounds through a Food Truck Ordinance;
- The City has implemented strategies to enhance personal safety in areas where people can be physically active, such as the crosswalk on Manhattan Avenue at 9th street;

- The City has adopted a Tree Ordinance that supports Urban Greening which creates more green space thus relieving stress and improving well-being;
- And, the City Council encourages City employees to move naturally, eat wisely, find their purpose, and find healthy social opportunities.

Simply put, there are cities around the country that can learn from the City of Manhattan Beach's leadership in making the healthy choice the easy choice for the community. Ms. McClure applauded the City's efforts and shared her excitement to partner with Manhattan Beach.

Ms. McClure presented a PowerPoint presentation and summarized the findings of the Preliminary Engineering Report.

Ms. McClure emphasized that the multi-city perspective is important and that additional study could include outreach to both the cities of Los Angeles and El Segundo, that many of the questions and concerns that were raised during the initial meetings at the various City Commission meetings have been addressed in the Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) part of the report, and/or would need further study and would be identified in the next phase which would be developing a comprehensive scope of work, that both the Hermosa Beach and Redondo Beach Public Works Commissions will be recommending to their respective City Councils to continue to the next phase of the project and that input from all parties involved is key to a successful project.

Chair Adami thanked Ms. McClure for her presentation.

Chair Adami, Commissioner Silverman and Commissioner Nicholson and Commissioner Stabile inquired about grant funding availability, the cost of the next study, if the grant application would be a joint effort, and the proposed timeline.

Ms. McClure responded that she anticipates a Bicycle Transportation Account (BTA) grant to be released next Spring, therefore, the study would need to move quickly; there are other grants available but that they are all competitive; that the technical portion will cost approximately \$35,000; however, once the full scope of the project is finalized the cost would probably be more; that she anticipated that the grant application will be a joint effort between Vitality City and the three beach cities; and that the timeline would be dependent on obtaining the grant funding in order to move forward with the project.

Commissioner Fournier inquired why Option Four in the study eliminates northbound movement to 10th Street and asked for illustrations of the different options.

Traffic Engineer Rydell explained that left turns would be eliminated because of the raised median in Option Four, although, parking spaces would be retained. Mr. Rydell explained all of the options still require further examination.

Chair Adami stressed the most important factors are the negative impact on businesses and the safety of everyone. He also shared the FAQs and resources found on the website were very informative.

Chair Adami opened the public hearing and allowed two minutes per speaker.

Jim Hannon, Redondo Beach resident, stated, if you build it, they will come. He is a member of the South Bay Bicycle Coalition, a retiree from the aerospace industry, a cycling coach, and part of the cycling club. He shared that he believes biking is great and wants to encourage people to bike to work. He began asking employees in the aerospace industry to sign a petition in support of a bicycle lane on Aviation Boulevard. Thus far (March – July) he has collected 904 names of people who live in the South Bay.

Mark Tucker, 1500 Block of Faymont, introduced himself as a biker and hiker. He believes that bicycle lanes on Aviation Boulevard are a great idea but not possible. He moved to the South Bay in 1962 when bicycles shared the road with cars. He pointed out that at some point City Council's everywhere got rid of bike lanes. Mr. Tucker also pointed out that he drives a car and likes parking spaces he does not have to pay for; he sees no easy way Aviation Boulevard can be widened.

Edward Fuller, 1700 Block of 5th Street, explained he was a Longshoreman after he fought in World War II. He has been paying attention to Aviation Boulevard for a long time and believes that changing the parking and turn movements would hurt the businesses. He sat down and watched cars pass at 50-60 mph the prior week – he believes that adding bicycle lanes would be dangerous and is therefore opposed to the idea.

Commissioner Silverman thanked Mr. Fuller for his service to the United States.

Susan Burden, Beach Cities Health District Board of Directors Representative, thanked the Commission and reaffirmed that more information is needed, the next step is gathering information to see if bicycle lanes are even possible on Aviation Boulevard, and mentioned that there are very successful examples.

Katrina Wurland, Healthways Representative, commended Manhattan Beach and the leadership role the City has taken on. Ms. Wurland pointed out this is one of the few multi-jurisdictional bike lanes going on in the country. It will be a showcase of what can happen when three communities work together.

Linda Ackerman, Manhattan Beach resident, shared she trained for her first marathon at 51 and is an avid female cyclist. She feels Aviation Boulevard is beyond daunting; she commutes to work on her bicycle but utilizes the Redondo/Douglas route. Ms. Ackerman is excited and supportive of bicycle lanes on Aviation Boulevard.

Evelyn St. Germain, 300 Block of Aviation Boulevard, explained getting out of her driveway is difficult; that speeding on Aviation Boulevard is horrible. Ms. St. Germain is concerned about the safety issues that come with installing bicycle lanes on Aviation Boulevard and does not want to see parking removed. She is not in favor of bicycle lanes on that street.

George Schmeltzer, 200 Block of Valley Drive in Hermosa Beach, explained that in the 1970s the focus of planning was all about moving cars as fast as possible; planners are now looking towards alternatives to the automobile. Bicycle lanes along Aviation Boulevard would provide a connection to rapid transit and the work place. The Public Works Commissions in Hermosa Beach and Redondo Beach recommended their cities move forward with the next study. There is no telling what the final outcome of the study will be, there may be insurmountable problems but he supports moving forward.

Bernard O'Connor, 400 Block of 1st Street, an avid cyclist, shared the experience of the bicycle lane along 7th Street in downtown Los Angeles. If it is possible in downtown on 7th Street, it is possible on Aviation Boulevard.

Rebecca Bird, 1100 Block of 11th Street, voiced her opposition to the bicycle lanes along Aviation Boulevard and stood with business owners who operate between 9th Street and 11th Street. Ms. Bird expressed her dismay with the suggestion of closing 10th Street to left hand turns.

Don Beckerman, 100 Block of South Aviation, Mr. Beckerman spoke about parking along Aviation Boulevard and the adjacent streets and the loss of parking in the initial engineering study and traffic that already exists.

Michael Dash, Hawthorne resident, shared he worked for the air force and now for the aerospace industry and expressed his concern with the whole idea of bicycle lanes on Aviation Boulevard. Mr. Dash believed the presentation was biased and that there were no alternative north/south routes in the presentation and no vehicular commuters speaking during the hearing.

Anthony Librano, 1500 Block of Ruhland, explained he has been the owner of Valentino's Pizza for over 20 years. Mr. Librano's concerns included: speeding cars, prohibiting left hand turns onto 10th Street, eliminating parking, and safety in general being his biggest concern.

Michael Don, Manhattan Beach resident, explained that cyclists are currently allowed to ride on the streets and provided some information about the public process that resulted in Aviation Boulevard being on the Bike Master Plan. Mr. Don supports further research and study. He mentioned that the 900 signatures on the petition show there is support but the next steps should not negatively impact any businesses.

Andre LeRoux, Redondo Beach resident, brought up traffic flow changes, the safety of children on Aviation Boulevard, the indirect and direct financial impacts, changes in parking patterns, alternative routes, and the initial cost of the first study.

Dean Moss, 1000 Block of Aviation Boulevard, owner of The Hanger on Aviation Boulevard celebrated the businesses 55th anniversary. Mr. Moss explained parking has always been the biggest nightmare and eliminating access to 10th Street would be detrimental to the businesses and would kill his business.

Nick Bhanji, owner of Rainbow Cleaners, shared his concerns regarding the safety of all involved and his belief that none of the businesses along Aviation Boulevard will benefit from bicycle lanes. Mr. Bhanji believes the best plan would be an alternative route. Ultimately, it is detrimental for the businesses, people, and residents because of the zoning.

Amir Bhamani, Aviation Boulevard Convenience Store owner, expressed his concern regarding the proposed limitation of access to 10th Street and safety concerns mainly focusing on the prevalence of speeding on Aviation Boulevard.

Walt Dougher, 1800 Block of John Street, explained he is a former Councilmember, Beach Cities Health District Board Member, and past City Commissioner. He has heard a number of concerns from members of the business community and parents concerned about safety. Mr. Dougher then clarified the current engineering study is a concept, not the final plan; he supports moving forward for further review and input from the community.

Chair Adami thanked Mr. Dougher for his service for the City of Manhattan Beach.

Kit Chape, 1800 Block of 10th Street, asked the Commissioners to think of the children and their safety. He explained that if it is more difficult or slower to drive down Aviation Boulevard drivers will detour to Redondo Avenue or Harkness Avenue as a bypass route.

Ann Chape, 1800 Block of 10th Street, echoed her husband's comments, explained her support of the Blue Zones project and asked the Commission to look at alternative routes. Mrs. Chape explained prohibiting the left hand turn would create more traffic on

Redondo Avenue and Harkness Avenue which are both used heavily by kids while walking to school.

Jean Hendricks, Manhattan Beach resident and Artesia/Aviation business owner, attended both the Hermosa Beach and Redondo Beach Public Works Commission meetings where each Commission recommended further study. Ms. Hendricks asked the Commission to also support further study.

Frank Belz, Manhattan Beach resident, wanted to ensure that the next stage of the engineering study come to fruition. Mr. Belz explained the law of unintended consequences is real and engineering studies are very important.

Jim Fasola, Hermosa Beach resident, stated that several of the concerns that were raised such as prohibiting turn movements or parking removal were based on options within the Preliminary Study. These are only options and there may not be any parking or left hand turn lanes removed. He also heard repeatedly that Aviation Boulevard is a busy street, and he thinks that the answer is to do something. We must do further study, to ensure that the project is properly engineered. The additional study may show that the project might not be feasible; however, the Cities of Hermosa Beach, Redondo Beach and El Segundo are all on-board and Manhattan Beach is the missing link. Mr. Fasola emphasized that further study is necessary and urged the Commission to move forward with the study.

Salim Musani, Redondo Beach resident, explained he is a motorist and bicyclist who used to commute on his bike to Northrup Grumann; he encouraged the Commission to examine alternatives that are already in place.

Judy Kerner, Manhattan Beach resident, explained that Aviation Boulevard is used by commuters, that as a driver, it is scary to try to figure out how to get around bicyclists to avoid hitting them and that bike lanes are necessary on Aviation Boulevard.

Mr. Fuller asked what would be done with the public hearing comments that were received.

Mr. Librano asked if time could be set aside so he can provide his own PowerPoint presentation with the opposing view point.

Rebecca Bird stated she did not receive the public notice mailer that went out and asked if it was too late to bring in a petition opposing the plan.

Michael Dash asked the Commission to take into account that the other cities have not made a final decision and the final engineering study would study alternatives.

Management Analyst Madrid explained that once the public hearing and Commissioner's comments are collected, staff will evaluate and forward them as appropriate.

Chair Adami commented that all public input is welcomed; he directed anyone wanting to contribute more to put it in writing and provide it to Management Analyst Madrid. Chair Adami closed the public hearing, thanked all those that shared their testimony, and opened up the commission discussion.

Commissioner Stabile emphasized that at this stage, nothing has been decided and a number of alternatives are on the table, including not having a bike lane on Aviation Boulevard at all. Further study is necessary and the public input process will continue for some time. The City Councils will make any and all decisions as to whether there will be bikeways in the beach communities. Commissioner Stabile further explained that the City Councils are extremely sensitive to comments, will listen and take them into consideration and the ultimate outcome will only come after a lengthy, deliberative process. He thanked the public for their comments.

Commissioner Fournier emphasized that the City Council does pay attention to the public input received at the Commission level. He added the greatest concern in Manhattan Beach is how the bicycle lanes will impact businesses on Aviation Boulevard. He further emphasized that Beach Cities Health District conducted an exhaustive study and encourages business owners to spend time with them in order to convey all of their concerns.

Commissioner Nicholson stated that he heard a lot from the business community and appreciated the feedback. He looks forward to implementing the thoughts of the public in conjunction with Vitality City goals. Commissioner Nicholson pointed out the downtown Long Beach business community shared many of the same worries as the Manhattan Beach business community before bike lanes were installed and the bike lanes have forced traffic to slow and the businesses are profiting from new customers. Commissioner Nicholson thanked the South Bay Bicycle Coalition, Beach Cities Health District, and Vitality City; he would like to see the next engineering study.

Commissioner Silverman commended his fellow Commissioners and shared his perspective on the project as a business owner worried about making ends meet, but also as a parent wanting the community to be safe for his family. This is about a vision of working together and highlighting several important issues: survival of businesses, safety, congestion and speeding on Aviation Boulevard. It is an opportunity to work together to make the community stronger. Commissioner Silverman's vision ten years from now is a stronger community where businesses have been impacted in a positive way.

Chair Adami thanked the public for their comments and added that he believes right now is the time for this biking program. He shared his appreciation for the businesses and explained more study and input is needed and a more detailed design for the connection to El Segundo. Safety is the number one issue but he hopes to see a boost for the businesses. Chair Adami once again thanked the public for their participation and asked anyone with a presentation to give Management Analyst Madrid a copy

F. COMMISSION ITEMS

1. Commissioner Stabile brought up the lack of signage for the No Smoking ban on The Strand at the last Commission meeting. Since the meeting he explained he had noticed the microscopic signage and has been conducting an informal survey of people he has observed smoking; most are unaware of the ban, unlike Hermosa Beach where the ban is apparent. Commissioner Stabile shared he believes the efforts that have been made to eliminate smoking on The Strand are unsuccessful and would urge City Council to reexamine the effectiveness of the effort to educate the public.

Chair Adami concurred with Commissioner Stabile's comment regarding the size of the No Smoking ban signage.

Management Analyst Madrid stated that she would include these comments in the action minutes to City Council.

2. Commissioner Silverman stated that he was driving North on Meadows at 19th or 21st and noticed the stop sign has a tree branch in front of it, creating a safety issue.

Management Analyst Madrid stated staff would submit a work order to follow-up on the tree trimming.

3. Commissioner Fournier welcomed Commissioner Nicholson to his first PPIC meeting and asked him to introduce himself.

Commissioner Nicholson introduced himself as a 60 year resident and product of the local school system. He served six years on the Parks and Recreation Commission, a year and a half on the South Bay Bicycle Master Plan Board, was a member of the Finance Committee for the Beach Cities Health District, Leadership Manhattan Beach graduate and is retired. Commissioner Nicholson expressed his pleasure at serving on the Commission.

4. Commissioner Fournier stated that the last two PPIC meetings were cancelled and asked if the Commission should consider taking on more responsibility from City Council.

A discussion ensued amongst the Commissioners regarding the roles of the commission; how items are brought forth to the commission; how often the commission meets; their concern with cancelled meetings and how the commission can request to take on more responsibility.

Management Analyst Madrid responded that the PPIC only meets when there are staff items to present; that the Traffic Division has several projects and studies that they are currently working on, but are not ready to be presented or do not need to be presented to the Commission. Management Analyst Madrid further clarified that if the Commissioners wish to make any requests to the City Council, the commissioner may include that request under Commission Items, which will be included in the Action Minutes to City Council. A City Council member must pull the item, and make a motion to agendaize it for further discussion in order for the Commission to take on that task.

5. Commissioner Fournier stated that he has noticed that the sidewalk at the intersection of Manhattan Beach Boulevard and Manhattan Avenue is dirtier during the summer, and suggested shifting cleaning services to increase the frequency of power washing the sidewalk in that area.

Management Analyst Madrid responded that she would pass along this suggestion to the appropriate department.

6. Commissioner Fournier inquired about a broken new technology parking meter and was concerned as to whether this was a common problem and if someone was tracking these issues.

Management Analyst Madrid stated that she will follow-up on with Raul Saenz, the Public Works Utilities Manager.

7. Chair Adami stated that there is an increase in pedestrian traffic in the Downtown during the summer months and inquired if it was possible to change the crosswalks at the intersection of Manhattan Beach Boulevard and Manhattan Avenue to a crosswalk similar to the one in Downtown Hermosa Beach on Pier Avenue.

Commissioner Nicholson asked if there was a way to adjust the timing during specific seasons since the pedestrian traffic varies in the summer vs. the winter months.

Traffic Engineer Rydell responded that scramble crosswalks are reserved for high pedestrian volume intersections; that there are some ADA concerns with that type of treatment since visually impaired individuals cue off of the traffic; that the traditional way to adjust the traffic is to shorten the signal cycle length; however, he would contact the County to look into the request.

8. Chair Adami observed that Public Works has recently done extensive road work on Manhattan Avenue and Highland Avenue. He inquired if the PPIC was responsible for approving those projects.

Management Analyst Madrid responded that this is regular roadway maintenance that is included in the CIP, which is presented to the PPIC on a yearly basis, but individual projects do not come before the PPIC.

G. STAFF ITEMS

7/26/12-5 - Monthly Revenue and Expenditure Reports

The report was received and filed.

7/26/12-6 - Staff Follow-Up Items

1. Management Analyst Madrid announced that the City was awarded a second Safe Routes to School grant in the amount of \$447,700, and the grant includes Pennekamp Elementary.

Commissioner Silverman asked how we were awarded so much money the second time around.

Commissioner Nicholson asked what the grant money is for.

Traffic Engineer Rydell explained the grant encourages kids to walk and bicycle to school and the application process requires a lot of coordination with all of the participating schools.

Chair Adami thanked Traffic Engineer Rydell and Management Analyst Madrid for their hard work and shared that the Meadows Elementary Principal commended their work.

2. Management Analyst Madrid provided an update regarding the status of several grant applications the Traffic Division is working on regarding the Community

Based Transportation Planning (CBTPG) grant for the traffic roundabout at the intersection of Valley Drive/Ardmore Avenue/15th Street and a Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) grant for a protected left turn signal on Sepulveda Boulevard at 8th Street.

Commissioner Nicholson asked what kind of grant funds are available.

Traffic Engineer Rydell explained that the HSIP grant for the intersection is for approximately \$300,000 and is CalTrans supported. The Community Based Planning and Transportation Grant requires heavy community involvement and is for \$175,000.

3. Management Analyst Madrid stated that the City Clerk's office is creating City email accounts for all Commissioners.
4. Management Analyst Madrid informed the Commission that the meeting in August will be Brown Act training with the City Attorney.
5. Chair Adami stated all of his business cards are gone and asked for replacement cards.

Management Analyst Madrid stated that she spoke with the City Clerk who stated only the Planning Commission receives business cards.

Commissioner Stabile stated he has business cards; Commissioner Silverman has generic business cards and Commissioner Nicholson has business cards from serving on the Parks and Recreation Commission.

Management Analyst Madrid stated she would follow up with the City Clerk's Office regarding business cards for Commissioners.

6. Chair Adami thanked Management Analyst Madrid for the parking permit.

H. ADJOURNMENT

The Meeting was adjourned at 9:14 p.m. to the regular Parking and Public Improvements Commission Meeting on Thursday, August 23, 2012, in the City Council Chambers of City Hall, 1400 Highland Avenue, in said City.