Grand Jury Report

RESPONSE FORM

Grand Jury Report Title: Crosswalks: Are You as Safe as You Think?

Report Dated: 6/9/14

Response Form Submitted By:

Mendocino County Board of Supervisors

Response MUST be submitted, per Penal Code §933.05, no later than:

8/31/14

We have reviewed the report and submit our responses to the <u>FINDINGS</u> portion of the report as follows:

- We agree with the Findings numbered:2. 4 and 7
- We disagree wholly or partially with the Findings numbered below, and have <u>attached</u>, as <u>required</u>, a statement specifying any portion of the Findings that are disputed with an explanation of the reasons therefore.

 1. 3. 5 and 6

We have reviewed the report and submit our responses to the <u>RECOMMENDATIONS</u> portion of the report as follows:

The following Recommendation(s) have been implemented and <u>attached, as required</u>, is a summary describing the implemented actions:

1, 3

The following Recommendation(s) have not yet been implemented, but will be implemented in the future, attached, as required, is a time frame for implementation:
 7

x The following Recommendation(s) require further analysis, and

attached as required, is an explanation and the scope and parameters of the planned analysis, and a time frame for the matter to be prepared, discussed and approved by the officer and/or director of the agency or department being investigated or reviewed: (This time frame shall not exceed six (6) months from the date of publication of the Grand Jury Report)
4, 5

x The following Recommendations will NOT be implemented because they are not warranted and/or are not deemed reasonable, attached, as required, is an explanation therefore:

We have completed the above responses, and have attached, as required the following number of pages to this response form:

Number of Pages attached: 4

We understand that responses to Grand Jury Reports are public records. They will be posted on the Grand Jury website: www.co.mendocino.ca.us/grandjury. The clerk of the responding agency is required to maintain a copy of the response.

We understand that we must submit this signed response form and any attachments as follows:

First Step: E-mail (word documents or scanned pdf file format) to:

- The Grand Jury Foreperson at: grandjury@co.mendocino.ca.us
- The Presiding Judge: grandjury@mendocino.courts.ca.gov

Second Step: Mail all originals to:

Mendocino County Grand Jury P.O. Box 939 Ukiah, CA 95482

Printed Name:	<u>Douglas</u>	<u>L.</u>	Losak
Title: Acting County	Counsel		

MENDOCINO COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS' RESPONSE TO GRAND JURY REPORT TITLED:

CROSSWALKS - ARE YOU AS SAFE AS YOU THINK?

FINDINGS:

F1 – Countywide, the markings of crosswalks are inconsistent in appearance and condition.

The Board of Supervisors disagrees in part with this Finding.

The Board of Supervisors agrees with and adopts the Mendocino County Department of Transportation's response to this Finding.

F3 – Pedestrian assumption that a crosswalk is safe is not true.

The Board of Supervisors disagrees in part with this Finding.

As the Director of MCDOT said in his response, "two painted lines do not provide protection against an oncoming vehicle." The burden of safety has to be on the vehicle's drivers and pedestrians. Both need to be alert for each other.

California Vehicle Code Chapter 5 "Pedestrians' Rights and Duties" requires drivers to "exercise due care for the safety of any pedestrian upon the roadway." Pedestrians have a right to be there, and if pedestrians have to cross the road without a "marked crosswalk," pedestrians must yield to vehicles. If there is a marked crosswalk, then vehicles must yield to pedestrians.

F5 - The lack of consistent or visible signage in many locations contributes to unsafe crosswalks.

The Board of Supervisors disagrees in part with this Finding.

There is no proof that having different types of signage affects the safety of crosswalks. As long as the signage being used meets state standards, the presumption is that it provides the appropriate amount of notice/warning. The fact that signage is not visible will of course affect the safety of a crosswalk. All signage required for crosswalks should be visible as required by applicable laws and regulations.

F6 - The default timing of traffic lights is insufficient for safe crossing in crosswalks, especially for physically challenged, elderly, and very young pedestrians.

The Board of Supervisors disagrees in part with this Finding.

The Board of Supervisors agrees with and adopts the response of the MCDOT to this Finding.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

R1 – Crosswalks within any governmental jurisdiction have the same visual look; although, they may be painted in different colors to designate proximity to schools. (F1, F5, F7)

This Recommendation has been implemented. It is unclear what is actually being recommended. Is the recommendation that all Crosswalks within Mendocino County, in both incorporated and unincorporated areas, have the same visual looks? Or, is the recommendation that all Crosswalks be the same in each of the individual jurisdictions?

All jurisdictions in Mendocino County follow the guidance established in the California Vehicle Code and the California Manual Traffic Control Devices. Therefore, all of the crosswalks are marked in accordance with these guidelines

R2 – If even one crosswalk at an intersection is designated by markings, then all possible ways to cross that intersection should be painted and marked. (F7)

This Recommendation will not be implemented. The Board of Supervisors agrees with and adopts the responses to this recommendation by the MCDOT.

R3 - Crosswalks be made as visible as possible to drivers and crosswalks be marked by center line signage to indicate the presence of crosswalks as resources become available. (F2, F3, F5, F7)

This Recommendation has been or will be implemented as appropriate. Crosswalks are designed in accordance with applicable state laws and regulations. It is agreed that they should be made as visible as possible to drivers. Center line signage is used when it is deemed appropriate. However, it should be remembered that in some circumstances, they can act as obstructions in the roadway.

R4 - Center line signage installation be prioritized as follows: (F1, F2, F3, F5, F7)

- School mid-street crosswalks
- School intersection crosswalks
- Other mid-street crosswalks
- Intersections without stop signs
- Intersections with stop signs
- Light-controlled intersections

This recommendation requires further analysis. The County complies with MUTCD and the CVC regarding placement of signage for crosswalks. However, the County Board of Supervisors agrees with the MCDOT's response to the recommendation that "The order of priority for center line signage as stated is a good idea and could be used as determined based on context." This issue will be further analyzed and addressed by the MCDOT within the next six months.

R5 - Timing of traffic lights be evaluated and adjusted regularly at intersections with high pedestrian traffic by the responsible agency. (F2, F3, F6)

This recommendation requires further analysis. The Board of Supervisors agrees with this recommendation, in theory, and will evaluate to determine if such a policy is feasible. The County will endeavor to complete this evaluation within the next six months.

R6 – There is no R6.

R7 - Crosswalks be made more recognizable and visible to drivers by installing consistent signage with a distinguishable and noticeable color. (F1, F5, F7)

This Recommendation will be implemented in part and further analyzed in part. The County of Mendocino complies with the MUTCD and the CVC, both of which allow different control measures, including crosswalk signage, depending on the different factors at each site. The County will review its use of crosswalk signage and determine in what ways, if any, the visibility of crosswalks can be improved.