THOUSAND OAKS CITY COUNCIL

Supplemental Information Packet

L. Lawrence

Agenda Related Items - Meeting of June 9, 2015
Supplemental Packet Date: June 9, 2015
4:30 P.M.

Supplemental Information:

Any agenda related public documents received and distributed to a majority of the City Council after the Agenda Packet is printed are included in Supplemental Packets. Supplemental Packets are produced as needed, typically a minimum of two—one available on the Thursday preceding the City Council meeting and the second on Tuesday at the meeting. The Thursday Supplemental Packet is available for public inspection in the City Clerk Department, 2100 E. Thousand Oaks Boulevard, during normal business hours (main location pursuant to the Brown Act, G.C. 54957.5(2) Both the Thursday and Tuesday Supplemental Packets are available for public review at the City Council meeting in the City Council Chambers, 2100 E. Thousand Oaks Boulevard.

Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA):

In compliance with the ADA, if you need special assistance to participate in this meeting or other services in conjunction with this meeting, please contact the City Clerk Department at (805) 449-2151. Assisted listening devices are available at this meeting. Ask City Clerk staff if you desire to use this device. Upon request, the agenda and documents in this agenda packet, can be made available in appropriate alternative formats to persons with a disability. Notification at least 48 hours prior to the meeting or time when services are needed will assist City staff in assuring reasonable arrangements can be made to provide accessibility to the meeting or service.

Janis Daly - Fwd: June 9 Cross-Guard Agenda Topic

From: Scott Mitnick
To: Lawrence, Linda
Date: 6/9/2015 4:11 PM
Subject: Fwd: June 9 Cross-Guard Agenda Topic

2015 JUN -9 PM 4:19
CITY CLERK DEPARTMENT
CITY OF THOUSAND OAKS

>>> Joel Price 6/9/2015 2:42 PM >>>

TO COUNCIL 6-9-2015
AGENDA ITEM NO. 7.E.
MEETING DATE 6-9-2015

Joel R. Price, Mayor Pro Tem
City of Thousand Oaks
(805) 449-2105
>>> "McIntosh, Kyle" <mcintosk@amgen.com> 05/31/15 8:55 PM >>>
Hi Joel -

I am writing to express my concern regarding the proposed termination of crossing guard service at the corner of Kimber and Walter near Maple School in Newbury Park. It is my understanding that CPRD is recommending this site as the one location for termination of cross-guard service.

My son is a second grader at this school and my daughter will be in kindergarten at Maple next year. We live in the neighborhood across Kimber from the school and I drop my son off most mornings. I'd like to be able to let our children walk to school in the future, but I will not without a crossing-guard for the following reasons:

1. Cars travel at high speeds on Kimber: Cars that are coming from Reino Road accelerate up the hill on Kimber, and there is limited distance between the top of the hill and the location of the cross-walk to Maple (I read the CPRD report and I did not see any mention of the speed at which vehicles travel before the crosswalk). While the vast majority of cars know there is a school there, we all know that drivers are easily distracted these days. In talking to the crossing guard last Friday, she indicated that often times cars do not stop for her even when here "stop" sign is up and she believes this is often due to driver distraction. Fortunately, she is able to keep the children back until it is safe to cross.

2. The school pick-up and drop-off creates a chaotic driving situation in which the crossing guard helps to protect children: As I drop my child off most days and I have picked him up occasionally, I have observed the following conditions on the road:

a. Cars often have to wait to turn right or left on to Kimber from Walter on both sides of Kimber. Given the heavy traffic in both directions (including parents turning into and out of Maple) drivers have to wait long periods and often accelerate quickly when they see a gap in the traffic on Kimber. This gap is often the same one that children and the crossing guard will use to start their walks across the street.

b. There is regularly a back-up of cars on to Kimber for parents lining up to pick-up or drop-off children (last Friday, I witnessed several cars backed up onto Kimber waiting to enter the Maple lot to pick up their children)

c. During the morning pick up, I often see other pedestrians (bikers, runners and walkers) in the intersection near Maple. This adds to the number of things that drivers are required to observe.

Considering all I have set forth above, I do not believe it is a safe choice for the city to remove the crossing guard from this location. Given there is no stop sign on Kimber and no flashing lights plus lower speed limit

when children are present, I believe there is a very high risk that one or more students could be severely injured without crossing-guard protection. The estimated cost of $7200/year for this crossing guard seems to be well worth it to keep our children safe at this intersection. Frankly, it's also a major protection for our drivers as well.

Please let me know if you would like to discuss this with me. I hope to attend the meeting on June 9 to present my concerns.

Best regards
Kyle

Kyle McIntosh
Amgen Inc | One Amgen Center Drive | Thousand Oaks, CA | 91320 |
Internal Tel: + 8 447 3925 | Direct Tel: +1 805 447 3925 | Mobile: +1 805 490 8204