

From: [Sam Morrissey](#)
To: [Wainwright, Scott \(FHWA\)](#)
Cc: [Kalla, Hari \(FHWA\)](#); [Pyburn, Steve \(FHWA\)](#); john.fisher@lacity.org; [Ellen Gelbard](#)
Subject: Re: Optional Use of Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacons (IA-11) and Request for Permission to Experiment
Date: Sunday, March 06, 2011 1:42:56 PM

Mr. Wainwright,

This message confirms receipt of your additional comments, in an email dated February 24, 2011, regarding Santa Monica's request for permission to experiment Circular Rapid Flashing Beacons (CRFB). As you know, the City's request to experiment is a component of an experimentation process, consisting of a comparative analysis between Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacons and CRFB, which has been approved by the California Traffic Control Devices Committee (CTCDC).

We agree with your assessment of the experimentation process, and in order to fairly compare CRFB vs RRFB, we will evaluate the same measures of driver behavior that were collected in the RRFB experiments that led to their Interim Approval. Further, we will collect data one year after the experimental Circular RFB is installed, to ascertain whether it maintains long-term effects comparable to the published data on long-term effectiveness of RRFB.

We thank you in advance of your consideration in allowing us to implement this traffic control device to enhance pedestrian safety within the City of Santa Monica. Please call or email with any further questions.

Respectfully,

Sam Morrissey, P.E., T.E.
Principal Transportation Engineer
Planning & Community Development Department
City of Santa Monica
Tel: 310.458.8955
sam.morrissey@smgov.net

On Feb 24, 2011, at 11:41 AM, "Scott.Wainwright@dot.gov" <Scott.Wainwright@dot.gov> wrote:

Sam, thanks for submitting your request. I have done a preliminary review and have identified two issues that I'd appreciate you addressing:

1. What data will be collected for the evaluation? In order to fairly compare Circular RFB vs RRFB, I think it should be the same 6 measures of driver behavior that were collected in the RRFB experiments that led to Interim Approval for RRFB – see pages 12-13 of the report at http://mutcd.fhwa.dot.gov/resources/interim_approval/ia11/stpetersburgrpt/stpetersburgrpt.pdf.
2. Additional data collection should occur at 1 year after the experimental Circular RFB is installed, to ascertain whether it maintains long-term effects comparable to the published data on long-term effectiveness of RRFB.

Please let me know if and how you will address these issues so that I can complete my review of your request. Thanks.

Scott

W. Scott Wainwright, P.E., PTOE
Highway Engineer, MUTCD Team
Federal Highway Administration
Office of Transportation Operations, HOTO-1
1200 New Jersey Avenue, S.E., E84-477
Washington, DC 20590

phone: 202-366-0857

fax: 202-366-3225

e-mail: scott.wainwright@dot.gov

From: Sam Morrissey[SMTP:SAM.MORRISSEY@SMGOV.NET]

Sent: Tuesday, February 22, 2011 12:57:25 PM

To: MUTCDofficialrequest (FHWA)

Cc: Eileen Fogarty; john.fisher@lacity.org

Subject: Optional Use of Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacons (IA-11) and Request for Permission to Experiment

Auto forwarded by a Rule

To Whom it May Concern:

The City of Santa Monica respectfully submits the following two documents for FHWA's consideration:

- Optional Use of Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacons (IA-11)
- Request for Permission to Experiment – Circular Rapid Flashing Beacon

Thank you for your consideration.

Sam Morrissey, P.E., T.E.

Principal Transportation Engineer

Planning & Community Development Department

City of Santa Monica

Tel: 310.458.8955

sam.morrissey@smgov.net