



**DRAFT**

**Transportation Advisory Committee Minutes**

Thursday, April 7, 2011

6:30 – 8:30 p.m.

San Tan Room – Development Services Building

**Committee Members:**

Ryan Nichols – Chair	Present
David Brandhorst – Vice Chair	Absent
Robin Benning – Council Member	Absent
Chris Clark	Present
Gregory Arrington	Present
Kim Mlazgar	Present
Nichelle Williams	Present
Patricia Conrad	Present
Richard Turman	Present

**Public:**

Seth Mlazgar	Present
--------------	---------

**Town Staff Members:**

Bill Birdwell, Traffic Analyst	Present
Laura Catanese, Sr. Administrative Assistant	Present
Tom Condit, Development Services Director	Absent
Troy White, Public Works Division Manager	Present

**1. Call to Order:**

Committee Chairman, Ryan Nichols, called the meeting to order at 6:34 p.m.

**2. Introductions:**

Self introductions were made around the table.

**3. Public Comment:**

Seth Mlazgar; Kim Mlazgar son, attended the meeting in order to fulfill requirements to earn his merit badge in citizenship.

**4. Items for Discussion and possible action**

**Item A: Consideration and possible approval of February 3, 2011 minutes**

Greg Arrington made the first motion to approve the February 3, 2011 meeting minutes. Nichelle Williams made the second motion to approve the minutes. Motion was carried **UNANIMOSLY**.

**Item B: Discussion on changes to the Town's adopted Traffic Calming Policy     Bill Birdwell**

Staff has already provided the current Town Traffic Calming Policy and the neighboring community's traffic calming policies (City of Chandler, Town of Gilbert, & City of Mesa). Tonight staff will present part three of the traffic calming series by discussing possible changes to the existing Town Traffic Calming Policy based on Transportation Advisory Committee input. Based on the comments and recommendations expressed by the committee tonight, staff will draft a new Town Traffic Calming Policy and bring it to the next meeting for discussion and possible approval..

Bill Birdwell gave the following presentation to the committee and emphasized that the recommended **Neighborhood Traffic Mitigation Program** was built around the premise that the Town and its' residents would work together to reach satisfactory solutions to traffic calming issues. Heavy emphasis on the "three E's" (**Education, Enforcement, and Engineering**) to improve neighborhood quality of life and driver compliance with traffic laws. The Town hopes to educate the public through implementation of the Neighborhood Speed Awareness Program (NSAP), which includes speed awareness device installation, speed awareness signing throughout the neighborhood, and flyers or other communication with area residents. Enforcement will be accomplished through targeted MCSO patrol/radar enforcement. Any approved and installed traffic calming device must meet all engineering requirements, which are covered under "Minimum Criteria" below. Final decisions regarding the design, type, and location of any traffic calming devices will be at the discretion of the Town Traffic Engineer.

**Neighborhood Traffic Mitigation (NTM) Program Highlights:**

**PROCESS:**

- Town will provide the NTM application form to resident.
- Resident(s) must complete the form to initiate a traffic calming study (10 signatures are required).
- Town staff will conduct a site visit and identify problem area(s).
- Town staff will evaluate the problem and try to offer solutions that do not require a speed hump.
- Town staff will determine where devices should be placed and the limits of the petition area.
- Resident(s) that initiates the traffic complaint is the point of contact and is responsible for petition completion (getting all signatures required).
- Town and neighborhood contact coordinate arrangements for a public meeting with affected residents.

**MINIMUM CRITERIA:**

- Posted speed limit of 25 m.p.h. or less.
- 85<sup>th</sup> speed is greater than 8 m.p.h. over the posted speed with traffic volumes between 500 and 5,000 vehicles.
- Street must have rolled or vertical curb for at least 50' on each approach.
- Devices shall not be located within 200' of a stop sign/traffic signal or on unloaded collector or higher level street; nor on unpaved streets.
- Drainage shall not be compromised due to the installation of the devices.
- Approval from the Fire Department and the Maricopa County Sheriff's Office will be necessary to proceed with any installation.
- Petition with 100% resident approval of those within 500' and 75% resident approval within designated boundary area of proposed speed hump installation. Each household gets 1 vote (if a couple is not in agreement, they can split their vote and be recorded as .50 each (.50 + .50 = 1 vote).

## **COSTS:**

- All costs associated with the design and installation (materials and labor if contracted to an outside vendor) will be the responsibility of the residents and or HOA.
- Residents/HOA responsible for \$500.00 traffic calming study (funds can be applied to any future speed hump installation).
- Staff will provide residents with cost estimate for approved calming measures.
- Resident(s) may collect monies in any manner it deems equitable.
- Town responsible for perpetual maintenance of device.

## **DISCUSSION:**

For the most part, committee members agreed with the proposed policy. The committee expressed the following concerns/recommendations:

1. Committee members thought the 100% resident approval of those within 100' of the traffic calming device would be hard to obtained and questioned if staff would be verifying the signatures on the petition matched the actual home owner of record (renters are not allowed to vote/sign petition).
2. How will staff determine that "a good effort" was made to reach the actual home owner? Should the petition only include home owners that are *actively living* at the residence affected by the device?
3. Is it better to require that a certain percentage (55 %?) of those signing the petition (home owners actively living in the home) be in favor of the device?
4. How do you keep the person responsible for acquiring petition signatures from only seeking home owners he/she know to be in favor of installing the device? Town staff will provide the primary contact with the necessary addresses to include on the petition.
5. More effort should be made to include HOA participation in the NTM program.
6. Has the Town considered taking the lead on getting the necessary signatures required? The Town could then be reimbursed the cost/time by the resident(s)/and or HOA, or charge the fee up front before beginning the petition drive.
7. Traffic calming devices installed because of improperly designed subdivisions should not be at the full expense of the resident(s)/HOA. Once Town staff evaluates the area, and if data collected overwhelmingly points to an engineering design flaw, then the Town should share (cost) responsibility for installation of any traffic calming device (sliding scale).

Final comments concerned traffic issues that may be the result of improperly designed subdivisions and are included under Item C.

### **Item C: Discussion on traffic calming design considerations for new subdivisions     **Troy White****

Can a more active role be undertaken during the review process so that potential speed issues do not arise at a later stage of development? Or, can the committee draft road design standards that would deter speeding that planners could use when reviewing a set of plans? Spotting a potential speed issue is difficult at best when reviewing a two dimensional set of plans. If plans are within guidelines then they must be approved. Can the Town encourage developers to use methods such as gently curving roads throughout subdivisions so as prevent a speed issue from ever occurring? Not allow any construction of "left turns to nowhere"?

Director Condit should bring up this item with his planning staff for their opinions on how best to deter speeding issues during the design phase.

**Item D: Information on FY2011-2012 CIP budget and project updates** **Troy White**

Troy White provided an update on the following current and possible projects:

Ellsworth Road Construction-Town Center  
Sonoqui Wash Phase II  
Riggs Road Bridge over the Sonoqui Wash  
Rancho Jardines Drainage  
Horseshoe Park Equestrian Centre Overflow Parking Lot  
Riggs Environmental  
Cloud and Sossaman Drainage  
Ocotillo Sidewalk  
Rittenhouse and 198<sup>th</sup> Street Left Turn Lane  
Villages at Queen Creek Traffic Circle  
Queen creek Wash Trail Projects  
Traffic Signal Chandler Heights and Sossaman  
Traffic Signal Rittenhouse and Village Loop South  
Traffic Signal 188<sup>th</sup> Street and Germann Road  
Park and Ride Lot

**Item F: Request for future agenda items** **Chair Nichols**

Carry over "Update on ITS (Intelligent Transportation System) projects as Bill Birdwell had to leave the meeting early to respond to a traffic emergency.

**5. Announcements**

Chair Nichols informed the committee about SB1525 that is in the House of Representative for vote. SB1525 was introduced by the Home Builders Association of Central Arizona as tool to help bolster the flagging construction industry by abolishing the development impact fees developers pay to local municipalities. Should the House pass SB 1525, the Town would have no recourse but to put the burden on residents by raising taxes. Chair Nichols encouraged committee members to email their representatives and let them know SB1525 would have a negative impact on the Town.

**6. Adjournment**

The committee adjourned at 8:15 p.m.