

TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING

DRAFT

HELD ON June 21, 2016

TAB Members Present

Bruce Hallsted, Chairperson
Kay Henry
Ron Wilson
Ian Murray
Louis Stephen
David Camp
Vern Mathern
Mike Schmidt

TAB Members Absent

Troy Peterson, Vice Chairperson
Jennifer Love
Michael Book

Others Present

Sabine Ellis
Erik Guderian
Renate Ehm
Jim Hash
Mark Venti
Commander Mike Beaton
Ivonne Machuca

Chairperson Hallsted called the June 21, 2016 Transportation Advisory Board meeting to order at 5:30 pm.

Item 1. Approval of the minutes of the Transportation Advisory Board meeting held on May 17, 2016

Board Member Mike Schmidt motioned to approve the minutes as written. Board Member Louis Stephen seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

Items 2 & 3. Acknowledge outgoing Board Member Bruce Hallsted & Annual election of Chairperson and Vice Chairperson

Chairperson Hallsted grouped items 2 & 3 together. He stated that he has been on the Board for six years and is not eligible to serve another term at this time.

Chairperson Hallsted asked if there are any members who want to serve as Chairperson of the Transportation Advisory Board (TAB) – none answered. Board Member Henry nominated Vice Chairperson Peterson to serve as Chairperson based off of past performance and that he is the most senior of the board members. The nomination for Troy Peterson to serve as Chairperson was accepted with no objections and the motion passed unanimously.

Chairperson Hallsted asked for nominations to serve as Vice Chairperson. Board Member Henry agreed to serve as Vice Chairperson and the motion passed unanimously.

Item 4. Items from citizens present

None.

Item 5. Hear a presentation and discuss Mesa's Speed Hump Policy

Sabine Ellis, City Traffic Engineer, discussed the current speed hump policy, history, why it was enacted, current day practices, and how it relates to the suggestions that were made at the June 21, 2016 TAB meeting.

The first item discussed was the definition of affected property owners. When the policy was first enacted in 1997, only the residents that lived on the affected street were surveyed. If at least 70% of those residents were in favor of speed humps, then the speed humps were installed. In the year 2000 a request was received to include more properties in the survey because more residents than those living on the street were affected. The City considered "what makes sense" without making what was considered to be the affected area too large. Too large of an area to be surveyed would make the survey process onerous and be unlikely to attain the minimum 70% approval rating. There are those people affected by the speeding and those people that may be affected by the noise generated once the speed hump is installed. A look at what other municipalities are doing and the commonalities demonstrated that three dwelling units along a side street were included. With a typical property size of 100 feet, the thought was to include three dwelling units and 300 feet on the side street because those are the properties that are affected by the sound. That is how the policy included the residences that abut the street as well as three properties or a minimum of 300 feet on each side of any connecting street in the initial neighborhood survey. Every effort has been made to ensure consistency on the application of who is surveyed throughout neighborhoods. However, there are instances that do not lend themselves for easy application so additional rules have been included. Before anyone is surveyed, the Fire Department is consulted because they determine response times and their fire routes. Today's practice includes residents that live on the street and residents within 300 feet on a side street with a few minor additions.

The second item discussed was, "How do we go about the survey process?" Once a street has been determined to be eligible for speed humps, the neighborhood survey is done by a neighborhood liaison who is someone that lives on the street that is affected. The liaison makes contact with their neighbors and collects their opinions on the survey form. An alternative option would be to send a mailer/postcard and determination would be made based on responses. But little to no response has been received with the mailer option. Past responses have been about 10%. There is little doubt that 70% would be difficult and staff may have to go door to door or make phone calls and resources are limited to achieve this. Also, persons do not tend to be home during the day and neighborhood engagement is critical part of this process.

The third item discussed was the cost sharing for speed humps that are on low volume streets which relates to less than 500 vehicles a day. In 1997 when the speed hump policy was first enacted the figure of \$500 was charged which made up 50% of the construction costs for one speed hump. This figure has remained at \$500 per hump ever since. Since the inception of the program, seven neighborhoods have contributed \$500 per speed hump to have them installed on a street with less than 500 vehicles per day. The program does not benefit from the cost sharing method but allows low volume streets that have a speeding problem, to participate in the program.

The last item discussed was how the speed counts are handled that are taken on a street. The policy is to collect vehicle speeds for 48 consecutive hours on a Tuesday and Wednesday or Wednesday and Thursday because typically those are the days that streets see the most traffic. The traffic volume and traffic speed is looked at on a daily basis. It is not uncommon to see fluctuations in the 85th percentile speed on any given day on low volume streets. The practice has been if a street meets the speed criteria on one day but not the other, the speed criteria is considered to be met and the process moves forward.

Ms. Ellis opened up the discussion.

Erik Guderian, Deputy Director of the Transportation Department, added that the purpose of today's discussion is to address the comments made by Mr. Condit last month, provide information to the Board, and receive direction from the Board on whether anything needs to be addressed on the Speed Hump Policy.

Board Member Camp asked what percentage passes the speed count criteria.

Ms. Ellis was not sure and asked if staff present had an answer, but none were given.

Board Member Stephen asked why all speed humps don't include a break in them for fire trucks.

Ms. Ellis said that speed humps with breaks are called speed cushions, and that speed cushions have a lesser impact on speeds than speed humps. Certain streets are eligible for speed humps while others are only eligible for speed cushions; however, ultimately the Fire Department makes the final determination on the kind of speed hump that can be installed.

Chairperson Hallsted reiterated that it appears the process is the same whether it is a speed hump or speed cushion and that Mesa Fire determines what kind to use.

Ms. Ellis informed the Board that cushions are installed on higher volume collector-type streets but residential streets generally get speed humps.

Board Member Stephen wanted to know who determines how many speed humps go in the road and the spacing involved.

Ms. Ellis explained that the spacing is typically 500 ft. and staff determines where they will be installed. The general speed reduction in traffic is approximately six mph overall.

Board Member Henry sought confirmation that it is up to the neighborhood to approach the City with their concerns for speeding – the City does not approach the neighborhood

Ms. Ellis confirmed that was true.

Board Member Wilson wanted clarification on the speed counts whether the collection occurs in one to two days.

Ms. Ellis clarified that the timeframe for data collection is 48 hours.

Board Member Stephen asked if there was a waiting period after the survey was complete. Do the citizens have the ability to state their case against the decision to move forward or if once the TAB makes the decision, is it rendered final.

Mr. Guderian explained the time line on how things happen with the speed cushion process.

1. Request is received
2. Residents are given information about speed mitigation programs, including the Speed Hump program.
3. The neighborhood funds the traffic study which takes about 1 month.
4. There is a 1 – 2 week review period of the data.
5. The neighborhood liaison is contacted and provided the traffic study findings. Assuming the speed criteria is met, the neighborhood liaison is provided the neighborhood survey form. Assuming that at least 70% of the surveyed property owners support the installation of speed cushions, a public comment period is initiated by staff.
6. There is a 2 week open comment period.
7. TAB presentation.

Board Member Stephen wanted to know if the Transportation Department takes it upon themselves to install speed humps.

Ms. Ellis answered no - Transportation does not initiate the installation of speed humps.

Mr. Guderian stated that the installation of speed humps and cushions tend to be the most cost effective option for traffic calming.

Chairperson Hallsted invited Mr. Condit for his comments.

Mr. Condit introduced himself and gave his address. Mr. Condit provided feedback on the Speed Hump Policy and proposed new processes to the Board that involved sending mailers as opposed to performing surveys.

Board Member Ian Murray spoke in support of continuing the current survey process.

Board Member Stephen stated that neighborhoods should have two options; survey or letter or the possibility of both for more money. The letter should go out and residents afforded enough time to respond.

Mr. Condit respectfully disagreed and noted that the voting process should be confidential and unbiased.

Mr. Condit noted that nobody has said that a speed hump is a safety device.

Mr. Guderian explained that the types of roadways that are being discussed are neighborhood roadways. He went on to state that speed humps reduce the severity of crashes because of the reduced speeds. He said the tipping point for fatalities is 30 mph.

Board Member Wilson spoke about a City of Portland study that showed a 39% decrease in crashes and a 46% decrease in fatalities due to speed humps.

Mr. Condit requested a copy of the study and asked that if his proposals were rejected then he would like to request an exception to his neighborhood and wants a full survey completed by his definition of the affected area of Lazona Drive that would propose the removal of the existing speed humps on Lazona Drive. Mr. Condit noted that if the survey was successful, the City would save \$15,000 by not having to reinstall the speed humps when the road was overlain with new asphalt at some time in the future.

Board Member Stephen wanted the survey to include not only those who travel in a vehicle but all persons who use the street like mothers with a carriage, children on bikes, and persons with a handicap.

Chairperson Hallsted went over the definition of "affected property owners" in the Policy, and noted that the last change in the definition occurred in 2013. He said that the current definition is functioning well. Chairperson Hallsted also indicated that speeding is a neighborhood issue and that neighbors should discuss the issue with each other. He thinks it is great that it is a neighborhood issue. With respect to Mr. Condit's request for a different process for his neighborhood only, Mr. Hallsted said that if the neighborhood survey shows that the speed humps on Lazona Drive are no longer wanted, then the City pays for the humps to be taken out.

Board Member Camp indicated we have a tried and true speed hump policy and it should stay in place with no changes.

Chairperson Hallsted motioned to keep the current speed hump policy in effect and the

motion passed unanimously.

Item 6. Hear a presentation and discuss Mesa's Bicycle and Pedestrian Program accomplishments in 2015.

Jim Hash, Senior Planner, provided an overview of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Program – 2015 Annual Report.

Mr. Hash stated that the annual report will be moved to a fiscal year report from a calendar year report therefore next year's report will be an 18-month report.

Board Member Stephen brought up the concern that pedestrians have to go around the bus to enter or exit the bike pathways. He asked how this could be taken care of and who could look into this?

Mr. Hash stated it will be looked into.

Board Member Camp wanted to know if there is a mechanism to determine the number of cyclists in Mesa.

Mr. Hash said he did not have the data.

Board Member Camp stated there have been three cyclists killed in Mesa where vehicles were making right hand turns and there are instances where cars and bikes are trying to change lanes. He asked about what information is available to solve these issues.

Mark Venti, Sr. Transportation Engineer, indicated that he was aware of the recent deaths and that there are ways to mitigate the issues through Police enforcement and education of the public. Mr. Venti indicated that he has been directed to make this a priority and noted that the Transportation Department is in the process of hiring a Public Information Officer who will work on marketing and media materials focusing on accidents and fatalities. The Department recognizes there are conflicts in mixing zones and that there may be a green lane pilot of those areas with high conflict.

Item 7. Speed Limit Increase from 35 mph to 45 mph on Sossaman Road from Pecos Road to a point 2,800 feet north of Pecos Road (Council District 6).

Dave Barrier, Traffic Studies Analyst, indicated that a recent speed study on Sossaman Road north of Pecos Road showed that the 85th percentile speed is 49.3 mph, well over the posted speed limit of 35 mph. The study area is Sossaman Road from Pecos Road to a point 2,800 feet north of Pecos Road. There is one traffic lane and bike lanes in each direction, and the adjacent land use is agricultural. North of the study area, Sossaman Road widens to provide two traffic lanes and bike lanes in each direction.

The current speed limit is 35 mph from Ray Road to Pecos Road. South of Pecos Road the speed limit is 45 mph. In an effort to increase driver compliance it is recommended to increase the speed limit to 45 mph in the study area, but that the speed limit in the airport area will remain at 35 mph.

Board Member Mathern moved to accept the recommendation.

Chairperson Hallsted seconded the motion and the recommendation was accepted without objection.

Meeting adjourned at 7:15 pm.