



PRESCOTT CITY COUNCIL PUBLIC WORKSHOP AGENDA

**PRESCOTT CITY COUNCIL
PUBLIC WORKSHOP
TUESDAY, APRIL 19, 2011
3:00 PM**

**Prescott Council Chambers
201 South Cortez
Prescott, Arizona
(928) 777-1100**

The following Agenda will be considered by the Prescott City Council at its **Public Workshop** pursuant to the Prescott City Charter, Article II, Section 13. Notice of this meeting is given pursuant to Arizona Revised Statutes, Section 38-431.02.

- ◆ **CALL TO ORDER**
- ◆ **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**
- ◆ **ROLL CALL:**

MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL:

Mayor Kuykendall
Councilman Blair
Councilman Hanna
Councilman Lamerson

Councilwoman Linn
Councilwoman Lopas
Councilwoman Suttles

I. PRESENTATIONS

- A. Presentation/discussion re traffic calming proposed for the Rosser Street Improvements Phase II Project in Cliff Rose Subdivision and bid alternate for removal of traffic calming in The Meadows Subdivision.**
- B. Discussion/direction re Copper Basin stop signs.

II. ADJOURNMENT

CERTIFICATION OF POSTING OF NOTICE

The undersigned hereby certifies that a copy of the foregoing notice was duly posted at Prescott City Hall on _____ at _____ m. in accordance with the statement filed by the Prescott City Council with the City Clerk.

Elizabeth A. Burke, City Clerk

COUNCIL AGENDA MEMO – April 19, 2011
DEPARTMENT: Public Works
AGENDA ITEM: Public workshop for discussion of traffic calming proposed for the Rosser Street Improvements Phase II Project in Cliff Rose Subdivision and the bid alternate for removal of traffic calming in The Meadows Subdivision

Approved By:	Date:
Department Head: Mark Nietupski, Public Works Director	4/14/2011
Finance Director: Mark Woodfill	
City Manager: Craig McConnell <i>Craig McConnell</i>	4-14-11

Summary

This workshop is to provide an opportunity for additional discussion of traffic calming proposed for the Rosser Street Improvements Phase II Project and potential removal of existing traffic calming on Rosser Street in the vicinity of the Meadows Subdivision. Bids have been opened for this Rosser Street construction work.

A "white paper" prepared by members of the Transportation Coordinating Committee (TCC) is attached for Council's consideration which highlights the purpose of traffic calming, the current City policy, and the process used in both Rosser Street subdivisions. The timeline of Rosser Street traffic calming is also attached along with a summary sheet of public input on the subject.

Bids were recently received for the Rosser Street Improvements Phase II Project, which includes the following traffic calming options and bid alternates:

Cliff Rose Subdivision

Option 1 – Full calming, side islands and medians, no speed radar signs.

Option 2 – Partial calming, medians only, speed radar signs added.

Option 3 – No physical calming, speed radar signs added.

The Meadows Subdivision

Additive alternate – Remove the existing calming and repave entire roadway, speed radar signs added.

Council direction is sought regarding: (1) selection of Option 1, 2, or 3 for the street reconstruction project within Cliff Rose; and (2) whether existing traffic calming within the Meadows should be removed via the aforementioned street reconstruction project. With this guidance, award of said construction contract will be brought to Council at an upcoming meeting.

Agenda Item: Public workshop for discussion of traffic calming proposed for the Rosser Street Improvements Phase II Project in Cliff Rose Subdivision and the bid alternate for removal of traffic calming in The Meadows Subdivision

Attachments

TCC Whitepaper

Rosser Street timeline

Public meeting summary and opinion poll summary

Date

To: Mayor and Council
From: Transportation Coordinating Committee

RE: Traffic Calming Policy Review
Rosser Street Overview
Meadows Traffic Calming
Proposed Cliff Rose Traffic Calming

Although we have not been asked to provide any review and/or comments regarding the above subjects the Committee (TCC) has a professional obligation to not remain silent. We have therefore prepared four short “white papers” for Council consideration. The subject of preparation of these “papers” was discussed informally with the Mayor last month, and he felt it was appropriate for TCC to proceed, and submit them to Council.

The Committee reviewed, and approved the text of this submittal at their meeting on Thursday, April 7th.

Bob Meyer, P.E.
Chair, TCC

TRAFFIC CALMING POLICY REVIEW

BACKGROUND

- The City of Prescott has had a City Council Traffic Calming Policy for a number of years, and it was recently updated and approved by Council.
- *Traffic calming is the combination of mainly physical measures that reduce the negative effects of motor vehicle use, alter driver behavior and improve conditions for non-motorized street users. (Lockwood, Ian. ITE Traffic Calming Definition. Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Journal, July 1997, pg. 22)*
- Traffic calming goals include:
 - Increasing the quality of life.
 - Taking into account the preferences and requirements of the people using the residential area along the streets, or at intersections, and those residing in the area.
 - Creating safe and attractive streets.
 - Helping to reduce the negative effects of motor vehicles on the environment.
 - Promotion of pedestrian and bicycle use.
- For collector streets, (where speed humps are not permitted) the most effective method used to obtain the above goals is by use of raised islands with horizontal traffic shifts (chicanes) combined with lane narrowing. (A center island alone does not accomplish the goals).

They are installed primarily to address neighborhood perceived safety issues that result from a percentage of drivers that substantially exceed the posted speed, improve safety where sight distance is limited, and improve the quality of life for the affected residents.

TCC OPINION

- **Calming measures are not primarily designed to benefit the through motorist, however often result in improved safety.**
- **Calming features are not pretty, in general. However, this is not a valid reason for rejecting such installations.**
- **Traffic safety decisions, are not, and never should be, a popularity issue.**
- **Drivers have a responsibility to safely negotiate traffic calming locations just as they are required to do on all roadways.**

It is worth repeating that traffic safety issues should not be decided as the result of a popularity contest, personal biases, or bowing to demands of a minority of the public.

If, the majority opinion of the City Council chooses not to utilize the calming designed by qualified individuals to improve safety and to enhance the livability of residential areas impacted by through traffic volumes, then reject it. It is unfair to residents of neighborhoods directly affected who follow accepted traffic calming procedures to have their preferences ignored by a future Council.

ROSSER STREET OVERVIEW

HISTORY

The initial construction of Rosser Street ran from Willow Creek Road to Campbell. All lots in this first section faced Rosser, and had direct driveway access.

From that point Rosser improvements were constructed as plats were approved. For many years, Rosser ended just beyond the intersection with Eagle View Drive in the Meadows development. The plat approvals up to this intersection included a mixture of “side-on” lots, and direct frontage with driveway access. The street profile approved by City as Rosser approached the Laurel/Eagle Ridge intersection required the installation of a 4-way STOP intersection due to very limited sight distance to the west.

Subsequent plat approval of the Meadows development included a number of lots facing Rosser with direct driveway access. Design approval was given to curve radii that has subsequently resulted in sight distance issues for some driveways, and intersections as they attempt to enter Rosser. These traffic safety locations became even more apparent, and of concern, after Rosser was completed as a through street between Willow Creek and SR89.

Plat approvals in Cliff Rose just to the west of SR89 had a smaller number of direct access lots, but approval of street profiles, and curve radii also resulted in sight distance issues for some driveways, and intersections, east of Broadway.

Before the through street opening TCC had prepared a “white paper” in which there was a prediction that the City was going to be faced with substantial complaints about the volume of through traffic to come, and demands on the Police Department for fairly constant traffic enforcement. It was the view of TCC, based upon the professional experience of city traffic engineers on TCC, that constant traffic enforcement was not going to be available. At best, there would be enforcement time allocated depending upon limited availability of the few traffic officers, and other traffic enforcement needs throughout the City. In any event, TCC expected rather vocal demands for enforcement. And, indeed, this did happen, and continues to this day.

THROUGH STREET OPENING EFFECTS

A substantial increase in demands for traffic enforcement occurred.

At the mid-point of Rosser (between Barmar, and Cedarwood) typical 24-hour week-day traffic volumes increased from about 1,200 to 4,000, or a 325% change.

It resulted in a number of public meetings with affected residents about traffic calming design options. A Consultant was selected to develop calming options for consideration. The recent reconstruction of Rosser from Willow Creek to Campbell used a design

concept embodied in the Consultant studies. Parking (which can in itself offer some calming effect) was permitted on one side only, and sidewalks installed on the north side with a narrowing of the roadway section.

The TCC has had more agenda regarding Rosser Street items than any other subject. Considerable volunteer time was spent on the part of some TCC members meeting with the Consultant/City staff, and at public meetings.

Over 70 speed studies have been conducted, and a substantial number of traffic volume counts.

The 25MPH posted speed on Rosser has never been generally observed. Depending upon the location the 85% percentile speed (that speed at which 85% of the vehicles measured traveled at or below) ranges from 28 to 38 or 40. Highest speeds that have been observed with spot studies have included vehicles traveling at 30 to 35, 34 to 40, 40 to 45, 45 to 50, and even above 50. These observations were by use of a radar gun and measurement of 100 vehicles in each direction, or 24-hour counts using two hoses and a machine to record the speeds. On occasion, vehicles are passed on double-yellow line sections of the roadway or forced to the side of the street.

TCC OPINION

The negative public reaction from residents most directly affected by the increased volumes and speeds due to the opening of Rosser to through traffic was predicted by TCC.

In the absence of additional effective traffic calming measures we do not expect concerns of directly affected residents to decrease.

To a great extent, TCC has been the avenue for affected residents to vent their displeasure, and concerns, instead of appearing before the Council. Some of them, if they were permitted, would prefer to see speed humps along Rosser. The Calming Policy, of course, does not permit them on major collector streets.

Because of what TCC members consider to be poor land use and street design decisions, on parts of Rosser we feel that the City (i.e. Council) has a responsibility to recognize that, and provide some degree of protection for directly affected residents who simply want to see lower traffic speeds, reduced traffic noise, and improvement in their neighborhoods quality of life.

MEADOWS CALMING

BACKGROUND

After public meetings and approval of a traffic calming concept for Rosser Street, the Meadows HOA Board of Directors and impacted residents came to TCC and asked for help in dealing with traffic impacts directly affecting the safety, and livability of their neighborhood. Their appearance at TCC was a direct result of one of their residents being hit by an eastbound vehicle “cutting the curve” by hugging the curb. In effect, their appearance “gave notice” to city staff that a traffic hazard existed. They asked what options were available to them. City staff and TCC recommended that they follow the adopted Traffic Calming Policy. They did so, and the result after a two-year process involving the TCC, City staff, and area residents, was approval by the HOA of the preferred option to narrow the roadway with calming devices, and move vehicle travel paths away from the south curb line to improve safety for driveways, and the south cul-de-sac.

Council approved the plan, and construction, in the summer of 2008. Construction was completed, and has been in operation since then.

CALMING PROJECT RESULTS

The HOA, affected residents, and City staff have observed that the calming has substantially improved traffic safety, and neighborhood livability. Drivers are able to back out of driveways, and enter Rosser from the south side cul-de-sac with greatly improved sight distance, and resultant safety.

Travel speeds as measured by the 85% percentile speed (that speed at which 85% of drivers are traveling at or below) have stayed relatively the same. Spot speed studies show that the 85% speed ranges between 29 and 33 MPH depending upon the location.

Has the installation resulted in total acceptance by drivers using Rosser? Of course not, and it would be naïve to think otherwise. However, considering that approximately one million vehicles a year travel the calming location those in opposition are clearly in the minority.

One continuing rumor has to do with vehicles hitting the medians. Do they? Of course some do. Is this cause for alarm or removal of the calming? Most definitely not!! As is the case everywhere medians are used drivers have a responsibility to exercise care, and be attentive when driving in any conditions. Medians around the city do get hit sometimes by inattentive or impaired drivers. There have been two crash reports at this location, and no claims filed against the City. These crashes involved caused by a medical condition and loss of control from a DUI. If the position is that these calming devices need removal because some drivers hit them due to their poor driving skills it would be same as advocating no medians be installed anywhere. That is clearly not a reasonable traffic safety decision. Remember, traffic safety is not a popularity contest.

One very interesting result of the installation is that the need for traffic enforcement has substantially declined in the calming area. And, that is a very positive factor to be considered as this frees the Police Department to focus their enforcement efforts on those areas in the City where collisions are occurring, thereby increasing safety.

TCC OPINION

The calming devices, with perhaps some modifications, must stay in place.

After being contacted (put on notice) by the Meadows HOA in 2006, TCC, city staff, and Council acted to address unacceptable traffic safety, and neighborhood livability. That approval and installation of traffic calming provides a public record to that effect. Removal of the calming devices would effectively revert the situation to the original condition, and, in our opinion and professional traffic experience result in increased risk to the City.

In accordance with Section 6 of the Calming Policy, removal should only come about after following the requirements contained therein. The policy only permits removal after there is a petition signed by 75% of property owners within the affected geographical area. The Council would be advised of the request, and the final plan of removal, and may opt to either consider and take action on the proposed removal, or not review the request, which effectively implements the action plan.

Finally, the proposed installation of Solar Radar Speed Signs in place of the calming in TCC view does not provide the same results as traffic calming. It should be understood that these signs would not do anything to alleviate the traffic safety issues discussed above that would return with the removal.

PROPOSED CLIFF ROSE TRAFFIC CALMING

BACKGROUND

In 2002 the City staff (with Council approval) began assessing the possibility that traffic calming on Rosser from Willow Creek to SR89 could be needed after the last link of a through route between the two roads was completed. This completion of the last link occurred in January 2004.

Several public meetings with directly affected property owners were held to determine their level of concern about the increased traffic volumes. At these meetings the purpose and types of options available for traffic calming were explained. The result was that a traffic consultant was retained to design Phase I (Willow Creek to Campbell) and Phase II (Cliff Rose) improvement projects with traffic calming components included.

During the preliminary calming design considerations additional public meetings were held. The TCC was also directly involved at this point with the traffic consultant due to several of the member's extensive experience in the use of traffic calming. Following a number of public meetings with the public, and Cliff Rose HOA, the consultant began the Phase II design using the option approved by directly affected residents and the HOA Board for Cliff Rose. Due to the level of explanation of the pros and cons of several calming options available from the calming toolbox the HOA Board, and residents, were able to concur that the chicane option best met the desired goals of lowering high speed levels, established a message to drivers entering the area that they had to recognize the fact they were in a residential area, and all without materially affecting the travel time through for drivers.

The selected calming design option was shared with Council, and with their approval the consultant proceeded to design the final plans for the Cliff Rose project with the calming chicane option included.

TCC OPINION

It is unfortunate that there appears to be a misunderstanding of the purpose, and benefits of traffic calming, or a simple disregard for all of the work, and public participation, which resulted in the selection of the preferred calming design incorporated into the final design plans. The unofficial manner in which that decision was made has been largely ignored, and publicly discarded. This has not set well with those directly affected on Rosser.

Following a meeting with some Cliff Rose HOA Board members (in a session without a quorum of the board) and select Council members in late 2010, staff was directed to include three options for bid. An option with the full calming complement, a limited

calming installation with center medians only, and one with no physical traffic calming measures.

As to the bid alternative with medians only there is emphatically no particular benefit toward traffic calming. The use of medians does not have any appreciable effect on the higher speeds. Looking at some of the spot speed study data it is not unusual to see 15 to 20% of the vehicles traveling at 35 MPH, or above, and top speeds sometimes ranging between 40 and 50, or over. Medians will not materially affect this pattern. And, by the way, the pattern clearly shows a total lack of respect for the neighborhood they are driving through on the part of some drivers.

The proposed use of Solar Radar Speed Signs (as discussed in the Meadows white paper text) will not provide any improved traffic safety overall, for this application at this particular location. Their use would be what we professional traffic engineers call "feel good signing". It might make some policy makers feel that their use supports their position against the use of calming. But, it does nothing for the neighborhood. Also, the high cost of these signs, and maintenance cost issues do not support their use.

For greatly improved traffic safety, improved quality of life for the directly affected residents, and a substantial reduction in the need for traffic enforcement by the Police Department the original design decision should be approved by Council.

Public Meeting and Opinion Poll Summary

The details below document the opinion polls collected following the Rosser Street public meetings held on Dec. 1st, 2010 and March 3rd, 2011. Of the total 110 opinion polls submitted, 84 were counted and 26 were disregarded as no name or address was provided. Of the 84 polls counted 75 properties were represented, with 96 total citizens voting. Overall option one (full traffic calming) was preferred in the Cliff Rose subdivision receiving 33 votes representing 45%. In The Meadows subdivision retention of the traffic calming was preferred receiving 41 votes representing 43%.

Cliff Rose Traffic Calming

	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Abstained	None on all
Cliff Rose resident - direct fronting	3	1	3		
Cliff Rose resident - non direct fronting	19	12	11	11	2
Non local resident	1	1	3	1	3
The Meadows resident - direct fronting	6	0		3	
The Meadows resident - non direct fronting	4	5	5	2	
Total Cliff Rose:	33	19	22	17	5
% of those voting for an option:	45%	25%	30%		

The Meadows Traffic Calming

	Retain Calming	Remove Calming	Abstained
Cliff Rose resident - direct fronting	4	3	
Cliff Rose resident - non direct fronting	19	22	17
Non local resident	1	6	2
The Meadows resident - direct fronting	9		
The Meadows resident - non direct fronting	8	5	
Total The Meadows:	41	36	19
% of those voting for or against removal:	43%	37%	20%

Properties represented 75
 Total votes by citizen 96
 Opinion Polls submitted 84
 Opinion Polls disregarded 26
 Total Opinion Polls submitted 110

ROSSER STREET TIMELINE

Cliff Rose Traffic Calming

OCT 3, 2002 – TCC discusses the process staff will take to accept proposals for selecting traffic calming study consultants following the through connection of Rosser Street.

NOV 6th, 2003 – The public works Director (Craig McConnell) provides an update to TCC on the planned public meeting in December. Every property owner along Rosser Street from WCR to SR89 will be notified.

DEC 3rd, 2003 – A public meeting on traffic calming along the entire length of Rosser Street was held with 60 people in attendance to give their input on traffic calming.

DEC 4th, 2003 – TCC discusses the public meeting results.

JAN 2004 - Rosser Street opened to through traffic.

APRIL, 2004 - Phase I traffic calming public meeting held at Taylor Hicks Elementary School to gather public input.

JUN 3rd, 2004 – Residents who live along Rosser Street appear before TCC to request physical measures to reduce speeding in the Cliff Rose subdivision.

JUL 1st, 2004 – TCC votes to eliminate all 30 MPH postings on Rosser Street and make it 25MPH throughout.

APRIL, 2005 – Ollsen & Associates (O&A) hired to design traffic calming from SR89 to WCR. Phase I improvement (½ mile) from WCR to Campbell, and Phase II improvement project (½ mile) from SR89 to Tatum.

MARCH 2006 – O&A hired to design the Rosser Street Improvement Phase II project.

JULY 2007 – Construction begins on the Rosser Street Phase I improvements which include roadway narrowing and parking on one side.

JAN 16th 2008 – Cliff Rose HOA meeting with O&A and staff to discuss the 30% plans with traffic calming concepts. HOA agreed to move forward with three traffic calming options for further refinement.

FEB 20th, 2008 – Cliff Rose HOA meeting with O&A evaluation matrix to continue discussion of the traffic calming concept refinement.

MARCH 2008 – Evaluation Matrix provided to City staff for review

APRIL 28th, 2008 – Rosser Street Traffic Calming Public Meeting. Soliciting input from homeowners immediately adjacent to Rosser Street about the three calming options.

MAY 2008 – Based on TCC and public input, staff recommends traffic calming option 3.

MAY 27th, 2008 - Rosser Street traffic calming public meeting held to present the preferred calming option to the public and homeowners immediately adjacent to Rosser Street.

JUNE 2008 – O&A moves forward with traffic calming option 3 as the final design.

NOVEMBER 2008 – Following a meeting with select City Council members and some (less than a quorum) Cliff Rose HOA Board members; staff was directed to change the final design to include three traffic calming options for bid.

DEC 1st 2010 – Public meeting held to discuss options for traffic calming in the Cliff Rose subdivision. Following the meeting staff is directed to change the final design to include a bid alternate for removal of the existing calming in The Meadows subdivision.

MAR 3rd 2011 – Public meeting held to notify Cliff Rose and The Meadows subdivision residents of the upcoming Rosser Street project and the plan to bid the project with traffic calming options and a bid alternate.

The Meadows Traffic Calming

- Requested by The Meadows Subdivision with Bob Gelinas serving as the neighborhood contact.
- Council adopted Policy was followed.
- TCC endorsed and approved the plan and forwarded to Council for approval.

SEPTEMBER 2006 – Bob Gelinas contacts staff and the TCC, 1.5 year process begins.

AUG 2nd, 2007 – The Meadows traffic calming discussed at TCC.

FEB 26th, 2008 - Council Briefing and presentation by staff to inform Council of the process and plan to move forward with the Traffic Calming request in The Meadows Subdivision.

MAR 31st, 2008 – The Meadows traffic calming public meeting held to discuss the proposed plan.

AUG 26th, 2008 - Council approves and awards the construction of the calming in The Meadows Subdivision. (\$73,235.15 approved to Core 5 Construction.)

SEPTEMBER 2008 – Construction begins on the traffic calming in The Meadows Subdivision.

JAN 4th 2011 – At a Council work session Councilman Blair and Hanna requested staff add a bid alternate for removal of the calming in The Meadows.