

COUNCIL DECISION REQUEST

SUBJECT: Speed Humps

MEETING DATE: 1-4-07

CSP ITEM: Yes No KRA#

ITEM NO.: I.2

TENTATIVE SCHEDULE: N/A

SUBMITTED BY: LaRon G. Garrett 

AMOUNT BUDGETED: \$ 0

SUBMITTAL TO AGENDA
APPROVED BY TOWN MANAGER

EXPENDITURE REQUIRED: \$ 0

CONT. FUNDING REQUIRED: \$ 0



EXHIBITS (If Applicable, To Be Attached): Speed Hump Policy, STAC Minutes

RECOMMENDED MOTION

I move to approve the Town of Payson Speed Hump Policy and direct staff to implement said policy.

SUMMARY OF THE BASIS FOR RECOMMENDED MOTION:

In May, 2006 staff asked for Council direction on the preparation of a Speed Hump Policy. The Council direction at that time was to expand the proposed Speed Hump Policy into a complete Town Traffic Calming Policy. Traffic calming includes a myriad of items beyond speed humps such as street widths, signage, landscaping, traffic islands, chicanes, speed limits, curb return radii, intersection geometry, on-street parking, legal enforcement, etc. Some of these items are fairly easy to deal with and some are very complex. Currently the street widths are based on the subdivision code. The subdivision code is in the revision process. Those revisions should be complete and adopted shortly. At that time the street width section of the Traffic Calming Policy can be completed. We are also waiting for word back on the Police Dept. receiving funding for a photo radar unit. The photo radar is part of the legal enforcement section of the Traffic Calming Policy.

In October, 2006 staff received a request to accelerate the Speed Hump section of the Traffic Calming Policy. That way we can begin evaluating and possibly using speed humps prior to the completion of the overall policy. Council discussed the proposed policy at the October 19, 2006 meeting. At that time Council directed the staff to have the Surface Transportation Advisory Committee (STAC) review the proposed policy and bring their recommendations to the Council at this meeting.

The STAC reviewed the proposed policy at their December 6, 2006 meeting. They recommended approval of the policy as now presented to the Council. A copy of the minutes from that meeting is attached. Therefore, attached for your review and approval is the proposed Town of Payson Speed Hump Policy.

Speed humps have been used in several other municipalities to successfully control excessive vehicle speeds. However, they are not without their issues. The proposed policy addresses the issues involved with installing speed humps and provides a process for the general public to request an installation.

Originally speed humps were constructed out of asphalt and made a part of the roadway pavement. This type of speed hump extends completely across the road and costs approximately \$4,000 to construct. The ones in Rumsey Park are this type of speed hump. (The speed humps in Rumsey Park are designed for 15MPH.)

JAN 04 2007 I.2

COUNCIL DECISION REQUEST

There are other types of speed humps now available. They are normally made of rubber (recycled tires) and are anchored to the asphalt. Some of the rubber speed humps extend across the entire roadway and some only cover a portion of the roadway. On October 4th a representative from Centerline Supply West that sells the rubber type speed humps brought one to Payson for a demonstration. We placed it in the Town Hall parking lot and had various drivers go over the speed hump and give us their opinion. One of the drivers to test out the speed hump was Councilman Vogel. The speed humps made it uncomfortable to travel at speeds over 25 MPH. The speed humps that only cover a portion of the roadway are designed to affect normal residential traffic but have less affect on larger vehicles such as fire trucks. These rubber speed humps are the style the Town of Gilbert is installing. If this policy is approved, it is staff's recommendation to use the rubber style speed humps. The cost of the recycled rubber speed humps is comparable to one constructed of asphalt.

PROS: Having a policy in place will allow the Town staff to administer the installation of speed humps in a fair, logical and uniform manner as they are requested, and may assist in maintaining slower vehicle speeds in residential areas.

CONS: Installation of speed humps can reduce response times for emergency service vehicles. Speed Humps can also increase neighborhood noise. Also, they encourage drivers to use alternate routes which may create additional problems.

PUBLIC INPUT (if any): N/A

BOARD/COMMITTEE/COMMISSION ACTIONS/RECOMMENDATIONS (if any) (give dates and attach minutes): The Surface Transportation Advisory Committee discussed the Speed Hump issue at their November and December meetings. Between the two meetings members of the STAC visited other communities to determine how effective their speed hump policies were. The STAC approved a motion 6-0 at their December to recommend to the Town Council approval of the proposed Speed Hump Policy as submitted.

TOWN OF PAYSON
SPEED HUMP POLICY

1.0 General Policy Statement

This speed hump policy identifies criteria to be used in determining when installation of a speed hump is warranted. This policy also outlines the mandatory neighborhood support needed for approving installation and cost responsibilities associated with speed humps.

2.0 Engineering Study

An engineering study shall be conducted prior to installation of speed humps to document safety or traffic concerns and to determine if installation of speed humps is in conformance with this policy.

3.0 Speed Hump Warranting Criteria

At least 2 speed humps should be installed in any location with a spacing between the speed humps of 450 to 550 feet. Installation of speed humps may be considered for a location that meet all of the following criteria:

1. The location is on a paved local residential street.
2. The speed limit at the requested location is 30 mph or lower.
3. The 85th percentile speed of the traffic is 4 mph or more above the posted speed limit.
4. There is a vertical curb or other man-made barriers to prohibit traffic from driving off the roadway to avoid the speed hump.
5. The longitudinal slope of the street is 5% or less.
6. There are at least 6 residences within 660 feet along the street.
7. There is at least 660 linear feet of street available in which to construct the speed humps.
8. The paved surface of the roadway (face of curb to face of curb) is less than 40 feet.

3.1 Speed Hump Prohibitions

Speed Humps are prohibited in the following locations:

1. On streets designated as Arterial Routes or Collector Routes.
2. On streets regularly used by busses or emergency vehicles.

3. Within 200 feet of a controlled intersection.
4. Within 200 feet of a sharp curve or on longitudinal grades greater than 5%.
5. On dirt or chip sealed streets.
6. On inverted crown streets.
7. Within 500 feet of another speed hump
8. Over water valve boxes, man holes, other utility access points.

4.0 Speed Hump Process

If residents are interested in having a speed hump installed in their neighborhood, they should complete the following steps:

1. A neighborhood representative contacts the Town of Payson Engineering Department to formally request a speed bump in their area. A written request form is available from the Town.
2. Town staff will review the request form and determine if the location requested meets the requirements of Section 3 of this policy. If the Town does not have a speed survey completed in the vicinity of the requested speed hump within the last 90 days, staff will perform a speed survey at the requested location to determine if Paragraph 3.0.3 is complied with.
3. If all criteria for a speed hump is met, Staff will meet with the neighborhood representative(s) to determine the exact location of the speed humps and to determine the area affected by the speed humps.
4. After determining the affected area, staff will prepare a petition to be circulated to determine the amount of neighborhood support for the speed humps. Staff shall also prepare a drawing that shows the proposed location of the speed humps to accompany the petition.
5. After obtaining appropriate signatures from the neighbors in accordance with Section 5 and paying the appropriate fees in accordance with Section 6, the Town will proceed with installation of the speed humps.

5.0 Neighborhood Support

Once a location has passed the warranting criteria and favorable conditions exist, the installation must then follow a neighborhood acceptance procedure. This is to assure that a majority of the property owners affected by the speed humps will support the installation.

1. The neighborhood representative(s) will contact other members of the neighborhood to determine acceptance of the speed humps.
2. The representative(s) circulating the petitions must be property owners of the affected area as determined in Section 4.0.4.
3. At least 70% of the property owners in the affected area must demonstrate approval of the speed humps. Property owners who do not respond or who respond with "No Opinion" are considered opposed to the installation of the speed humps.
4. All property owners within 100 feet of any proposed speed hump must approve the installation.
5. The representative(s) have 6 months to obtain the signatures on the petitions from the affected property owners. Any petitions submitted to the Town after the 6 month deadline will be rejected.
6. If, during the petitioning, residents wish to change the location of one or more speed humps, or add speed humps to the proposal, they must notify Town staff. Staff will prepare new petitions showing the new proposal, and residents must discard all previous petitions, signed or unsigned.
7. The Town cannot proceed with the installation of the speed humps without the neighborhood support as described above.

6.0 Speed Hump Costs

The cost of installing the speed humps will be paid by the property owners in the affected area (See Section 4.0.3), or it may be a cost share between the Town of Payson and the affected property owners. The determination of the portion of the cost each shall pay is as follows:

MPH the 85 th Percentile Speed is over the Speed Limit	Percent of Speed Hump Cost Paid by the Affected Property Owners	Percent of Speed Hump Cost Paid by the Town of Payson
4-6	100%	0
6.1-12	67%	33%
12.1-18	50%	50%
Over 18	0%	100%

The cost of the speed hump shall be the actual amount the Town pays for the construction. The current estimated cost is \$3,500 to \$4,500 per speed hump.

1. It is the responsibility of the property owners in the affected area to determine the actual cost to each individual property owner.
2. The Town cannot proceed with the installation of the speed humps without prior payment of the property owners share of the cost.

7.0 Removal of Speed Humps

No speed hump will be removed for at least one year after installation. If the neighborhood desires removal after that time, they may request a petition for removal from the Town. The Town of Payson will remove speed humps based on the following criteria:

1. The speed humps have been in place at least one year.
2. All affected properties, which were previously identified in the installation process, shall be involved in removal process.
3. A simple majority of the affected property owners must request removal. Property owners who do not respond or who respond with "No Opinion" are considered opposed to the removal.
4. The neighborhood is responsible for the cost of the removal. A cost to remove the speed hump will be determined prior to circulating a petition. Funds for the removal shall be paid to the Town before proceeding with the physical removal.
5. Once speed hump(s) are removed from a location under this process, that location cannot be reconsidered for speed hump installation for a period of three years from the date of removal.

SPEED HUMP REQUEST

Request Location for a Speed Hump: _____
Address and Street Name

Is this request being made by an individual or a group: _____

Describe why you believe a speed hump would be appropriate in this location: _____

Contact Information: _____
Name (Please Print)

Address

Phone

Signed

Date

SPEED HUMP REQUEST
EVALUATION FORM

Requested Speed Hump Location: _____ Date: _____

Is this or a paved local residential street? YES NO

Is the posted speed limit 30MPH or less? YES NO

What is the 85 percentile speed at this location? _____ Date: _____

Is the 85 percentile speed more 4 mph or more above the speed limit? YES NO

Is there vertical curb in this section of the roadway? YES NO

Is the longitudinal slope of the street greater than 5% in this area? YES NO

Are there at least 6 residences within 660 feet along the street? YES NO

Is there a straight section of roadway at least 660 feet long? YES NO

Is the street width less than 40 feet? YES NO

Is this request on a Collector or Arterial Street? YES NO

Is this route used regularly by busses or emergency vehicles? YES NO

Is the requested location within 200 feet of a controlled intersection? YES NO

Is the requested location within 200 feet of a sharp curve? YES NO

Does the street have an inverted crown? YES NO

Is there another speed hump within 500 feet? YES NO

Can a speed hump be located here without covering water valves, manholes or other utility access points? YES NO

Does this location meet the general criteria for a speed hump? YES NO

If not, why? _____

If yes, person petition(s) were given to and date: _____

PETITION FOR A SPEED HUMP

We the undersigned, representing property owners in the affected area, hereby request that the Town of Payson install speed humps at the locations shown on the attached map. We understand that as property owners we will pay _____% of the cost to install the speed humps per the Towns Speed Hump Policy Section 6.0 prior to the installation.

Name of Neighborhood Contact: _____ Phone: _____

Address _____

	Signature (One per Household)	Address	Phone
1			
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			
7			
8			
9			
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			

SURFACE TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
DECEMBER 6, 2006

- | | | |
|---|---|--------------------------|
| A | Chairman Al Lyons called the duly posted Surface Transportation Advisory Committee meeting to order at approximately 4:00 p.m. in the Council Chambers. | Meeting Time & Place |
| B | ROLL CALL: Al Lyons, Chairman, Members Ginger Henry, Bruce Van Camp, Roy Kindrick, Ernest Schmidt, and Gordon Metcalf | Roll Call |
| C | STAFF PRESENT: LaRon Garrett, Assistant Public Works Director/Town Engineer. | Staff Attending |
| D | OTHERS PRESENT: Michele Maupin, Secretary. | Others Attending |
| E | PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no public comments. | No Public Comments |
| F | MINUTES:
November 1, 2006 Surface Transportation Advisory Committee Minutes. Chairman Lyons pointed out some corrections on page 107 section C. Member Schmidt had a correction on page 107, section G and on page 108, section A. Member Van Camp had a correction on page 108, section C. Members moved to accept the November 1, 2006 Surface Transportation Advisory Committee Minutes. Motion carried, 6-0. | Minutes
APPROVED, 6-0 |
| G | Status report and update on street projects by the Public Works Engineer or his designee.

Mr. Garrett, Assistant Public Works Director/Town Engineer, announced that the design on St. Phillips and Bonita, and Mud Springs Phase I are both moving forward. The roundabout design for Mud Springs and Granite Dells is laid out. The soil-boring test on St. Phillips and Bonita was done approximately two weeks ago. The test results will be used to determine the structural section of the road. Mr. Garrett stated there was not much more to report on other than routine maintenance. Member Schmidt asked if construction on Bonita would close the street. Mr. Garrett explained that the street would not be closed; there is not enough room to do one lane at a time. Bonita will have to be under construction all at the same time. The Town will keep it open and treat it like McLane Road, when it was under construction. The Committee discussed how to handle the traffic flow on Bonita during construction. | Status Report |

A Discussion/Report from the Chairman of the Street Task Force.

Mr. Garrett introduced the street task force work group. Mr. Fran Hoffman he explained that their job was to go out and inventory and rate all the streets in the Town of Payson. They started three weeks ago. They are collecting data to help the Town meet the GASB34 requirements, which is information that the Town must give to the auditors explaining the cost of infrastructure. Mr. Bob Gilley has been assisting Mr. Hoffman. They are doing the ride comfort system to rate the streets. Mr. Hoffman discussed how they collect and process the data. Mr. Hoffman stated that he did not have much to report on at this time since they had just started. He asked for volunteers to help on this project. Mr. Garrett explained Mr. Hoffman has an approved map of the streets to follow, and with the GASB34 the Town is required to do this inventory for every street in the Town of Payson. The street task force is determining the value of every street. The Committee discussed this issue and thanked Mr. Hoffman for coming to the meeting.

Street Task Force

B Discussion/Possible Action concerning traffic flow in the Main Street/Colcord/Frontier Street Area.

The Committee discussed the different possibilities to improve traffic flow in this area. Mr. Garrett explained that Frontier, in front of the Post Office, is wide enough and would carry two-way traffic at this time. Mr. Garrett did speak with ADOT and they are not opposed to putting two-way traffic on Frontier as long as there is a "right only" onto Highway 87. Mr. Garrett mentioned if any new access points were constructed on Highway 87 the Town would fund 100% of the cost for right in/right out turn in the area of Highway 87 and Frontier. ADOT would not assist in funding. The Committee discussed Member Schmidt's sketches. Member Metcalf was concerned with "right only" that citizens would not pay attention. Mr. Garrett suggests the use of curbing to direct traffic. The Committee discussed turning issues, curbing, signage and arrows at both Colcord and Main, and Frontier and Highway 87. The Committee recommends this be presented to the Council. **Moved by Chairman Lyon's, seconded by Member Metcalf. Motioned carried, 6-0.**

Main/Colcord/Frontier

A Discussion/Action concerning the Town's proposed Speed Hump Policy.

Chairman Lyon's stated he liked the speed hump policy that Mr. Garrett introduced to the Committee. Mr. Garrett stated the speed hump policy is one chapter out of the traffic calming manual, and the Council gave us direction to pull speed hump chapter out of the manual and bring it ahead of the policy. With the Committee's recommendation, this needs to go back to the Council for the January 4th meeting. Then the overall policy will be completed. Member Van Camp and Member Kindrick discussed their trip to Chandler and the research they conducted. The Committee discussed the cost of speed humps, and which streets in Payson would benefit from having speed humps. The Committee also discussed the travels of emergency vehicles, school bus and snow removal equipment in relation to speed humps. Mr. Garrett asked that some Committee members try and be present at the next Council meeting. Mr. Garrett will present this issue to the Council at the January 4th meeting. Motion to recommend approval of the speed hump policy to the Town Council as written. **Motioned** by Member Schmidt, **seconded** by Member Van Camp. **Motion carried 6-0.**

Speed Hump Policy

B Discussion/Possible Action concerning traffic flow for Goodnow Street in Wells Fargo Bank Area and Bonita Street.

The Committee discussed possible solutions for the traffic flow on Bonita and Goodnow. The Committee liked Mr. Garrett's suggestions for traffic and designs. Member Schmidt discussed right angle turns verses sweeps. Mr. Garrett explained sweeps would work better than right angle turns for that particular area. The Committee continued to discuss possibilities for the shopping center, bank area and Clark Street. Member Van Camp recommended that Mr. Garrett continue negotiating for what the Committee needs to do with this issue.

Goodnow and Bonita

C Discussion/Possible Action concerning items to be placed on the next agenda.

Clark and Goodnow will be placed on January's agenda along with new Chair and Vice Chair to be elected by the Committee. The Committee discussed Chairman Lyon's term of office. Mr. Garrett will check with Clerks record for the termination date. Traffic calming issues may be put on the January agenda.

SURFACE TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
DECEMBER 6, 2006

114

A **Adjournment**

Chairman Lyons adjourned the meeting at approximately 5:17 p.m.

Approved:

Al Lyons, Chairman

Date: _____

ATTEST:

Michele Maupin, Secretary

Certification

I hereby certify that the foregoing minutes are a true and correct copy of the minutes of the Surface Transportation Advisory Committee of the Town of Payson held on the 1st day of November, 2006. I further certify that the meeting was duly called and held and that a quorum was present

DATED this ____ day of _____, 2006.

Michele Maupin, Secretary

Affix Town Seal
mm