



Prosperity & Livability Committee
Members: Ewing, Hill, Wagner and Williams
Chaired by Council Member Ewing
3rd Floor Lobby Conference Room
August 3, 2016 – 9:00 A.M.

MEETING MINUTES

Present:

Committee Chair Jason Ewing, and Committee Members Alyce Hill, Jay Wagner and Chris Williams

Also Present:

Council Members Cynthia Davis

Staff Present:

Randy McCaslin, Deputy City Manager; Eric Olmedo, Budget & Performance Manager; Jeron Hollis, Communications & Public Engagement; Mike McNair, Director of Community Development; Mark McDonald, Transportation Director; JoAnne Carlyle, City Attorney; Maria Smith, Deputy City Clerk and Lisa Vierling, City Clerk

Others Present:

Judy Stalder, TREBIC; Barry Kitley, High Point University

Handouts:

- *City of High Point Traffic Calming Program*
- *City of High Point Policy to Allow Enhancement of City Streets, Intersections, Alleys, and Cul-de-Sacs*
- *Application for Logo Placement- High Point University / Howard Place Water Tank*

Note: These handouts will be attached as a permanent part of these proceedings. Some of the sections were mis-numbered in the proposed policy that was distributed at the meeting.

Chairman Ewing called the meeting to order at 9:04 a.m.

1) Proposed Traffic Calming Policy

Mark McDonald, Director of Transportation, provided an overview of the proposed Traffic Calming Policy. The City of Raleigh's Traffic Calming Policy was used as a template. He stressed that this is a

very rough draft and corrections could be made as needed. He encouraged Council and staff to email him with any questions and/or suggestions and advised that he would also be meeting and reviewing the policy with the High Point Fire Department, Police Department, Public Services, Parks & Recreation, etc...

Overview

He described how this section talks about what we are doing and why we are doing it. It explains to enhance public safety through our streets through moderation of vehicle speeds and volumes while using different strategies to achieve that goal.

2. Program Components

He was concerned with the word “components.” He added how this limits it to residential neighborhoods, neighborhood streets, local streets, and in some cases there may be an opportunity to apply this in a mixed use area that may have some residential components.

He reviewed the streets that would not qualify such as: Federal and State system streets (carry higher volume traffic).

2.2 *Treatments.* He made reference to the “toolbox” which outlines a number of speed reduction strategies and reported that each area would be evaluated on an individual basis to establish the context and determine the most appropriate applications.

2.3 *Public Involvement.* Mr. McDonald advised this would be a key component as the Raleigh policy goes into a great detail regarding meetings. He agreed that this should be left in.

Chairman Ewing had a question regarding the scope of the program and if there were DOT maintained streets and if there would be an application process with DOT for approval to add those streets to be encompassed by the policy or would it be straight forward? Mr. McDonald felt this was something that could be discussed with NCDOT and noted typically there is no traffic calming on secondary routes. He gave an example within the city limits; they do not have any State maintained subdivision or neighborhood streets.

2.4 *Emergency Access.* He added how this would need to be discussed in further detail and to consider an emergency access with response time to gauge the impact to response time.

2.5 *Street and Utility Maintenance.* He reported that it would be necessary to make sure Public Services is on board with this. He explained the need to plow streets with speed humps and run the risk of damaging their equipment and as a general rule they do not plow residential streets. He added for the streets this would apply to be worked out case by case basis.

2.6 *Equity.* He explained our current policy that all requested parties to pay the bill for whatever is done. He noted how others have to reach a point to raise \$5-10,000 which could put a strain on communities that do not have a homeowners association.

3. Process

Mr. McDonald believes further review is needed regarding the process as to how traffic concerns within neighborhoods are addressed.

4. Criteria

4.1 *Speed limit reduction.* He reported on the thresholds for speed limit reductions and the volume.

4.1.1 He pointed out the proposed policy uses the threshold of 4,000 vehicles per day for residential collector streets; Mr. McDonald suggested it should be more in the 2,500 range.

4.1.2 He asked what the desired level of support for the petition process was for speed limit reduction. The proposed policy requires a petition of support for the speed limit reduction by at least 75% of properties along the affected segment of the street and allows a property owner or adult resident of the property to sign the petition. Chairman Ewing asked what it would be to reverse it and Mr. McDonald responded the same standards would be used.

4.1.3 He discussed the limitation of neighborhood speed limits to 25 mph which could be done by a petition of the residents of all streets within the defined area, or by request of an established homeowner's association.

Chairman Ewing expressed concerns about one area where many vehicles pass through from Wendover Avenue to Penny Road. Mr. McDonald agreed that area could possibly be addressed through traffic calming. Mike McNair, Director of Community Development, brought up the idea if we had a petition and reduced the speed limit to 25 mph but the speeding is still going on should we reset that or can we not continue to look back at the toolbox to get the desired result. Mr. McDonald agreed this would help to moderate speeds. Chairman Ewing suggested to set up a petition as to where there is a series of actions and the initial petition is if they are seeking speed reduction that would be number one and speed reduction does not accomplish what you want and what we want; then step two would go into force. Committee Member Wagner pointed out that they would then make their petition and then staff would do an evaluation to see what the best traffic calming measure would be. He then mentioned how this could be where the staff's initial idea did not work.

Committee Member Williams addressed the set cost of the signs and another on the speed humps. Committee Member Hill also weighed in on the score card that might factor into the cost. Chairman Ewing advised how staff would need to be diligent in both identifying the best measure of corrective action but then also full support of police, fire, etc... and follow through. Mr. McCaslin spoke on behalf of the Police Department as they will enforce it by putting the radar trailer up as the cars will slow down temporarily and once they leave the speeds go back up.

Committee Member Hill suggested that addressing the speed limits should be a separate issue. Chairman Ewing mentioned being from another state how all the neighborhoods were all 25 mph and wanted to know the basis here. Mr. McDonald reported that statutorily speed limits are set at 35 mph inside the City limits, unless otherwise

posted. Regarding new development, Chairman Ewing asked if this would be something staff should be making recommendations to developers on lower speed limits, etc.... Mr. McDonald replied that in the past everything had been designed for the 35 mph and possibly moving toward a lower speed for some subdivisions.

4.2 *Multi-way Stop Control.* Mr. McDonald explained how this could be a tool and used on a case-by-case basis with the right location and the right application.

4.3 *Traffic Calming*

4.3.1 He noted that installation of traffic calming devices may be considered for streets taking into consideration traffic volume, crash history, speed-related accidents, etc.... He suggested adding pedestrian components (presence of sidewalks, schools, etc....)

4.3.4 He reported that the length of street segments on streets less than two (2) blocks or 1,000 feet in length will not be considered for treatment unless other criteria in Section 4.3.1 are met.

5. Traffic Calming Toolbox

Mr. McDonald reviewed the following:

5.1 Type I - Upgrades to existing traffic signing and pavement marking with spot enforcement.

5.2 Type II – Dynamic messaging, community outreach, and aggressive enforcement.

5.3 Type III – Speed limit reductions and/or multi-way STOPS, as applicable.

5.4 Type IV – Horizontal treatments. Channelization techniques that may include medians, mini-roundabouts, chokers, chicanes, bulb-outs or curb extensions, and diverters.

5.5 Type V – Vertical treatments. Speed humps, speed tables, raised crosswalks and intersections.

6. Petitions

He mentioned how this refers to the level of support that is required which is 75% and who gets to sign the petition and who does not put their name on it. They would have two weeks to submit their name or remove it. He pointed out petitions must be returned within 60 calendar days and unsuccessful petitions would have to wait six months before they could restart another one and no more than three petitions on a single project within a five-year period.

Council Member C. Davis asked if that should be the same for a street renaming which would be a year instead of six months and Mr. McDonald noted adjustments could be made according to Council's direction.

8. Project Funding

He reviewed the following of what the City would incur and the neighborhood paying for the other half:

Example 1:

Total annual budget = \$100,000

Project cost = \$21,650

City cost = \$10,000 (maximum City expenditure for any one approved project)
Sponsor cost = \$11,650 (matching share plus excess cost)
Remaining budget = \$90,000

Committee Member Hill commented that this is not a situation where the city is paying for it all. Mr. McDonald agreed from those examples, but it could be. Council Member C. Davis was concerned that there was discussion from the last meeting regarding funding the poorer neighborhoods and this would not allow for that to happen. Chairman Ewing suggested a Council initiative be directed. Mr. McDonald referred to #8 Project Funding first paragraph, second sentence *“City Council may, also at its discretion, choose to modify the program, and may periodically amend this policy, or suspend or discontinue its use.”*

Committee Member Williams asked if we were to keep the policy would it be an exception rather than a modification and Mr. McDonald agreed.

7. Reporting

Mr. McDonald advised that this would be important to keep Council updated on an annual basis and staff was in the process of setting up a database to log calls for tracking purposes.

8. Maintenance

He reported how the City would be responsible when something is constructed then they would be maintaining it and homeowner associations (HOA) to enter into an agreement with them to take care of any landscaping. Mr. McCaslin suggested that we might want to go a step further because staff is already stretched having to maintain all the small neighborhood parks where there are no homeowner's association. He suggested if there is a valid homeowner's association, the city may need to require them to maintain it.

8. Removal

Approved and constructed projects must remain for a minimum of three years from the date of completion. Staff will evaluate the effectiveness of the project after six months and annually for a period of three years.

Chairman Ewing suggested having a clawback clause based on the funding and if the traffic calming measure has successfully accomplished its intended purpose, then the city should have an option in place that would require them to pay for the city's portion of the installation costs. He suggested it should be retroactive and part of the agreement.

Committee Wagner also suggested that any money recouped should go back into the traffic calming policy funds. Mr. McCaslin explained as a general rule, the funds would not be carried over because the overage normally goes back into fund balance, but it could be set up that way.

Appendices

Mr. McDonald shared some photos of the different types of traffic calming measures that Raleigh is using. He explained that he did make some adjustments and took the emphasis off speed and put more on volume due to volume being a fairly significant component at times (went from 50 on speed and 10 on volume). He did the same for pedestrian activity, facility, bus route, bike route, park, etc... Additional emphasis will be put on volumes starting at 500 vehicles and he continued by reviewing other factors/components that would be considered.

Committee Member Hill felt the pedestrian activity component was very important, but questioned the streets that it would actually apply to and the streets that would be excluded. She pointed out complaints have already been received on Johnson, Washington, Rotary and Chestnut and when people speed, they usually use a primary residential street to cut through. She asked if staff was going to be able to address some of the problems regarding some of the streets on the list. She suggested removing the street list from the proposed policy. Chairman Ewing agreed that it would be good to eliminate Appendix D altogether. Mr. McDonald noted the list does not necessarily need to be included, but it might limit itself better to be mapped instead of listed (to show land use as well as road type). Mr. McDonald replied that these streets were on the list because they were either State routes and/or major or minor arterial routes or limited residential components. Committee Member Hill suggested a list may be a good tool for evaluating purposes, but did not feel it should be included.

Council Member C. Davis communicated that she liked the list and suggested changing "not eligible" to some different wording. Chairman Ewing felt identifying streets on a list would create administrative problems.

Mr. McDonald requested that Council review the proposed policy and advised the next step would be to accept comments and go back and review the existing policy to see if there are any desired components from it that may not be in the proposed policy. He felt the proposed policy was lengthier than he would like and expressed a desire to simplify it somewhat.

Chairman Ewing suggested the Committee review the proposed policy, make recommendations to staff within the next two weeks so the final policy could be discussed during the Prosperity & Livability Committee meeting in September and forwarded to the City Council for action at the first meeting in October. Mr. McCaslin suggested the Committee pay close attention to the money aspect of it because staff needs direction on this.

2) **Proposed Intersection Enhancement Policy**

Chairman Ewing pointed out this was Committee Member Wagner's idea and asked him to discuss it in more detail.

Committee Member Wagner explained an architect who lives in Portland got the idea from a visit he made to Central America. He wanted to create a focal point for the

neighborhood and shared his idea with the city, but they turned him down. After being turned down, he took the initiative to paint the street anyway and after they saw the design, they ended up liking it and decided to allow it. He explained requests from the neighborhoods go through the Transportation Department and requires a permit to allow neighborhoods to paint their intersections. As part of the process, they are required to submit plans, a petition showing support from the neighbors and agree to maintain it.

Eric Olmedo, Budget and Administrative Director, pulled up some examples on-line to view the different street designs in Portland. One design that Committee Member Wagner pointed out was a coffee kiosk where people can stop and leave money in there for coffee or tea. There was another example of a kid-friendly bench that a neighborhood put together. He noted this would not only include painting the intersections, but it could be other enhancements to the intersection. He felt the best thing about this is that it is all citizen funded and would not cost the city anything.

Committee Member Wagner explained something like this would bring the neighborhood together and the neighbors would have to maintain it. As a result, he pointed out what they have seen since the policy was put in place in Portland with over 100 intersections painted, they have seen a drop in crime, an inadvertent traffic calming measure, and property value increase.

He suggested to have the policy written to only apply to residential areas; it would require a petition process (75% of the neighbors within a block or within 500 feet whichever is less). He further explained the neighborhood would come together and decide on a design:

- Present the petition
- \$50 permit fee
- City would put up a barricade (block the street off)
- Cannot use any words or definable logo or any logo that would be known outside the neighborhood
- stimulate the Arts Community
- The city would approve the type of paint to be used. Flat paint is being recommended. Committee Member Williams asked if “glow in the dark” paint would be prohibited
- Design cannot create a traffic hazard

Mr. McDonald and his staff would have the authority to approve the permit. It was noted that if the neighborhood does not maintain the design, staff would have the right to revoke the permit and if the city has to dig up pipes under the design, it would be the responsibility of the neighborhood to put it back.

Council Member C. Davis was concerned about the other neighborhoods that may have some interactions of gang activity or gang problems and asked if we would have staff work with the police department to make sure that there would not be any underlying symbols hidden in those designs. Committee Member Wagner agreed that they would look into that and if there was any vandalism or graffiti painted over it then the neighborhood would be responsible for painting over it.

In the case of a four-point intersection, Committee Member Wagner explained it would require 75% of the owners on the four corners, or 75% within one block or 500 feet in each direction, whichever is less. Mr. McDonald explained once petitions are received, staff reviews the property records and makes sure that the signatures match up. Judy Stalder, TREBIC, asked if these have to be intersections and it was noted that they do not and *can* be mid-block or a cul-de-sac. Committee Member Wagner mentioned that there is also a new idea for painting crosswalks and Chapel Hill has done this. Ms. Carlyle pointed out a positive aspect of this is that it is a policy, not an ordinance, and it would go through staff for review/processing and approval.

Council Member C. Davis felt the crosswalk on Main Street in front of the Brown Truck needs to be bigger.

Committee Member Wagner stated he would like for the Committee to go ahead and move this forward to the City Council for approval at the August 15th meeting. Chairman Ewing noted he did not have a problem sending it forward and he thought it would be great to have a neighborhood ready to make application when it goes to City Council for approval.

Chairman Ewing made a motion to move the Policy to Allow Enhancement of City Streets, Intersections, Alleys, and Cul-de-Sacs forward to the City Council for approval at the August 15, 2016 meeting. Committee Member Wagner made a second. The motion carried by a 4-0 unanimous vote.

Formal Application for Placement of a Logo- High Point University/Howard Place Water Tank

Chairman Ewing mentioned that High Point University has made formal application to place a logo on the Howard Place Water Tank. A copy of the application as well as a draft of the logo were distributed during the meeting and will be attached as a permanent part of these proceedings.

Staff will be reviewing the application and working with High Point University to get some of the details finalized in hopes of submitting the finalized plan for review by the next meeting. Council Member C. Davis asked if we have opened this up for the rest of the community and if they are aware it is available. She specifically asked if it was available on the city's website and Communications & Public Engagement Director Jeron Hollis replied that it is not, but acknowledged that it was covered in an article by the High Point Enterprise.

There being no further discussion, the meeting adjourned at 10:20 a.m. upon motion duly made and seconded.

Respectfully Submitted,

Maria A. Smith
Deputy City Clerk

Jason P. Ewing, Chairman

DRAFT