

---

## **SALT LAKE CITY COUNCIL STAFF MEMO**

---

**DATE:** September 12, 2003

**SUBJECT:** **Traffic Management Program**

**AFFECTED COUNCIL DISTRICTS:** Citywide

**STAFF REPORT BY:** Michael Sears, Budget & Policy Analyst

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT.**

**AND CONTACT PERSON:** Community and Economic Development Department, Alison Weyher

---

The City Council during the August 7, 2003 Council work session meeting discussed the Traffic Management Program and held a public hearing on September 9, 2003 to receive resident input on the program. The public hearing was well attended and several of the comments are summarized below.

After the public hearing on the traffic calming program and traffic management issues in the City the Council closed the hearing and deferred further discussion on the topic until the September 16, 2003 Council work session. Council Members may wish to consider policy options at the September 16 meeting, based upon the information from previous briefings and the September 9, 2003 public hearing

### **CITIZEN COMMENT REGARDING THE TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT PROGRAM:**

The following are comments that have been submitted to the City Council in either written or verbal form as summarized by Council staff:

- Speed bumps are effective
- Speed bumps have a drastic positive impact – they are effective in slowing traffic down.
- West side lacks speed bumps – majority of speed bumps have been placed on the east side of the City.
- People who live in the neighborhood should have control of what happens in their neighborhood.
- Transportation has been helpful to the Poplar Grove area.
- Planters and temporary devices should be used in the program.
- UTA has a great relationship with Transportation Division. Speed bumps do not impact bus routes or condition of buses. UTA has a neutral position.
- Many times traffic enforcement is not available – speed bumps are effective.

- Residents with projects are waiting to move forward with implementation after moratorium is lifted – Bonneville Drive, 11<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Fremont/600 West (proposal for center dividers) – urging Council to lift the moratorium.
- People who oppose speed bumps are commuters – speed limit needs to be enforced.
- Traffic speed is diminishing property values – speed bumps are needed on Bonneville Dr.
- Bonneville Drive is receiving additional traffic as a result of Oak Hills speed bumps – considers Bonneville Drive as part of the Oak Hills overall traffic plan – waiting to have traffic calming measures implemented.
- 1700 E. concern – proposed revisions to the Traffic Management Plan are different from what 1700 E. residents have been working with – 1700 E. residents have exhausted all other options – participated in Pace Program, adopted crosswalks, created signs and placed them on their streets to remind drivers to slow down, etc. Last option is to participate in the Traffic Management Program.
- If Traffic Management Program is discontinued, it will show the City’s lack of integrity – speed bumps force drivers to slow down and drive courteously.
- Traffic Management Program is extremely popular, under funded, and under staffed. Comprehensive plan would be more effective than taking one street at a time.
- Suggestion: make public announcements to encourage drivers to drive safely and within speed limit.
- Replace speed bumps with more traffic enforcement
- Mission of the Traffic Management Program lacks a fundamental mission statement – fails to articulate the mission of the streets and road business. Plan does not acknowledge there is a need for some streets to act as primary streets while others can be quiet.
- Traffic calming contributes to air pollution
- Traffic Management Program’s strategy is not very well defined. Is the purpose of traffic calming to reduce traffic speed, traffic congestion?
- Speed bumps divert traffic to other residential surrounding streets.
- City is building obstacles on arterial streets.
- Speed bumps are being used as a launching pad for teens to gain air in their vehicles – people are swerving near the curbside to avoid the speed bumps – concern for pedestrian safety.
- Instead of using funds for speed bumps, fund more police officers.
- Speed bumps force vehicles to start up and slow down – emissions and smoke from buses contributes to air pollution.
- Speed bumps do not allow a driver to travel at posted 25 mph
- Unless a resident lives on the street that is being considered for traffic calming measures, opinion does not matter.
- Consider having residents being responsible to pay for speed bumps, such as decorative lighting.
- City is shortsighted to utilize speed bumps – utilize funds more wisely.
- Opposes speed bumps – neighbors are doing the speeding, use funds for speed bumps to purchase more speed boards.

Several of the above suggestions and comments about the traffic calming program have been discussed by the Administration and have been incorporated into the revised Traffic Management Program.

The following are questions that have been asked during the review of the traffic calming program and were included in the Council staff report for the August 12, 2003 Council work session briefing on traffic calming. They are included for Council review.

1. Should the City allow privately funded traffic control measures in the public way?
2. How might the Council encourage the Transportation Division to continue working with neighborhoods to create their own traffic calming solutions? Currently, the process begins with a neighborhood meeting where the residents are invited to participate in a neighborhood traffic calming committee (NTCC). The NTCC works closely with the Transportation Division to design a traffic calming plan for a particular street. A survey is sent to street residents and property owners to establish whether there is sufficient support for the plan. If so, the Transportation Division initiates a trial or test during which residents and property owners are surveyed again to verify their support of permanent measures.
3. Should impacts on surrounding streets be factored into the criteria system?
4. Is an expanded notification process beyond the current practice (notification is made to residents living on the street) necessary?
5. Would it be helpful to include as part of the program a presentation before the local community council on the proposed traffic calming devices before the City begins installation?
6. Should the City consider the use of increased traffic enforcement to augment the traffic calming measures employed by the City? The City could increase the use of traffic patrol officers in heavily traveled areas or neighborhood areas that have a demonstrated traffic speed problem.
7. Should the Council enhance speeding fines? The Council could, by ordinance, establish stricter fines for speeding on neighborhood streets. Signage and a public campaign could be incorporated into the ordinance revision to allow for greater visibility of the differing fines on neighborhood streets.
8. Should the City pursue the use of devices such as PhotoCop (by State statute requires the presence of a peace officer)?
9. Should the City increase the number of speed boards that City owns? (The Council would need to provide additional resources to enable the Administration to deploy them with greater frequency in areas requesting traffic relief.)
10. Could neighborhood design guidelines be implemented to encourage modifications that increase pedestrian activity and enhance features that create a neighborhood scale? These approaches sometimes have a traffic calming effect.
11. The Fire Department has indicated that, due to the enhanced safety provided by speed bumps, they do not oppose their installation and they have confirmed that speed bumps do not create an unmanageable response time problem. Because this comes up so frequently, the City Council may wish to clarify whether speed bumps influence emergency response times and impact passengers in need of medical assistance. The

Council may also wish to clarify whether speed bumps implemented on street slopes impact snow removal efficiency and are speed bumps subject to ice build up during the winter months.

12. Should the Administration be encouraged to pursue a system to track the effectiveness of a traffic calming device after it has been implemented for a specified period?
13. Should the Administration be asked to clarify how data is analyzed in relation to neighborhood traffic? The Council receives questions about whether traffic speed and volume are based upon the overall percentage of increased traffic on the street or based upon data comparisons from other areas of the City.

cc: Rocky Fluhart, Cindy Gust-Jenson, Alison Weyher, Chief Dinse, Chuck Querry, David Dobbins, Tim Harpst, Scott Vaterlaus, and Craig Timothy

File location: Michael\Staff Reports\