

**MINUTES OF THE
TARA HILL AREA TRAFFIC CALMING TASK FORCE**

Wednesday, January 12, 2004

Dublin Municipal Building – 5200 Emerald Parkway

Present:

Task Force Members

Randy Luikart

Tim Lecklider

Amy Gerhart

Dave Cecutti

Vince Blaeser

Deborah Frazier

Tina Wray

Kimberly O'Brien

John Jung (excused)

Amy Salay (excused)

Staff Members:

Paul Hammersmith, Jeannie Willis, Ken Richardson

Consultants:

Joe Sullivan, R. D. Zande & Assoc.

Dave Samuelson, R.D. Zande & Assoc.

Tina Wawzkiewicz, R.D. Zande & Assoc.

Brian Hagerty, R. D. Zande & Assoc.

Call to Order:

Mr. Luikart, Chair, called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

Approval of Minutes

Ms. Wray suggested the addition of the word “not” to the last sentence of the last complete paragraph on page 3, to read: “The Task Force did not attempt to eliminate parking directly in front of the residences on Tara Hill.”

Ms. O'Brien moved to approve the minutes of the December 1, 2004 Task Force meeting as approved. Ms. Wray seconded the motion. The minutes were unanimously approved.

Ms. O'Brien stated that in the previous Task Force meeting at which on-street parking was discussed, she had indicated that the City had posted “no on-street parking” on Tara Hill Drive in front of her home. However, although the post is still there, the sign itself has disappeared!

Mr. Hammersmith stated that staff would note that and have it replaced.

Traffic Study Findings

Mr. Samuelson stated that the focus of tonight's meeting will be how to meet the Task Force's objective of presentation of a concept plan to Council in the month of April. There are at least four items to discuss tonight: a meeting schedule, the recommended plan, a second petition process, and recent depletion of funds. Items that would impact the additional amount needed are: future meeting schedule, a second petition process, criteria for selecting a recommended plan, the license plate survey and anything else the Task Force may require.

He noted the basic findings of the Stage 1 traffic study findings for the benefit of those in attendance for the first time and to provide a refresher for those who are not new. The primary

reason for the traffic study was to improve safety in the neighborhood. A high percentage of young drivers -- 40 %, were involved in accidents, versus the state average of 17. Nearly 4 out of 10 collisions involved injuries, twice the rate City-wide. Such a high ratio is indicative of speeding. West of Literary Lane the speeding has a trend upwards, dropping off as it nears Muirfield Drive. Traffic calming would try to level that out, to provide a consistent speed along Tara Hill Drive. Another reason for reducing speed was the safety of pedestrians. Volume was identified as a secondary purpose for the study. Reducing speeds can divert traffic to some extent. In 2003, the average volume on Tara Hill was approximately 4,080. With Jerome High School opening Fall 2004, a reduction of volume on Tara Hill was noted and in the Fall 2005, further reduction is anticipated. However, the expansion of Coffman Park is expected to divert some traffic to Tara Hill. All of this reverts Tara Hill Drive to its 2003 position. Stage 2 of the traffic study recommended traffic improvements around the study area, such as at Brand and Coffman and Brand and Muirfield, which were anticipated to further reduce traffic volume on Tara Hill.

Task Force Concept Plans

Stage 2 of the traffic study report showed four concepts as a starting point for discussion. In August 2004, the Task Force prepared a concept using only horizontal measures. In a work session, two Task Force teams developed two concepts; those were combined into a merged plan. Concept 7 was presented at the open house, but it was not the last or final recommendation. Concept 8 will be presented tonight.

At the last Task Force meeting, a resident inquired why street narrowing could be considered traffic calming. Mr. Samuelson displayed sample views of streets that had been narrowed, causing vehicles to reduce their speeds and "hug the curb." To obtain an idea of what a 22-ft. wide street feels like, there are several streets of that width, such as Beery Lane, Raymond Drive, Killarney Court or Ketchum Court.

On-Street Parking Alternatives

Mr. Samuelson noted that tonight various ideas for on-street parking alternatives will be reviewed by the Task Force. Those ideas were presented to the residents at a December 16 neighborhood meeting. The consultants seek guidance and identification of criteria from the Task Force tonight, as they attempt to balance on-street parking and traffic calming. The consultants require that information to help the Task Force prepare a recommended plan for presentation to Council.

Ms. Wawzkiewicz stated that the criteria they ask that the Task Force establish is how much parking is desirable with the traffic-calming plan. There was a neighborhood meeting on December 16 with the neighborhood group that had petitioned the Task Force to reconsider and redevelop a plan for their neighborhood -- between Adventure and Literary. Staff presented two options to the neighborhood -- Option 8A and Options 8B (PowerPoint presentation). Option 8A provides more on-street parking than was included in Concept 7, which was presented at the open house. Option 8B retains at least one space in front of any home that currently has an existing parking space on Tara Hill. She noted that there would be less speed reduction in the case of 8B. At the December 16th meeting, the residents requested an additional option, and the

consultants developed Option 8C, which presents a level of on-street parking between Concept 7 and Option 8A.

Mr. Luikart stated that Option 8A presented more parking than Option 7. What then was the disadvantage of that option compared to 8B?

Ms. Wawszkiewicz responded that 8A has more traffic-calming than 8B; Option 8B provided more on-street parking. Concept 7 provided 18-22 parking spots in the area between Shady Nelms and two lots east of Literary. Options 8A provides 52 parking spots in that same area. This is accomplished by shortening the curb bulbs at Conquistador, removing the median east of Adventure, shortening the choker east of Ketchum, shortening the median west of Literary Lane, and shortening the curb bulbs at Literary Lane – in essence, removing one traffic calming device and altering the others.

Mr. O'Brien inquired the distance between Adventure Drive and the choker.

Ms. Wawszkiewicz responded that the choker is about 400 feet away. In Option 8B, the devices are spaced more uniformly. It provides approximately 64 parking spaces. There aren't any homes that would lose all of their existing Tara Hill parking. At Conquistador, the curb bulbs were changed -- a 10-foot deflection was reduced to a 5-ft deflection on the intersection side and added a bay on the other side. A car would not necessarily change its path, but it would receive a more narrowed feel.

Mr. Lecklider stated that 8C would address the issue for the homes on Conquistador, Adventure and Literary. Have staff spoken to each of those homeowners?

Ms. Willis responded that the homeowners addressed are those who signed the redesign petition. Staff met with them.

Mr. Lecklider inquired if all the residents on Shady Nelms, Adventure, and Conquistador had expressed concern.

Ms. Willis stated that the petition started at Adventure. The adjacent streets have not presented concerns to the Task Force.

Mr. Lecklider stated that there are four corner lots on Conquistador, Adventure and Shady Nelms that lose their parking (see concept 7), but how big of an issue is that? When the curb bulbs are shortened from 10 to 5 feet, how much traffic-calming impact is being lost? Were specific concerns raised for those households? If not, is the Task Force over-reacting? He is interested in equity for all the homeowners.

Ms. Frazier inquired if those residents with whom staff/the Task Force met are present tonight and, if so, would they like to comment.

Christian Sarych, 6905 Conquistador Ct., stated that Option 8A is better for those who are losing spaces, and there is a cumulative effect for all the residents.

Mr. Lecklider stated that he lives on a corner lot and never parks on the street. He believes that the issue is balancing traffic calming rather than attempting to provide parking for occasional events at the homes on that street. He inquired what type of impact shortening the bulbs would have on the traffic-calming plan for Tara Hill.

Ms. Wawzkiewicz responded that the spacing should be fine – there are two traffic circles less than 300 feet apart, so shortening the curb bulbs should be fine.

Mr. Sarych stated that the on-street parking issue is not of as great a significance at this location, where there are only four homes as it is further east, particularly east of Ketchum.

Mr. Lecklider stated that was his concern. At Conquistador, is this change to the plan necessary for four homes that have other options for parking? Perhaps further east these changes are more necessary.

Ms. Wray stated that those homes already suffer from loss of parking spaces for their family/guests during City events. Limiting their potential parking in the traffic-calming plan would cause a greater difficulty for them.

Mr. Luikart stated that Ms. Wawzkiewicz has indicated that shortening the bulbs would not negatively impact the traffic-calming plan. It may even be a better balance. He is in favor of making the change.

Ms. Gerhart inquired if 8A is acceptable, or is 8B preferred?

Ms. Frazier requested a description of 8C.

Ms. Wawzkiewicz stated that 8C is a combination of options A and B, providing 49 spaces in that area. The curb bulbs were kept at 10 feet on both ends of this section, and the plan incorporates the choker and shorter median locations from 8A and 8B.

Ms. Frazier inquired the size of the shortened median.

Mr. Hagerty stated that it would be 20 feet.

Ms. Gerhart inquired if it would be possible to plant on the median.

Mr. Hagerty responded that it is possible, but the options are more limited as the ends must still accommodate visibility and errant tires.

Mr. Luikart stated that he likes the road narrowing of option 8B, the fact that cars in both directions would need to deflect somewhat. If the bulbs are narrowed, though, does a parked car protrude beyond the narrowed bulb?

Ms. Wawzkiewicz responded that usually the length is the same as a car length.

Mr. Luikart summarized the December 16th meeting with the 8-10 residents who had petitioned the Task Force to re-evaluate the loss of on-street parking spaces occurring with option 7 of the proposed traffic-calming plan. They reviewed options 8A and 8B.

Mr. Samuelson noted that Option 8B provides more parking spaces, but it would have less impact on speed reduction.

Mr. Luikart stated that ideas that came out of the 12-16-04 meeting were incorporated in an 8-C version to review at this Task Force meeting. This option would provide 49 spaces. They requested the opinions of residents in attendance.

Mr. Sarych responded that 8B was the option of choice at the site meeting. It is anticipated that 8C would also be acceptable. It would lose a few parking spots, but is a good balance of traffic calming with on-street parking.

Ms. O'Brien stated that Option C loses three spots across from Literary Lane, which would force them to use their neighbors' parking spots.

Scott Timmerman, 5705 Tara Hill Drive, stated that his is one of the houses across from Literary Lane. Although Option C eliminates the parking, no one uses those parking places. He is more concerned about the loss of parking in the more dense area. The lost spaces near the corner lots of Conquistador and Adventure are not significant.

Mr. Hammersmith stated that there is a fire hydrant there. Those parking spaces probably do not exist in reality. The house across the street is a corner lot. The parking space there is adjacent to its sideyard, so would likely not be used by the homeowner.

Ms. O'Brien stated that the only resident who would use the space is the one at the corner of Literary and Tara Hill. If his neighbors do not have on-street parking, they are pushed to his side of the street next to his sideyard.

Mr. Samuelson stated that the parking spots are theoretical. The issue for the Task Force is even if the current resident does not express a need for parking, is it the Task Force's intent to provide the option for future residents of that home?

Mr. Lecklider stated that he appreciates the thought of future potential, but if the present residents have not seen a need for on-street parking, it is likely future residents would find the conditions similar.

Ms. O'Brien stated that the plan shows the curb as shortened on Tara Hill at Literary Lane. Doesn't that return a parking space? Would there still be a loss of two spaces?

Ms. Gerhart stated that even if the current resident indicates they would not be impacted by the loss of on-street parking in front of their home, it is important to consider re-sale value of the homes and future residents of those homes.

Mr. Luikart stated that the Task Force cannot evaluate the parking for every house on the street, therefore, it is necessary to set some general guidelines or criteria for the provision of on-street parking spots.

Mr. Lecklider noted that there are many streets where there has never been parking on more than one side of the street.

Patricia Kuntz, 5711 Tara Hill Drive, stated that she does not understand Mr. Lecklider's suggestion that the City would be justified in removing parking on one side of the street from Tara Hill residents on the basis that there are streets that have never had parking on both sides of the streets. Is he suggesting that all locations should be uniform – if one place does not have something, another location should not?

Mr. Hammersmith responded that Mr. Lecklider was offering a gauge of general trend to use in the discussion. This is useful because the Task Force is trying to provide direction to the traffic consultant regarding the number of typical parking spaces provided per household. They are looking for a benchmark to use.

Mr. Luikart inquired if an estimated ratio exists for recommended number of parking spaces per household.

Ms. Wawzkiewicz responded that presently the estimated trend on Tara Hill is 3.4 parking spaces per household. With Concept 7, the ratio would be 1.7/household; with option 8A, the ratio would be 3.3/household; with option 8B, it is 4.0/household; with option 8C, it is 3.1 spaces/household.

Mr. Lecklider inquired if a general count of vehicles parked on Tara Hill on a daily basis has been taken.

Ms. Wawzkiewicz estimated 8-10 vehicles.

Discussion continued regarding development of criteria for provision of parking spaces.

Mr. Hammersmith stated that the reason there is a need for traffic calming on Tara Hill Drive is the width of the street – it is approximately 36 feet wide. In order to do traffic calming the street must be narrowed, which means some parking will be sacrificed. A determination must be made as to how many spaces are necessary and would actually be used. He added that, if they were to be built today, many of the 36-ft wide streets within the City would be constructed at 28 feet wide with parking on one side – for instance, Tullymore. If it were 28-feet wide, there would not be the discussion today over traffic calming and speed enforcement. The City has never implemented traffic calming on 28-ft wide streets because they do not have speeding problems. What is typical and successful in the rest of the community is parking on one side of the street. If the Task Force would like staff to calculate the number of parking spaces per household that is also typical, that can be done.

Mr. Sarych stated that there may be some streets in Dublin that have restricted parking on one side of the street, but not in this area.

Mr. Hammersmith responded that if the traffic calming is tailored in favor of on-street parking, then it is difficult to justify the cost of the traffic calming. It may not be worth doing.

Ms. Gerhart suggested that if Task Force members cannot disagree on this segment of Tara Hill, can't another phase be completed first?

Ms. Frazier noted that it would be essential for Council to buy into the entire plan to give approval. That would put the plan at risk. The Task Force is here today because the residents want a traffic-calming plan. It is essential to work out the balance, and that can be accomplished.

Ms. O'Brien requested that the area on Tara Hill by The Athenry not be included in the calculations for that segment, as it is a no parking area.

Mr. Sarych noted that the problem with making a decision based upon the average need in an area is that it does not address the times where there are scout meetings, birthday and graduation parties, etc. There are many times when the residents have events in their lives that significantly reduced parking would create a problem for them.

Mr. Luikart stated that the Task Force will attempt to achieve a balance. He suggested that the Task Force develop criteria based upon a "spaces per section" basis.

Mr. Samuelson noted that the last option gives 3.1 parking spaces per household. Therefore, setting a number of 2 would give the consultants some latitude to work with; setting it a three would give them no latitude.

Mr. Luikart inquired how large a section is.

Ms. Wawzkiewicz stated that it could be determined in various ways. For her studies, she divided the street into sections of 25 houses.

Ms. Frazier stated that she would rather use a per driveway basis. What is the typical lot width?

Mr. Hammersmith stated that on Tara Hill, the average lot is 70-75 feet wide.

Ms. Frazier suggested defining a section as two lots.

Ms. Willis suggested that it be larger than that – 140 feet would be consumed in an intersection.

Ian Harris, 5577 Tara Hill Drive, stated that he lives at the intersection with Earnestway. He inquired if everyone is comfortable with the fact that the future Post Road diversion will add "only" 200 cars per day to Tara Hill Drive. He evidently missed the meeting where that was discussed as this meeting is merely "haggling" about who gets what spot. It appears the whole effort tonight is deflected to discussing the number of parking spaces when the real issue is preventing the amount of traffic on Tara Hill from increasing above 4,000 cars/day. How did we

get diverted to this discussion? To him the critical issue is if “200” is a realistic number. How was it arrived at and what data backs it up?

Mr. Hammersmith stated that the number is realistic. It was arrived at in an extensive traffic study and review that was completed for the Coffman Park Expansion Task Force by another traffic consultant. Although Zande & Assoc. did not go back and verify that number, they reviewed how the number was arrived at. Those who were also present during the Coffman Park Expansion Task Force study recall the extensive discussion that occurred regarding that number. It is the best that science can produce. The traffic engineer who conducted that study is typically conservative, as is City staff.

Mr. Harris inquired how many cars per day travel Post Road?

Mr. Hammersmith responded that he did not have traffic volumes committed to memory.

Mr. Harris inquired how he could find the traffic study report containing those numbers.

Mr. Hammersmith stated that Engineering has the study. He will have that information forwarded directly to Mr. Harris.

Mr. Luikart directed the discussion back to the issue of criteria for parking spaces.

Ms. Wawzkiewicz suggested that an average number of spaces per driveway or per household be determined with a goal for a certain number per 1,000 feet.

Mr. Luikart inquired the length of Tara Hill Drive.

Ms. Wawzkiewicz responded that it is approximately 5,900 feet.

Mr. Luikart suggested that it be divided into seven sections.

Thomas Buchan, 5729 Tara Hill Drive, stated that Option 8C appeared to be the more desirable option, depending on what the Task Force decided to do per driveway or per section. He inquired if there was the potential for Option 8C to be revised.

Mr. Luikart stated that 8C offers a lower number of parking spaces than the others – 49 parking spaces. So, is Mr. Buchan indicating that 49 spaces or above would be acceptable?

Mr. Buchan responded that more, of course, would be preferable.

Mr. Luikart inquired if the ratio of Option 8C is 3.1 spaces and the street today is 3.4, is there any latitude for the traffic consultants to work with to provide traffic calming?

Mr. Samuelson responded that he would suggest a lower number for that reason.

Ms. O'Brien stated that as long as the plan does not compromise traffic calming for the entire street in any section, anything is fair. Traffic calming cannot take a back seat to parking options.

Mr. Luikart stated that the Task Force was happy with Concept 7, with the exception of this one section.

Ms. Frazier stated that she believes the Task Force should take a close look at the conditions for each house.

Mr. Luikart stated that what the Task Force would do is request a concept based upon the numbers given. The Task Force would then look at that concept plan for specific difficulties for any of the homes.

Mr. Hammersmith agreed.

Ms. Wawzkiewicz stated that under the current status, the theoretical number of parking spots for this section is 4.9 spaces per driveway. Task Force members discussed whether the criteria should be based on a per driveway basis or a per house basis. Consensus was to base it upon a per driveway basis. Following discussion the preferred ratio for the street was set at 2.0 parking spaces per driveway.

Timeline for Indirect Traffic Calming

Ms. Willis stated that at the last meeting, the Task Force had requested a timeline for other indirect traffic calming projects. They are as follows:

- Signalization of Muirfield Drive/Sells Mills Drive Intersection – The intersection is close to meeting a warrant. The intersection will be monitored until it meets the requirement, at which time a project will be designed.
- Muirfield Drive/Tara Hill Drive Intersection – Through signal timing, this can be made an indirect traffic calming measure. Zande & Associates are working on this.

Ms. O'Brien inquired if this also includes Post, Coffman and Emerald?

Ms. Willis responded that it does. Traffic movement will be facilitated from Emerald southbound, across the bridge and down to I-270.

- Avery-Muirfield Drive/Tullymore/Valleystream – a study is planned for 2005 to determine how to facilitate using Valleystream to access Muirfield Drive, rather than using Tara Hill
- Avery Muirfield/Post Road Left Turn – The design is planned for the redirection of Post Road for 2005, and that is the caveat for implementing the southbound left to Post Road.

Ms. O'Brien stated that if the design occurs in 2005, the construction wouldn't be completed for a couple of years.

Mr. Hammersmith stated that the intent is, if possible, to accelerate that timeframe so that the redirection of Post Road can occur sooner, but with the other projects that are scheduled, it would be difficult to accomplish.

Ms. O'Brien inquired why the intersection could not be completed sooner and the left turn permitted before the redirection of Post Road is complete.

Mr. Hammersmith stated the reason the implementation of the left turn would be timed with the redirection of Post Road is that condition was included in the plan recommended by the Coffman Park Expansion Task Force to Council. That restriction was made because the Post Road residents were concerned that the left turn would increase traffic volume on Post Road.

Ms. Gerhart inquired how many residents that restriction was made on behalf of – 4?

Mr. Hammersmith stated that Council adopted that recommendation, and that is what staff is presently obligated to follow. If the Task Force disagrees with that recommendation, they can make Council aware of their opinions.

Ms. O'Brien stated that would be valuing the wishes of maybe a handful of residents on Post Road over about 200 residents on Tara Hill.

Task Force members expressed consensus.

Ms. Gerhart stated that if the Post Road left turn does not occur until after the construction of the redirection, during the construction traffic will be further increased on Tara Hill.

Ms. Frazier inquired if it would be appropriate for the Tara Hill Task Force to include in their recommendation to Council the recommendation that the left turn activation precede the redirection of Post Road.

Ms. O'Brien requested Mr. Lecklider's opinion. Could the Task Force include in the proposal the recommendation that the intersection be implemented before the redirection of Post Road to re-train motorists to use Post Road.

Ms. Wray added that an important consideration is that once the outside intersections are working as intended, the traffic volume on Tara Hill may diminish and less traffic calming would be needed.

Ms. Gerhart inquired if it would be inappropriate to include the recommendation that Council reconsider delaying the left turn until after the redirection of Post Road. Can't Council reject certain recommendations, if they choose, without jeopardizing the entire proposal? At least the record would reflect that the Task Force is concerned that the Post left turn could significantly impact Tara Hill traffic and the traffic calming needs.

Ms. O'Brien stated that it is consistent with the Task Force's focus to point out that the left turn could provide traffic calming for Tara Hill. Therefore, the need for and the cost of Tara Hill traffic calming could be less.

Mr. Luikart stated that he would not like to think that the next traffic calming task force could conclude that the work of this task force should be undone. If Council adopts a task force plan, that task force should be able to trust Council's action.

Ms. Gerhart stated that even if Council's practice is not to amend its decisions, for the record, this Task Force should formally express their consensus that this should be done.

Ms. O'Brien added that because it could improve the current Tara Hill traffic problem and cut the cost of the Tara Hill traffic-calming project, it should at least be on the record.

Mr. Hammersmith stated that the Coffman Park Expansion Task Force recommendation was also based upon the traffic study that was completed for them.

Ms. Gerhart stated that it is hard for Tara Hill residents to understand the reasoning that traffic should not turn left on Post Road but it is fine for traffic to turn left on Tara Hill. Wouldn't the Task Force be doing a disservice to our constituents not to state our disagreement, for the record?

Mr. Luikart suggested that the discussion be resumed at the time the recommendation is being developed.

Mr. Lecklider stated that the Task Force members are stating the obvious. It did not go unsaid when the Coffman Park Expansion Task Force recommendation was under review. Therefore, if the Task Force wants to re-state that, they could do so. However, in reference to the comment that indirect traffic calming could reduce the need for a certain portion of the proposed traffic calming, it is impossible to evaluate what will occur over time, such as development and school redistricting. In 5-10 years, perhaps no traffic calming will be needed on Tara Hill. There has been discussion about massive development in the north or northwest -- 7,000 homes outside our jurisdiction. If the Task Force were to disband now and meet again in 5 – 8 years, perhaps the discussion would be completely different.

Mr. Luikart stated that he preferred to achieve the most traffic calming possible through this plan. Then, if indirect calming also occurs, the situation only improves.

Ms. Frazier stated that in her opinion, even if the development does occur, it will not diminish the traffic to the point that no traffic calming is needed.

Mr. Samuelson stated that even though the southbound left from Muirfield to Post Road could divert some traffic from Tara Hill, it would be more than offset by the redirection of Post Road. That change is expected to increase the traffic on Tara Hill Drive.

Ms. Willis resumed the indirect traffic calming projects report.

- Signalization of Coffman and Brand Road intersection. A signal is presently not warranted. It is not entirely within the City corporation limits. A roundabout may be a possibility at this location.
- Coffman Road/Tara Hill, Coffman Road/Emerald Parkway, Emerald Parkway/Post Road. These intersections cover the traffic movement from Cardinal Health to I-270 via SR 161. Tara Hill and Coffman Road will be taken out of the corridor by making it more difficult to use Tara Hill Drive as a cut through.

License Plate Survey

Mr. Samuelson stated that these surveys are expensive endeavors. He displayed schematics which showed where license plates would be recorded as they entered/exited the area. Option A would include a survey of the Sells Mill Dr./Adventure Dr./Shady Nelms/Tara Hill Dr. area. That survey would cost \$8,300. At the December meeting, there was also discussion concerning including a license plate survey of traffic using the Downpatrick entrance to the Recreation Center. That survey would cost \$3,400. Following discussion, consensus of the Task Force was that both surveys are necessary. The combined cost would be \$10,575

Mr. Samuelson stated the surveys would be conducted in three time periods – AM peak hour, school dismissal hour, PM commuter peak hour.

Ms. O'Brien inquired if those would be the preferred survey hours for Downpatrick. Use of the Recreation Center is highest in the morning and evening.

Ms. Wray stated that student traffic is high in the AM and mid afternoon on Downpatrick, so the suggested hours should be appropriate.

Mr. Samuelson stated that their morning survey would begin around 6:45 am.

Cost Comparison for Other Traffic Calming Projects

Ms. Willis stated that the Task Force requested a cost comparison of other traffic calming projects completed by the City. Some examples are:

- Southwest Area, Phase 2, in 2001 - \$804,030
- Southwest Area, Phase 3, in 2002 -- \$696,000
- Muirfield/Brand Road Roundabout -- \$1,419,471
- Southwest Area, Phase 4, in 2003 -- \$728,635

Ms. Willis noted that the above projects included an extensive amount of landscaping.

Ms. Willis stated that a specific project cost would be the speed bumps on Martin Road. Six humps were constructed; at \$3,000 each, that would be \$18,000. On Monterrey Drive, the speed humps project cost around \$6,000/hump.

Mr. Luikart inquired if there was a way to use a balancing ratio, such as the number of households benefited.

Ms. Willis stated that there are over 300 residents in Heather Glen alone, and the southwest encompasses a greater area than that.

Mr. Hammersmith stated that the southwest area is bordered on the south by Tuttle Road, on the east by Emerald Parkway, on the west by Avery Road, and on the north by Shier Rings. A comparison according to number of homes benefited would be difficult to use. For some projects, the beneficiaries are those on a specific street. For others, it would be more dispersed.

Draft Status Report for Council

Ms. Willis noted that the report is only a draft for the Task Force to use as a starting point. It can be revised as the Task Force wishes. The report is not complete. The additional budget requirement needs to be developed. The funds for the traffic consultant have been depleted. There have been twice the number of meetings anticipated. The additional meetings in 2005 that will be necessary to complete the final recommendation for Council and the cost of the license plate survey will need to be included in a request for additional funds to Council.

Ms. Willis suggested that the status report could be ready for the February 7 Council meeting.

Mr. Luikart will present the report to Council.

Mr. Hammersmith stated that after the budget information has been compiled, Ms. Willis will email a final draft of the status report to the task for approval.

The Task Force discussed the timeline for completing the Task Force tasks, which include: Review of revised concept plan by the Task Force; preparation of final, revised plan; presentation of plan to community for final input; presentation of final package for Council; presentation to Council.

Ms. O'Brien inquired if the final plan should be presented to the study area or the affected area.

Mr. Hammersmith stated that it would suffice to present it to the affected area.

Mr. Hammersmith noted that one question is whether Council requires a second petition process to gain 85% community input. His view is that the Task Force has served in lieu of the City's Traffic Calming Plan, which requires the survey to ensure there is 85% community support for the plan. However, Council may disagree and believe it is important to canvass the area again.

Mr. Luikart stated that a second petition could push the plan approval out one more year.

Mr. Lecklider stated that on February 7, Council may want to know the total amount expended by the Task Force to date, so the staff and Task Force members should have that information on hand.

Next Meetings/Next Steps

Following discussion, the Task Force established the following meeting schedule for 2005.

- February 2, 2005
- February 16, 2005
- March 9, 2005
- March 23, 2005 (tentative)
- April 13, 2005
- May 2, 2005 – Presentation to Council

The meeting was adjourned at 9:35 p.m.

Submitted by:

Deputy Clerk of Council