



CITY OF WAUWATOSA
TRAFFIC AND SAFETY COMMITTEE
MINUTES • FEBRUARY 11, 2014

Regular Meeting

Committee Room #1

7:00 PM

7725 West North Avenue, Wauwatosa, WI 53213

TRAFFIC AND SAFETY COMMITTEE ITEMS

Attendee Name	Title	Status	Arrived
James Moldenhauer	Alderman	Present	
Jeffrey Roznowski	Alderman	Present	
Dennis McBride	Alderman	Present	
Bobby Pantuso	Alderman	Present	
Jason Wilke	Alderman	Present	
William Porter	Public Works Director	Present	
James Archambo	City Administrator	Present	
Elizabeth Hilt	Program Analyst	Present	

1. Memo from the Director of Public Works regarding a traffic calming policy

The committee reviewed a memo from the Director of Public Works regarding a traffic calming policy.

Mr. Porter said over the past several years when the committee has had to look at neighborhood traffic issues there has only been one tool in the tool box to use, whether to put up a stop sign or not. Over the past year, recent direction to staff has been to look at different options. One of the options that has been discussed extensively is traffic calming methodology which encompasses a lot of different things.

The overarching effect is physical improvements to the street, to mitigate traffic speed, cut-through traffic, accompanied by education, enforcement, encouragement and engineering. Mr. Porter said before you make any physical improvements, Phase I of the program will be used to mitigate traffic concerns.

Last year the city purchased some portable speed tables and had a pilot project which demonstrated some effectiveness in slowing down traffic. The committee directed Mr. Porter to draft a Traffic Calming policy and bring back to committee. This would be modeled somewhat with the policy in effect in the City of Milwaukee.

Mr. Porter said he broke the policy up into several discussion points in order to get feedback from the committee. A formal policy will then be put together and brought back to committee for approval.

Decision #1

What percentage of resident participation is necessary to start Phase I Traffic Calming Procedures?

- Those who live on the street or those who responded?
- One vote per property?
- Are renters' part of the discussion?
- Residents

The committee discussed and provided this feedback:

- Requests handled on a case by case basis, one person can't speak for the neighborhood
- Alderperson notified on request
- Requestor must be advocate and gather petitions from the neighbors, they must take on some of the responsibility themselves
- Milwaukee template is a good template to work with
- Petition should be presented before staff spends a lot of time on issue

- One vote per household, including renters; don't forget the value of the subjective
- The value of subjectivity should be considered in lieu of a percentage of required numbers for a petition; must be on a case by case basis
- The alderperson can be the chief advocate compiling evidence to bring an item forward

Decision #2

Phase I Traffic Calming Measure Request Form

- (Shown on page 4 of Milwaukee's manual) Should staff develop a similar form to utilize for the City's requests?

The committee discussed and provided this feedback:

- Form similar to what the City of Milwaukee uses with the inclusion of the district and alderperson
- Form should be made available online/fillable if possible
- Map linking from the form if possible on website

Decision #3

Assessments

- Are any costs assessed for initiation and completion of Phase 1 actions?
- If so, what percentage of final costs?

The committee discussed and provided this feedback:

- No charge for Phase I 'soft costs'

Decision #4

Points of contact

- Who should accept requests for neighborhood traffic management improvement requests?
 - City Staff
 - Alderperson
 - Both

The committee discussed and provided this feedback:

- Both alderman and staff will receive requests and communicate to each other

Decision #5

Is the methodology defined on page 2, points 2-4 of appendix A acceptable?

- Highlights
 - After request form is received, DPW staff determine affected area and impacted area.
 - Provide requestor with map of impacted area and a blank petition, on which they must receive signatures from 50% of property owners in the impacted area.
 - After petition is received, DPW will obtain project site data and work with local alderpersons to plan a neighborhood meeting.

The committee discussed and provided this feedback:

- Requests handled on a first come first served basis unless there is a distressed area concern
- DPW will review the impact area traffic related
- DPW will update the Traffic & Safety committee on requests for their prioritization
- Policy to be put into place regarding the City's ability to grant or deny requests dependent on the available equipment, time and order of requests

Decision #6

Is the methodology defined on pages 2-3, points 5-7 acceptable?

- Highlights
 - DPW works with neighborhood to devise a Proposed Neighborhood Traffic Management

- Plan?
 - DPW will assist interested community members of the neighborhood in implementing Phase 1 of the non-construction related elements of the plan.
 - After a determined time period, DPW will evaluate the effectiveness of the non-construction related elements of the Phase 1 plan and present them to local alderpersons.
- Time frame for such evaluation? 6 months? One year?

The committee discussed and provided this feedback:

- Availability of staff time and resources - no set timeframe
- When funds are available a plan will be started or if the neighborhood comes up with the funds they would be a priority

Decision #7

(Point 8 of Appendix A) Phase II Engineering solutions

- Milwaukee's policy recovers 90% of the "hard" costs
- No recovery is made for staff time associated with Phase I costs or "soft" costs associated with Phase II ("soft" costs refer to costs associated with studies, neighborhood meetings, and administrative overhead).
- Is this approach acceptable? (reference Appendix B for Milwaukee's special assessment policy)

The committee discussed and provided this feedback:

- Staff requested to find out how the City of Milwaukee came up with the 90% figure
- 100% of hard costs recovery suggested since there are no funds to pay the remaining 10% of the cost, this could insure that the residents are really serious about their request

Decision #8

In lieu of special assessments, staff recommends utilizing special billings for Phases I and II improvements.

- Invoice as we do for other services in the City, such as special pick-ups, and if invoice is un-paid, it would be applied to their tax bill.

The Finance Director and City Attorney did not recommend billing through the special assessment program as it is a cumbersome process; a special billing was suggested to be paid up front. This way the City is protected if the resident didn't pay.

The committee discussed and provided this feedback:

- Committee was in favor of billing through the special assessment program to help finance the expense
- Funding by the city in cases where City property is involved in the impacted area, but criteria must be established

Due to time constraints the last two points will be discussed at the next meeting.

Carla A. Ledesma, CMC, City Clerk