

## **Staff Report**

**June 23, 2004**

**TO:** City Council

**FROM:** Pat Fitzsimmons, City Engineer  
Roxanne Namazi, Senior Civil Engineer

**SUBJECT:** Request for Traffic Calming - Colgate Drive

---

### **Recommendation**

Approve staff's recommendation to not install traffic calming measures on Colgate Drive.

### **Fiscal Impact**

The new FY 04/05 Traffic Safety Measures budget is \$90,500 (Traffic Safety revenues). If two speed humps were installed, the cost would be about \$5,700.

### **Background**

At the May 18, 2004 meeting, Council directed staff to survey the Colgate Drive neighborhood for the installation of speed humps on their street. See attached Exhibit A for the location of existing signage and marking on Colgate Drive.

After comparing the traffic data and the survey results to the adopted Traffic Calming Policies and Guidelines, the current recommendation remains unchanged for the following reasons:

- The Colgate Drive's 29 mph critical speed is below the guideline (32 mph):
  - Adherence to the guidelines avoids subjective application of traffic calming devices.
  - Adherence to the guidelines avoids the proliferation of unnecessary devices.
  - Adherence to the guidelines avoids unnecessary expenditure of the traffic calming budget.
- There are no unusual or deficient traffic conditions on Colgate Drive:
  - Street visibility is good.
  - Street signage is good.

- The school crosswalk is in good condition, very visible and has the appropriate signage and marking.
  - Observing parent drop off and pick up periods indicates no traffic circulation problems or pedestrian safety problems.
  - Observing the traffic on numerous occasions indicates no traffic problems or safety concerns that need correction.
- If speed humps are installed on Colgate Drive, traffic will very likely be diverted to Duke Drive resulting in a similar request and probably a similar traffic data result.

Most Colgate Drive residents did not feel this was an important issue (19 of 28 either did not respond or did not favor). However, the majority of those residents returning their surveys favored speed humps (9 of 13 responses).

| Survey Results (28 Mailed)         |                   |          |         |
|------------------------------------|-------------------|----------|---------|
|                                    | Total             | Yes Vote | No Vote |
| Returned Surveys                   | 13                | 9        | 4       |
| Policies & Guidelines Requirements | 50% minimum or 14 | 10 min.  | n/a     |

Following is a summary of the traffic data collected:

|                | Colgate Dr. | Guideline         | Meets Guideline? |
|----------------|-------------|-------------------|------------------|
| Daily Vehicles | 1,200       | 500 min.          | Yes              |
| Critical Speed | 29 mph      | 32 mph or greater | No               |

The critical speed guideline is a very important threshold because most local streets probably have a critical speed close to 30 mph.

If the Council decides to install speed humps on Colgate Drive, staff suggests working with the Safety Advisory Commission to review the current Policies and Guidelines and perhaps revise them to be more in keeping with the Council priorities.

rn/eb

Attachment: Exhibit A

c: Kevin Wolf

j:\pw\trn\sac.mb\staffprt\ccsr.colgate(2).pf.doc