



Environmental Quality and Public Works Committee Meeting
June 16, 2015
Summary and Motions

Vice Chair Stinnett called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m. Committee Members Kay, Moloney, J. Brown, Gibbs, Evans, F. Brown, Mossotti, and Lane were in attendance. Chair Farmer was absent.

I. Approval of Committee Summary

A motion was made by Mossotti to approve the May 19, 2015 Environmental Quality & Public Works Committee Summary, seconded by F. Brown. The motion passed without dissent

II. Neighborhood Traffic Management Program (NTMP)

Roger Mulvaney presented recent revisions made to the Neighborhood Traffic Management Program (NTMP). He explained that the NTMP was created in 2000 to establish traffic calming standards, and the recent revisions provide for clear and consistent policies. Major changes to the NTMP include the establishment of timelines for the review of petitions, and removal of cost sharing options for certain traffic calming measures.

Gibbs inquired why cost sharing programs for neighborhoods are being removed. Stinnett clarified that the proposal would not cut all funding for the traffic calming devices, but would eliminate the cost sharing program. Mulvaney stated that speed tables are amenities not necessarily prescribed by federal or state agencies. Mulvaney noted that the devices slow response times for emergency vehicles and can move issues onto adjacent streets. Gibbs stated that neighborhoods should have the option, and that removal of cost sharing impacts neighborhood safety.

Lamb inquired about the difference between local residential streets and residential collector streets. Mulvaney replied local streets are intended for access points, such as driveways. Collectors balance access and traffic volume.

Lamb asked about the criteria for evaluation of installing a four-way stop. Mulvaney stated that the proximity of a potential multi-way stop to existing stops is evaluated as one factor that may discourage a new multi-way stop from being built. Lamb noted that there are two elementary schools in her district with serious traffic issues and asked if Traffic Engineering coordinates with Fayette County Schools regarding traffic issues. Mulvaney stated that coordination effort typically occur during land development planning. Lamb also stated she has issues with the loss of the cost-sharing program and its effect on traffic calming.

Bledsoe inquired if they are trying to discourage neighborhoods from using Type II & III options for traffic calming. Mulvaney stated they are not trying to discourage these options, but rather make the point that they are more of an amenity and are expensive to install and maintain; he also noted these options are not mandated by the Federal Highway Administration. Dowell Hoskins-Squier stated that there are very few speed tables in the city, and noted that they do not want to have speed tables all over the city. Squier stated that speed tables reduce driving speeds but there are other effective options, including painting white edge lines and working with Police for enforcement. Bledsoe stated her agreement with the need for enforcement and inquired if Type I is as effective as Type II & III. Squier stated they could provide some studies about the various types which would not be specific to Lexington. Bledsoe stated this would be important to show the public.

Mossotti inquired about the difference between a ballot petition and a regular petition. Mulvaney replied that a regular petition results in a study of the request; if those findings warrant a traffic calming device, they follow up with a ballot petition to the addresses on the prior petition. Mossotti inquired if the ballot petition is sent by registered mail. Mulvaney stated they are sent through USPS. Mossotti inquired if only homeowners are considered in a petition. Mulvaney replied that for a Type II or III the petition is limited to homeowners, but for a Type I all residents are petitioned because those measures are not likely to affect property values.

Akers inquired about the previous deadlines for the review of initial petitions. Mulvaney stated there was not an established timeline and that the revisions to the NTMP establish deadlines. In response to a question from Akers, Mulvaney responded that there is no deadline for returning ballots. Akers stated her agreement with Gibbs regarding the importance of the cost sharing program. Akers inquired what the NTMP budget for speed tables has been for the past few years. Mulvaney stated past budgets are approximately \$25,000. Akers inquired how much of that budget they have spent. Mulvaney stated most of the budget has been spent on signs. Akers asked how much has been used for Type II & III, to which Mulvaney replied they have not installed these since at least 2013.

In response to a question from Akers, Mulvaney stated that NTMP funds will be utilized for Type I measures. Akers stated she has been working to get speed humps on Ash Street and stated that without the cost sharing the community will not be able to afford the speed humps. Akers stated she feels the policy favors wealthy neighborhoods.

Evans inquired if existing speed humps will be replaced with speed tables. Mulvaney stated if Type II and III meet warrants, there would be not be any legal obligation that the City or neighborhood installs them. Meeting warrants allows, but does not require, the installation of traffic calming measures. Mulvaney stated he would report back to Council about the replacement of existing humps.

F. Brown stated his concern for traffic flow and inquired if Type II & III would affect collector streets. Mulvaney stated they may not be used on Collector streets. F. Brown asked about the

process to initiate a study for a traffic calming option. Mulvaney stated that, to warrant a study, signatures are required for at least 65% of the properties listed; for a stop sign to be studied they need 65% within 500 feet from a proposed multi-way-stop intersection; for a speed limit study they require 65% of the entire street to be studied. There was further conversation about these requirements as they relate to connector streets.

Kay asked for clarification about the petition process and Mulvaney provided an overview. Kay stated he has an issue with unreturned ballot cards being counted as “no” responses, noting that it unfairly weights the decision. Kay stated he feels it is a mistake to remove the cost sharing program.

In response to a question from Stinnett, Mulvaney stated there is not a specified maintenance budget for traffic calming devices within Traffic Engineering, and maintenance funds would be located within Streets & Roads’ budget. Mulvaney stated Traffic Engineering repairs the speed cushions and Streets and Roads maintains the others. Stinnett stated that lower income neighborhoods cannot afford the cost sharing program, anyway, and the proposal does not say it will not fund speed tables. Stinnett stated Council can fund speed tables at their discretion. Stinnett stated that it was complicated and difficult for neighborhoods to use the cost sharing program in the first place.

Lamb inquired about speed cushions. Mulvaney stated that speed cushions are no longer utilized due to maintenance requirements, and described maintenance issues.

Akers inquired if the Council advocates for devices if that would interfere with Traffic Engineering’s approval process. Squier stated that the policies will remain the same with the exception of the cost sharing language. Mulvaney noted that Council funding a studied and recommended device does not circumvent the process, but supports it.

There was further discussion about adding additional funding for traffic calming devices during the budget process.

III. Traffic Signal System

Dowell Hoskins-Squier provided an overview of the existing traffic signal system. She stated that there are a total of 377 signalized intersections in Fayette County, of which 137 are owned by the LFUCG, and all signals are maintained by the LFUCG. Squier reviewed signal structure types and installation costs, as well as maintenance costs and priorities. There are significant wiring and infrastructure deterioration issues at over 40 LFUCG owned intersections. Squier reviewed new technologies being utilized, as well as improvements included in the FY16 Mayor’s Proposed Budget.

Mossotti inquired about increasing the time to cross busy intersections and Squier stated that Council can forward those requests for review to Traffic Engineering at any time. Squier informed the Council about the Mayor's recent Safer People, Safer Streets initiative.

Lamb inquired if the information presented included lights other than stoplights. Squier stated flashing beacons and other measures were not included. Lamb inquired about the construction timeline for the six signalized intersection rebuilds. Squier noted that the department hopes to have all of them in some phase of design or construction within the next fiscal year. Lamb inquired about protocol and if Traffic Engineering will reach out to Council Members prior to construction. Squier stated they would.

Akers agreed with Lamb's request to be notified of construction timelines.

Stinnett inquired about the difference between types of signals and the methodology involved in choosing each type. Squier stated she would provide that information. Stinnett asked about the costs and benefits of intersection improvements. Squier stated they are working on quantifying the data.

IV. Division of Water Quality Projects Report

Charlie Martin provided an overview of active and planned projects.

Kay inquired about the plans for the appearance of the Lower Cane Run storage tank. Martin stated they are engaging stakeholder input and are compiling those suggestions. Kay inquired if they are seeking opportunities to make the space an attraction or otherwise enhance the community. Martin stated they are having those discussions and noted cost and maintenance considerations.

Akers inquired about the progress of the latest design ideas and Martin gave an update.

Moloney stated his desire to see the project progress to meet EPA deadlines and not to allow the aesthetics to detract from that goal, noting that a board or committee could be created to oversee aesthetic issues. In response to a question from Kay, Akers stated that there have been meetings since fall about the Lower Cane Run facility. Lane noted there have been many ideas expressed for the exterior in previous sessions. Moloney stated he feels there should be a committee put together to address the many upcoming opportunities, noting the tank on Richmond Road which will have similar concerns. Kay stated he feels that could be considered after this process is complete. Martin noted that addressing aesthetics separately is keeping the project on track.

V. Items Referred to Committee

A motion was made by Kay to remove Consolidate Greenway Responsibilities from Committee, seconded by Gibbs. The motion passed without dissent.

A motion was made by Kay to remove the Distillery District Update from Committee, seconded by F. Brown. The motion passed without dissent.

A motion was made by Mossotti to remove Streetlights analysis from Committee, seconded by Evans. The motion passed without dissent.

A motion was made by Evans to remove Todd's Road Widening Phase II from Committee, seconded by F. Brown. The motion passed without dissent.

A motion was made by F. Brown to remove Safe Routes to School from Committee, seconded by Gibbs. The motion passed without dissent.

A motion was made by Kay to remove Traffic Signal System from Committee, seconded by Gibbs. The motion passed without dissent.

A motion was made by Gibbs to remove Changing Signalized Intersections to Four Way Stops from Committee, seconded by Mossotti. The motion passed without dissent.

A motion was made by Gibbs to remove the Reduction of Speed Limit on Jouett Creek Drive from Committee, seconded by Lane. The motion passed without dissent.

A motion was made by Evans to adjourn, seconded by F. Brown. The motion passed without dissent.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:56 p.m.

DS 6-19-2015