



City of Broken Arrow

Legislation Details (With Text)

File #: 20-1236 **Name:**
Type: Presentations **Status:** Agenda Ready
File created: 9/29/2020 **In control:** Broken Arrow City Council
On agenda: 10/6/2020 **Final action:**
Title: Presentation of the City of Broken Arrow Traffic Calming Device Policy with respect to ongoing street habilitation projects in association with general obligation bond programs and street sales tax program
Sponsors:
Indexes:
Code sections:
Attachments:

Date	Ver.	Action By	Action	Result
------	------	-----------	--------	--------

**Broken Arrow City Council
Meeting of: 10/06/20**

Title: Presentation of the City of Broken Arrow Traffic Calming Device Policy with respect to ongoing street habilitation projects in association with general obligation bond programs and street sales tax program

Background:
In 2008, the City of Broken Arrow for the first time included a residential street habilitation component to the community's general obligation bond program. During the first few neighborhood engagement meetings initiated with the impacted residents before the commencement of construction, some of the first questions from the residents regarded the traffic calming devices (speed humps). In those meetings, residents quickly voiced their displeasure of the traffic calming devices placed in their neighborhoods. Those present loudly voiced that they wanted the devices removed. In the very first meeting, Staff stated that they could remove them from the construction plans. However, Staff clearly stated that if a resident desired to have the devices re-installed and the traffic and conditions met the requirements as defined in the Traffic Calming Policy, then the device would be re-installed. The residents present understood that criteria.

This situation occurred a couple of more times regarding other subdivision street rehabilitation programs. Staff met with previous City Administration and discuss the matter in detail. It was decided to leave the devices out of the public construction contract for that reason as well as a few other reasons. If the residents desired for the devices to be re-installed, then the City would quickly perform the analysis to ensure that the current traffic conditions still warranted the traffic calming devices.

A couple of other factors considered in the original decision included the placement of the devices during construction would create an additional and unnecessary obstacle. Also, to include the work in a public construction contract was probably not the best use of funds since the cost for a Contractor to place the asphalt was significantly higher than for the City to perform the work.

It should be noted that in the all of the subdivisions where these devices have been removed only a small

fraction have been requested to be reinstalled.

Lastly, Staff does certainly believe that there are extenuating circumstances that warrant the re-installation of these devices. In locations where a school is near or in subdivision where there is a wide residential collector street with a long straight run, it most likely makes good sense to re-install the devices after the completion of construction with City crews.

Cost: None

Funding Source: N/A

Requested By: Kenneth D. Schwab, P.E., CFM, Assistant City Manager - Operations

Approved By: City Manager's Office

Attachments: None

Recommendation:

As Directed by Council.