

Traffic Calming Process Step	Topic	Potential Changes	Staff Discussion	Proposal
General	Program Purpose and Objectives	Revise objectives	Opportunity to update objectives to reflect the reality of the Traffic Calming Program.	See 'Alignment with Objectives' under 'Project Qualification' below.
		Resident Driven vs. Staff Driven approach	The existing Program places an emphasis on Traffic Calming as a resident driven approach. Staff are responsive to project areas that express interest in the Traffic Calming Program and available to help prospective petitioners as they prepare to circulate a petition in their neighborhood, however staff do not push Traffic Calming Projects forward where there is not neighborhood buy-in and interest in the Program. Due to the wide range of community views and reactions toward traffic calming devices, staff believe it is important to maintain the resident driven nature of the Program. Where staff identify safety concerns on a residential street, there are other avenues to pursue installation of necessary engineering retrofits, outside of the Traffic Calming Program.	Maintain the resident driven nature of the Program. Add objective: Empower residents to make their neighborhood streets safer through a resident-driven process
		A Vision Zero focus, emphasis on saving lives not just reducing speed.	Comparison research of Seattle, Boulder and Boston show an integration of traffic calming with Vision Zero principles. Seattle and Boulder achieve this by tying their traffic calming program to a Transportation Plan or Vision Zero Plan. The City of Ann Arbor foresees that the Transportation Plan update process will develop the city's implementation of Vision Zero and we anticipate the Traffic Calming Program will be part of it.	Staff see an opportunity to integrate the Traffic Calming Program with a Vision Zero focus through the City's Transportation Master Plan Update. Incorporating review of crash data in project area qualification also helps to achieve Vision Zero goals. Add objective: Use engineering best practices and stakeholder engagement to advance Vision Zero principles as adopted by City Council.
	Budget/funding	Additional funding needed for updated program (i.e., more project areas qualifying). Alternate funding source?	The Traffic Calming Program is funded by Act 51. Act 51 is the funding source for maintenance of the public right-of-way (ROW), including snow plowing, salting, pot hole patching, pavement surface treatments, etc. Changes to the Program which result in more qualified projects, will require additional funding expenditure. More funds spent from Act 51 on Traffic Calming means less funding will be available for other public ROW maintenance activities. The General Fund was used for the Traffic Calming Program when it was originally adopted. Could consider expanding the language in the Street Millage to include traffic calming as an eligible expenditure.	ACT51 is currently the most suitable funding source. Current budget will be maintained at present, \$30,000 annually. Additional budget requests can be made in future budget cycles.
		Purchase of temporary curbing for tactical urbanism practices (i.e., temporary placement of removable curb).	This would provide a low cost, temporary change to help residents visualize horizontal deflection.	Staff requests this be budgeted and purchased to support Traffic Calming Program activities. This budget request can be submitted in November 2018, for the 2020 Fiscal year.
		Communications budget - digital/electronic communications, videos, infographics	Materials and resources that clearly explain the program, process, toolbox of devices, etc. in a readily available and accessible format are needed.	Staff requests a communications budget for the Traffic Calming Program. This budget request can be submitted in November 2018, for the 2020 Fiscal year.
	Thresholds	<i>Speed Reduction Committee request - simplify and reduce thresholds in the 10-step process</i>	Project qualification thresholds would be reduced by switching to a qualification scoring approach (See 'Project area eligibility'). The qualification scoring approach would award points for various criteria on an incremental basis rather than an all or nothing approach. Thresholds for project approval (response rate and overall support) are low in comparison to peer communities. Staff believes there has been a misconception about the thresholds, often cited as a "supermajority." The City of Ann Arbor's two-step process for final survey assessment, including separate engagement and support thresholds, is intended to ensure adequate participation and overall buy-in from the affected community. Staff are willing to further lower the public support criteria and simplify the final survey assessment by eliminating the engagement criterion (see 'Public Support').	Use qualification scoring matrix to lower thresholds/allow more qualified projects. Reduce the public support criteria requirement. Eliminate engagement criteria.
	Program ownership and administration	Council authorize the Administrator, or the Administrator's designee, to manage and maintain the Program	The existing program, established by City Council resolution, does not leave flexibility for adaptation to new ideas and innovations. The current process includes City Council approval of each project area before construction and City Council approval of any Program updates. Efficiency could be gained by allowing the City Administrator, or designee, to manage and maintain the Program. This would also be more consistent with general City practices that City Council does not need to be involved with project review/approval for individual projects. Staff would move forward with construction for projects that meet the neighborhood support criteria. Staff would be able to make Program improvements as needed without seeking Council approval.	Request that Council authorize the Administrator, or the Administrator's designee, to manage and maintain the Program. This would remove the need for City Council approval of each individual Traffic Calming plan before construction and remove the need for City Council approval of new changes to the Program.

1. Petitions	Public Support	Move the higher level engagement criteria from final polling to petition, effectively increasing the criterion for the qualifying petition from 30% to 50%, and eliminating the 60% engagement previously required at final polling.	Moving the higher level engagement criteria from final polling to petition provides assurance that there is adequate interest among neighbors before investment of community time and staff resources. This also helps to simplify the process for the community by providing only one threshold for engagement level (i.e. where a percentage of responses are required from the project area), and overall lowers the engagement percentage required (previously 60% at time of final polling, proposed here as 50% at the project outset). Additionally, 50% project area signatures would be more consistent with peer communities evaluated.	Change the criterion for the qualifying petition from 30% to 50%, and eliminate the 60% engagement previously required at final polling (Also see Step 9. Second Survey). Use petition support as a qualification criteria to earn points on an incremental basis.
	Project area qualification	Qualification scoring criteria? Rolling application or application window? First come first served or prioritization?	A qualification scoring approach would award points on an incremental basis, instead of an "all-or-nothing" approach. This approach will allow more projects to meet the initial qualification for the Program. Staff do not recommend a prioritization ranking approach because of the potential for qualifying project areas to continually be left at the bottom of the list as they are bumped for higher priority areas. For each project area where qualifying conditions are met there should be a fair chance to work through the Traffic Calming Program. A defined application period is most relevant for a prioritization approach. If first come first served is maintained, then a defined application window doesn't seem to provide additional benefit.	Use qualification scoring matrix to lower thresholds/allow more qualified projects. Not recommending a prioritization approach at this time, maintain first come first served approach.
	Speed Criteria	Jack Rabbits (excessive speeding)	Data shows that no streets in the sample set (reference Nov. 2016 Response to R - 16 - 352) would qualify for the program at the proposed 5% of vehicles traveling in excess of 10 mph over the speed limit criterion. The criterion would need to be lowered to 1% to achieve any qualifying projects and this may not be a statistically valid amount of traffic on which to base a decision. Instead of considering excessive speeding, percent violators will provide a more meaningful criterion for broader inclusion.	Not recommending Jack Rabbits (excessive speeding) as a Traffic Calming Program qualification.
		Rush Hour Rushing (peak hour speeding)	Excessive speeding during AM and PM rush hours, was generally not observed for the streets evaluated (reference Nov. 2016 Response to R - 16 - 352). A peak hour criterion would likely have a minimal effect on the number of streets that qualify for the program based on the sample data analyzed.	Not recommending Rush Hour Rushing (peak hour speeding) as a Traffic Calming Program qualification.
		Directionality	A speeding problem in one direction and at any location is a sufficient warrant.	85th percentile of 30 mph in either or both directions and at any point within the identified project limits is valid as a Traffic Calming Program qualification.
		<i>Speed Reduction Committee request - reduce qualifying speed criteria</i>	85th percentile speed means 85% of vehicles go at or lower than the given speed limit, and 15% of vehicles go faster than the speed limit. Some comparison research shows lower speed criteria (For example, Boulder uses 85th percentile of 3 mph over legal speed). Staff encourage the community to recognize that the existing approach is intended to target the resources where speeding problems are of greatest concern. A lower qualifying speed criteria will likely result in more qualifying project areas, which may delay program execution for streets with higher level speeding concerns. A qualification scoring approach will allocate points for 85th percentile speed on an incremental basis, allowing streets with a less severe speeding problem to still earn some points toward qualification.	Maintain that 85th percentile speed of 30mph still achieves qualification as a stand alone criterion. Use a qualification scoring approach to award points on an incremental basis where some level of speeding is observed.
		Percent Violators	This criterion considers when the Ann Arbor Police Department (AAPD) would deploy resources for targeted enforcement. This provides an additional criterion to evaluate when speeding is an identified problem. Points would be allocated on an incremental basis for level of percent violator through the qualification scoring approach. If 50% of all vehicles on the road are in violation of the speed limit then the street qualifies for the Program.	50% of traffic in violation of the speed limit to be added as a stand alone criteria. Use a qualification scoring approach to award points on an incremental basis where some level of excessive violation is observed.
	Volume	Remove volume criterion	There is a speeding problem regardless of traffic volume. Removing the lower threshold volume criterion is consistent with a Vision Zero approach. We have not encountered a local street in the Traffic Calming Program that reached the upper threshold for volume. Rather than maintaining traffic volume requirements, a scoring approach is proposed to award points for traffic volume on an incremental basis.	Remove the volume criterion. Allocate points for traffic volume on an incremental basis through the qualification scoring approach.

2. Project Qualification	Roadway Classification	Change the street classification from current Act 51 based standard to National Functional Classification definition of a Local Street	This change allows the opportunity to evaluate a street based on the way it functions rather than the way it is classified for funding purposes. The National Functional Classification is a nation-wide system that is locally administered by MDOT. (click for map)	Change the street classification from current Act 51 based standard to National Functional Classification definition of a Local Street.	
	Vulnerable Users	Include program qualification criteria to emphasize importance of protecting vulnerable users	Demographic data (age) was considered but determined that defining census block groups for each project area would be difficult and demanding on staff time. Incorporating school travel and major pedestrian generators will help emphasize protection for vulnerable users.	Add 'school travel' and 'major pedestrian generators' as qualification criteria.	
	Alignment with Objectives	<i>Speed Reduction Committee Request - establish qualifying criteria aligned with the main objectives of the Program.</i>	Reduce the speed of vehicular traffic: Existing 85th percentile speed criteria achieves this. Adding a new criteria for percent violators also achieves this. Combine with other similar objectives to simplify.	Promote non-motorized transportation - the existing objective, "improve the safety and convenience of pedestrians and cyclists," is closely related to this objective. Revision should clarify that the Traffic Calming Program does not include installation of pedestrian and bicycle facilities.	Combine these four related objectives into a single objective: Improve the safety and convenience of pedestrians and cyclists by reducing the speed of vehicular traffic. Crash history, percent violators, 'school travel' and 'major pedestrian generators' were added to the program qualification criteria to help achieve this objective.
			Minimize the negative effects of automobile travel: Existing 85th percentile speed criteria and travel volume criterion help to measure this. New percent violators criterion also achieves this.		
			Improve the safety and convenience of pedestrians and cyclists. Incorporating crash history to the qualification criteria helps address safety. Inclusion of 'school travel' and 'major pedestrian generators' helps address improvements for pedestrian convenience.		
			Improve the quality of life within residential neighborhoods: "Quality of life" is too subjective to be meaningful. Our experience with the Traffic Calming Program has revealed a wide range of perspectives on whether traffic calming device installation improves or diminishes quality of life.		
			Reduce cut-through traffic: True measurement of cut-through traffic is challenging. Comparing the calculated trip generation on the street with average daily traffic (as used by Washtenaw County Road Commission) is a rough and potentially inaccurate measurement. This methodology is particularly challenging for a connected urban environment, and requires significant staff time/resources. Though the East Lansing Traffic Calming Program also cites a "cut-through traffic" measurement, but the East Lansing staff response indicated that no such measurement is taken. East Lansing staff also expressed that it is illegal to ID or record license plates and then review records to ID whether or not they are in fact residents, which further complicates the ability to measure cut-through traffic.	In some instances a high volume of trips within a neighborhood may be perceived as "cut-through" traffic; however, these trips may actually serve local travel within the neighborhood, such as to an elementary or middle school on a local street. These uses are generally paired with higher volume use of the street, which may make overall traffic volume uncomfortable for residents.	Remove this from the Program objectives. Modify the average daily traffic (ADT) qualification criteria to allocate points for traffic volume on an incremental basis through a qualification scoring approach.
			The current funding source for the Traffic Calming Program (ACT51) includes restrictions on appropriate use. It is critical that the Program objectives match eligible use of ACT51 dollars to ensure that the Program funding source is not compromised.		
			Because there is misalignment between existing perception and concerns and the tool to measure the phenomena, and concerns about funding eligibility, "reduce cut through traffic" should be removed from the program objectives, though it may remain an outcome of the Program. Staff believe that the intent of this objective is maintained through the modified traffic volume		
			Create attractive streets: "Attractive streets" is too subjective to be meaningful. Our experience with the Traffic Calming Program has revealed a wide range of perspectives on whether traffic calming device installation improves or diminishes the attractiveness of the street.		Remove this from the Program objectives.

	Coordination	Primary emergency route/Fire Department coordination	Per discussion with Fire Marshal, the City of Ann Arbor does not have primary emergency routes. Emergency responders will use the fastest available route. The Fire Marshal and AAPD will continue to be engaged in the Traffic Calming Program to provide an assessment of traffic calming device suitability. The City of Ann Arbor currently operates under the 2015 edition of the International Fire Code: 503.3.4.1 Traffic calming devices. Traffic calming devices shall be prohibited unless approved by the fire code official.	AAFD and AAPD review and input required. Current language reflecting the need for coordination with AAPD and AAFD will be maintained. Remove "the street must not be a primary emergency route" from program qualification criteria.
	Disqualification	Reapplication threshold	Current program does not specify a reapplication threshold. However, past practice is to request that petitioners wait three (3) years before resubmitting the same project area because speed conditions and neighborhood interest are not likely to change over the short term. Washtenaw County Road Commission uses a 2-year resubmittal requirement.	Formalize a 2-year resubmittal requirement.
		Other Options - offer education and enforcement options for project areas not qualified for engineering retrofits	Advertise other resources available outside of the Traffic Calming Program: sidewalk gap program, traffic complaint questionnaire (targeted enforcement, speed radar trailers), see click fix (signage and marking requests).	Advertisement of additional resources to be incorporated in guidebook/website update.
3. Informational Package	Mailing List	Determine cul-de-sac parcel participation	The impact on Traffic Calming devices to cul-de-sac properties is recognized. Staff supports including these properties as information only in the Traffic Calming mailing distribution. Staff is concerned that cul-de-sac properties are likely to focus on the negative impacts to their convenience of travel, without having the same vested interest in safety benefits provided. Cul-de-sac properties will not see benefits of slower traffic as directly because their property is further from the location of the installation (assuming device installation is made on adjacent streets, not directly adjacent to the cul-de-sac).	Include cul-de-sac parcels as information only in Traffic Calming mailing distribution.
		Interior Cross Streets vs. those at the intersection	Clarification: include addresses adjacent to the defined project area and addresses 100 ft. from where the project street intersects a local cross street. Where the project area intersects a major street, addresses within 100ft. Will not be included in the mailing list. Addresses within 100ft will be included where the project street intersects a local cross streets interior and exterior to the project limits.	Addresses adjacent to the defined project area and addresses 100 ft. from where the project street intersects a local cross street will be included in the project area mailing list and will be invited to participate in final polling.
		All users of the corridor	People who reside outside of the immediate project area but frequently use the corridor, often desire equal participation in the process. The project area limits are defined such that those most impacted by the outcome, good or bad, participate in the final polling, while others can still influence the outcome through participation at meetings. Neighborhood meetings for the Traffic Calming Program are open the public and welcome participation of surrounding area residents or other corridor users.	Welcome participation of surrounding area residents or other corridor users. Continue to limit final polling to those most impacted by the outcome.
		Definition of "resident." Property owner and/or renter	Mail to both property owner and current resident (specifically for instances where the property owner is not the current resident, i.e. rental properties). Be inclusive. Both are affected by the outcome of the traffic calming process and should have an equal opportunity to participate. Each rental unit should have the opportunity to participate.	The property owner and current resident are included. Where one parcel includes multiple units, each unit will be included in the mailing list and invited to participate in final polling.
	Coordination	Primary emergency route/Fire Department	<i>see 'Primary emergency route/Fire Department coordination' above.</i>	Remove.
		Ann Arbor Area Transportation Authority (AAATA)	Where there are AAATA bus routes along the project area City staff coordinate with AAATA staff for input and review of proposed traffic calming devices.	Maintain existing coordination with AAATA.
		Ann Arbor Public Schools (AAPS)	Where there are AAPS bus routes along the project area City staff coordinate with AAPS staff for input and review of proposed traffic calming devices.	Maintain existing coordination with AAPS.
		Temporary or permanent radar feedback sign	The device toolbox is best suited for permanent installations, that make a capital investment for engineering retrofit. Short duration mobile use of radar feedback signs has been most effective, based on review of data from prior feedback sign installation.	Not in toolbox. Requests for radar sign installation should be submitted to Traffic Complaint Questionnaire.

		Marked Crosswalk, Marked Crosswalk with Signs, Marked Crosswalk with advanced signs	Installing crosswalk markings independently are not "traffic calming." However, this could be considered in combination with other device installation. Could be marked along a published walk to school route to highlight pedestrian crossings. Project areas that qualify for the Traffic Calming Program will receive an evaluation of the existing crosswalks within the project area. Decisions about crosswalk improvements will be made outside of the Traffic Calming Program and in compliance with Crosswalk Design Guidelines.	Not in Toolbox. Project areas that qualify for the Traffic Calming Program will receive an evaluation of the existing crosswalks within the project area. Decisions about crosswalk improvements will be made outside of the Traffic Calming Program and in compliance with Crosswalk Design Guidelines.
		Lane narrowing	Lane narrowing would require that lines were painted to delineate lane width. Lane markings are considered a type of "long line pavement marking." Long line pavement markings are outside the scope of the Traffic Calming Program which emphasizes engineering retrofits to create physical changes to slow traffic. Long line pavement markings are not typically used on local streets due to limited resources available and the on-going maintenance that pavement markings require. Generally local streets have a low enough volume that long line markings are not recommended per industry best practices.	Not in toolbox.
		Pedestrian gateway treatment	Can add links on website to MDOT literature about pedestrian gateway treatment. Recurring or seasonal installation. Results have shown that these are effective, high yielding rates. Public support for these installations has been expressed. Must be consistent with crosswalk design guidelines.	Add to toolbox. Must be consistent with crosswalk design guidelines.
		Neighborhood gateway treatment	May be most effective at boundaries where roadway functional classification changes. Opportunity for neighborhood gateway treatment may be provided with other devices in the toolbox (such as curb bump out, traffic circle, etc.). Neighborhood could seek a license agreement for neighborhood gateway.	Add to toolbox. Neighborhood would bear landscaping installation and maintenance costs.
		Pedestrian island/median	May provide effective lane narrowing opportunity.	Add to toolbox.
		Curb bump out	Curb extension devices used through the existing program have included curb bump outs. The toolbox language and descriptions could be revised to better clarify distinction among curb extension devices. Also clarify that alternating curb bump outs could be used to create a chicane effect. Bump outs can also be used to create a chokepoint.	Add to toolbox. Include clarifying language: curb extensions can be applied in different ways including pedestrian bump out, choke-point and chicane.
		Choker/Neckdown*	Two bump-outs across from each other can be used to create a chokepoint. Incorporated as part of the curb extension section.	Incorporated as part of the curb extension section.
		Chicane	May not be a lot of interest in a true chicane because it will cause loss of on-street parking. Chokepoints would provide similar effectiveness with less impact to on-street parking. Additionally, this would require significant changes to the roadway, could impact drainage and may be at a cost that exceeds funding availability through the Traffic Calming Program. Road Reconstruction may be a more appropriate time to consider this option because of the scale of impact. The Traffic Calming Program includes devices that can be installed as retrofits to the existing roadway. Alternating curb bump outs could be used to create a chicane effect.	Incorporated as part of the curb extension section.
		Compact urban or mini roundabout	Where existing intersections have an outdated design there may be opportunity to remove excess pavement and install compact urban/mini roundabout(s).	Add to toolbox.
		Residential traffic circle*	Where existing intersections have an outdated design there may be opportunity to remove excess pavement and install residential traffic circle. May be well suited for a T-intersection.	Keep.
		Public outreach	Some communities include public outreach or education as a tool within their traffic calming toolbox. The City of Ann Arbor Traffic Calming Program incorporates public outreach as a critical element of the existing program and provides outreach and engagement opportunities at multiple points throughout the Program. The City of Ann Arbor has maintained a toolbox of devices that are specific to engineering retrofits.	A critical element of the Program, that applies to consideration of all tools. Not a separate tool in the toolbox.
		Speed limit enforcement	Devices in the toolbox are engineering retrofits.	Not in toolbox. Requests for speed limit enforcement should be submitted to Traffic Complaint Questionnaire.

5. Plan Development	Traffic Calming Toolbox (*already in toolbox)	<i>Speed Reduction Committee Request - Vehicle deterrents/diverters</i>	Concerns about breaking connections and connectivity and impact to emergency response time. Vision Zero is an overarching philosophy to eliminate serious injury and fatal crashes occurring on our transportation systems. Vision Zero considerations generally rely upon a framework of advancing a culture of transportation system and user safety through education, enforcement, engineering and emergency response. Hesitant to adopt Program changes that create barriers for emergency response and work against vision Zero Principles.	Not in toolbox. Vehicle deterrents would be considered in locations where there is a documented safety need. Such instances are handled outside of the Traffic Calming Program.
		<i>Speed Reduction Committee Request - Active transportation priority elements</i>	Based on the Speed Reduction Committee clarification: "Incorporate bicycle boulevard elements and pedestrian enhancements to prioritize pedestrians and cyclists." The Traffic Calming Program is not ideal for comprehensive design elements, such as bicycle blvds. that need to be part of larger scale transportation strategies. These features would be better incorporated into a city-wide transportation master plan. Traffic Calming project areas are often only a couple of blocks and generally do not provide a view that is broad enough to effectively incorporate a bicycle boulevard. Staff are concerned that approaching bicycle boulevard with a fragmented small scale project approach could have haphazard results. If a Traffic Calming petition is submitted on an identified bicycle boulevard location, that could influence how traffic calming is implemented. Pedestrian enhancements such as bump-outs, raised crosswalks and raised intersections are already part of the Traffic Calming Program. Other pedestrian enhancements such as sidewalk or path installation, other pedestrian crossing enhancements, or street lighting would need to be pursued outside of the Traffic Calming Program; staff are always willing to connect residents with resources to pursue other requests.	No additional changes needed.
		Speed humps*	Effective.	Keep.
		Speed table	Provides a traffic calming effect comparable to speed humps. Addresses AAFD concerns associated with speed hump impact to emergency response equipment in locations that serve as an access route to multiple other locations.	Add to toolbox.
		Raised crosswalks*	Effective.	Keep.
		Speed cushions	Speed cushions would be challenging given our existing winter maintenance practices (plowing, not salting local streets).	Not in toolbox.
		Raised intersection*	Effective.	Keep.
		On-street parking	On-street parking is not "traffic calming" when changes are made independently. However, this could be considered in combination with other device installation.	Typically changes to on-street parking are handled through a separate public input process. Could be considered in coordination with a Traffic Calming Program. Not in toolbox.
		Static speed limit sign	Speed limit signs are not generally posted on local streets. Speed limit signs have been found to rarely affect the 85th percentile speeds and are not considered an effective speed control device. It is expected that the general public knows that residential areas have a speed limit of 25 mph. Best practice is that when you turn off of higher speed roadway onto lower speed roadway that a sign is posted to raise awareness of the change in speed limit, but not posted throughout the neighborhood.	Not in toolbox.
		Stop Sign	Traffic professionals and the Michigan Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MMUTCD) have found that installing stop signs on all approaches to an intersection does not result in fewer collisions or slower traffic. By law, the purpose of a stop sign is to assign right of way, not to slow vehicles, and in fact, the MMUTCD prohibits the use of stop signs as a traffic calming device.	Not in toolbox.
		Marked crosswalk with rectangular rapid flashing beacon (RRFB)	This is not a tool in the local category in the City Crosswalk Design Guidelines.	Not in toolbox.
		Marked crosswalk with pedestrian hybrid beacon (PHB)	This is not a tool in the local category in the City Crosswalk Design Guidelines.	Not in toolbox.

		Traffic signal/ pedestrian signal mid-block crosswalk	This is not a tool in the local category in the City Crosswalk Design Guidelines.	Not in toolbox.
		Street closure to through traffic	City of Ann Arbor Standard Specifications (a2gov.org/Standard Specifications) limit cul-de-sac length to 600 feet; reference Division II: Design Standards, section 7H. 'Cul-de-sacs.' Additionally, street closure would present operational issues including solid waste collection and winter maintenance services. Street closures impact emergency response vehicle accessibility; the International Fire Code (IFC) 2015 Appendix D specifies turnaround requirements for "dead-end fire apparatus access roads in excess of 150 feet" (IFC D103.4)	Not in toolbox.
		Conversion to one-way street	Conversion to a one-way street would require City Council approval. Best practice promotes two way travel for pedestrian safety. Additionally there is a compliance and enforcement issue.	Not in toolbox.
		<i>Speed Reduction Committee - Creative neighborhood-derived solutions</i>	Staff agree that the Traffic Calming update and toolbox revision should leave space to be flexible to new ideas and innovations.	Request that Council authorize the Administrator, or the Administrator's designee, to manage and maintain the Program. <i>See 'Program Ownership and Administration'</i>
6. Meeting #1	Community Engagement Process; <i>Speed Reduction Committee Request - Maintain a high level of public input in the design process, allow residents to offer potential solutions, and include a resident-centered design workshop</i>	Meeting #1 Presentation/Workshop to replace on-site walking meeting.	While the existing on-site meeting provides value by generating interest from residents who might not otherwise attend a public meeting, it allows neighbors to visualize conditions at the proposed location, and is responsive to community interests and requests, staff also recognize the value of an interactive workshop and presentation for meaningful discussion and neighborhood collaboration. Staff would like to take the time to familiarize the neighborhood with the Program and process in detail early on. Staff will bring starter ideas to Meeting #1 rather than sending a draft plan in advance of the meeting. Leave flexible to adapt engagement approach as needed.	Modify Meeting #1 to include a program orientation and workshop style discussion, to replace the existing on-street walking meeting.
7. Plan Refinement	Concept Plan	Preliminary plan developed after Meeting #1, rather than distributed in advance.	Staff will bring starter ideas to Meeting #1 to gather community input and feedback. Want to provide the opportunity to orient the community to the Program, device toolbox and project area before providing a draft plan. Staff believe this approach will help build context and improve the community's understanding of the value of different tools.	Licensed engineers will develop a preliminary plan to distribute prior to Meeting #2, based on starter ideas shared at Meeting #1, community feedback as well as safety and industry best practices.
8. Meeting #2	Community Engagement Process	Final plan developed by licensed engineers after Meeting #2, rather than at Meeting #2.	This will function similar to the existing on-site Meeting #2 however, community feedback will be gathered and then considered by licensed engineers in the development of the final plan. Staff will gather feedback but avoid a "vote on-site" approach that has been used previously and has resulted in highly emotional reactions from meeting participants.	Licensed engineers will develop a final plan to distribute as part of the final polling based on starter ideas shared at Meeting #1, community feedback from Meeting #1 and 2, as well as safety and industry best practices.
		Change "second survey" to "final polling"	Would improve clarity of the language.	Change "second survey" to "final polling"

9. Second Survey	Public Support	Move the higher level engagement criteria from final polling to petition, effectively increasing the criterion for the qualifying petition from 30% to 50%, and eliminating the 60% response rate/engagement previously required at final polling.	This would help simplify and streamline the process, and eliminate one additional step to qualify for the program. Review of peer communities demonstrates a single-part criteria is more common. This approach also simplifies the process by eliminating the need to distinguish homeowner occupied parcels, which has been confusing and difficult for the community to understand in the past. Moving the response rate/engagement criteria to earlier in the process ensures neighborhood interest before investment of staff time and resources, and before setting unrealistic community expectations. Eliminating the response rate criterion from final polling but moving a higher level engagement to the petition requirement maintains the opportunity to ensure neighborhood buy-in in the Traffic Calming process.	Eliminate response rate criterion for final plan approval.
		Eliminate the "supermajority" support requirement. Reduce the support criteria to a simple majority.	The City Council 2016 resolution about the Traffic Calming Program and initial conversations with the Transportation Commission Speed Reduction Committee revealed a misconception that the existing program required a supermajority of the entire project area to support a project. In fact, the support criteria in the existing program is based on a percentage of responses received, not total project area count, which generally results in much less than a majority support in terms of total addresses within the project area. However staff are open to reducing the public support threshold to a simple majority of responses received. This means, for example, that if 3 final polling forms are returned, and 2 support the project, then sufficient public support has been achieved, regardless of the total number of addresses in the project area.	Reduce the public support criteria to a simple majority (greater than 50%) of final polling forms received. Eliminate the engagement/response rate criterion at this stage of the process.
		Assess public support for the complete final concept plan rather than each device in isolation.	The final concept plan should be implemented in it's entirety, or not at all. Isolating specific devices from the comprehensive plan would result in less effective implementation of traffic calming devices which are intended to work together in a series for the most impactful results.	Final polling based on support for complete plan as proposed.
		Address safety improvements separate from Traffic Calming Program	Where demonstrated safety concerns are identified by professional engineering staff decisions about improvements will be made outside of the Traffic Calming Program. This should be explicitly stated in order to manage community expectations.	Where demonstrated safety concerns are identified by professional engineering staff decisions about improvements will be made outside of the Traffic Calming Program.
		Electronic response option for second survey/final polling	Provide a unique identifier with the final survey, and survey respondents would submit that code online with their response. Could utilize SurveyMonkey or other online survey tool.	Allow electronic response option.
		City department to tally responses	Confirmed that the Clerk's Office staff is still available and willing to tally the final polling responses.	No changes.
		10. Optional Survey	Community Engagement Process	Remove the optional survey.