

Background of Issues Discussed in Neighborhood Traffic Calming Subcommittee

- **Popular program. Last revisions made it easier to qualify. Now the City has a backlog of projects. (11/22)**
 - Demand outpaced resources until recently. However, we have doubled funding for this program planned for the next two fiscal years, which seems like it might put us on track to keep up with demand. We may need more time to tell.
 - The previous target to process 3 petitions per year is expected to increase to 10 petitions this calendar year. As such, this sets a trajectory which could clear the backlog of petitions and set a work program that keeps up with demand.
 - Solution: Maintain current funding
- **Process/ Petition Challenges (11/22)**
 - Large administrative burden for staff.
 - Cost of projects has increased which are draining the approved funds at a faster rate, which delays the start of projects in queue.
 - Not systematic.
 - Generally neighborhood support at end of process, but petitions have been disqualified as a result of the neighborhood rejecting the proposed final plan
 - Certain areas have a difficulty qualifying due to rental properties adjacent to the desired petition area
 - Too [empowerment](#) focused.
- **Utilization of Traffic Calming Tools**
 - Bump-outs are considered safety improvements but aren't used without a level of support from the neighborhood. (11/22)
 - Administrative Historical experience demonstrates that resident engagement is important for implementing vertical devices. Lack of data demonstrating a speeding/safety concern coupled with lack of resident support could result in political pressure to remove devices (waste of money and resources etc.) (1/2023)
- **Program Management (1/23)**
 - The traffic calming program was established by means of council resolution, so it lacks flexibility and staff doesn't have the latitude to utilize all elements
 - Approval by Council makes traffic calming potentially politically charged, rather than an engineering project
 - Solution: Move to staff led program
 - The traffic calming program is an [empowerment program](#), which means residents make the final decision on engineering designs (1/23)
- **Staff suggestion: Combine local streets Traffic Calming into [City-Wide speed management program](#). (2/23)**
 - Pros: Able to focus on a safe systems approach under one program umbrella. Simplified amount of training to all involved. Guidance would be incorporated into City standards (Orange book) - for example: all roads would get bumpouts, ped islands, and intersection treatments where feasible; possibly higher order

treatments adjacent to schools. By incorporating it into City Standards makes it accessible to all staff, consultants, contractors and private developers.

- Cons: Takes away neighborhood control that the original program gave them. Will increase project costs for all projects (which means less roads will be done in a year). May need additional resources to scale program systematically (related to engagement, data collection, etc.)
- *Considerations/Outstanding Issues:*
 - *Should any qualifying parameters be incorporated into this systematic approach? For example, would this apply to cul-de-sacs, unpaved roads, truck routes or other locations that may not be considered under the existing program?*
 - *Is the intent that this would pertain to other capital projects which may disturb the existing road surface, but which is not a resurfacing project (e.g. watermain projects or other underground utility projects)?*
 - *Data collection expectations?*
 - *Absent the intensive process of the existing Traffic Calming Program to determine an acceptable configuration of vertical devices, it may be hard for staff to propose something that would be supported by the neighborhood.*
 - *Increased project costs?*
 - *Engagement expectations?*
- Solutions:
 - Recommend Transportation Plan recommendations:
 - Pilot a neighborhood-based approach to traffic calming
 - Install bump-outs
 - Develop school traffic calming toolkit within 3 years.
 - Evaluate conditions at all schools within 3 years
 - Enable staff to have utilize traffic calming tools for all roadway projects (recommend starting with horizontal)
 - Qualifying Parameters: crashes, records of speeding, and/or resident complaints. Consideration for traffic calming treatments should factor in the All Ages and Abilities Bike Network

Transportation Plan Recommendations

- Pilot a neighborhood-based approach to traffic calming. (p. 37)
 - In order to address traffic calming more equitably and comprehensively, the existing traffic calming program could be expanded to take a neighborhood-based approach, addressing a small network of streets together. Priority for areas should be given to areas with demonstrated need due to crashes, records of speeding, and/or resident complaints. Consideration for traffic calming treatments should factor in the All Ages and Abilities Bike Network (see Strategy 6)

- Implement a policy to install bumpouts by default on streets with onstreet parking. Bump outs should be considered in Capital Improvements Planning streetscape projects. (p. 42)
- Expand multimodal options in A2 Fix It (p. 115)
- Develop a simple, online process to request traffic calming and other programs complementary to the Traffic Calming Program (consider incorporating into A2 Fix It). (p.115)
- Short-term recommendations: Evaluate and improve sidewalks, crossings, bike infrastructure, and traffic calming along designated school walking/biking routes. (p. 133)
 - Develop school traffic calming toolkit within 3 years.
 - Evaluate conditions at all schools within 3 years.