

SECOND DRAFT 12-4-20

Comments on the Process for the 7<sup>th</sup> Street Speed Calming Effort

The concern:

Over the course of many years, neighbors worked with the city to try and resolve problems with speeding and unsafe turns on 7<sup>th</sup> St.

Solutions put into place:

Narrowed lanes, buffered bike lanes, advisory bike lanes, gateway treatments, radar speed signs, pedestrian island and Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacon (RRFB) at Seventh and Washington, speed limit signage along Waterworks Park, crosswalk markings, and leading pedestrian intervals at traffic signals, were all introduced. No comprehensive evaluation of these remedies has been done, partly because “before” data is lacking or not comparable to data now available.

**Commented [CK1]:** Consider: “enhanced lane share markings” or “sharrows with conspicuity markings”

Timing:

During the time of complaints and working towards solutions there was significant turnover of city staff. Additionally, there was focus on other aspects of transportation safety, including some safety focus areas being newly developed. Neighborhood turnover can also be a factor.

**Commented [CE2]:** This can be more factual, when did the effort start, when were public meetings held and how long from meetings to actual changes,. Date of consultant report is another timing fact.

Communication and education:

The systems in place for communication and basic information sharing were lacking (i.e. that a stop sign isn’t allowed and why, and at what level of government that decision is made, was not communicated). The communications tools listed below were (and still are) available, but the tools were not utilized to their full potential through the community discussion with Seventh Street:

- Email subscription topic through Gov Delivery (293 subscribers to date)
- Project webpage [www.a2gov.org/Seventh](http://www.a2gov.org/Seventh)

**Commented [CK3]:** Wasn’t this communicated at public meetings in 2013? I also found some language about Stop Sign warrants in the [2015 Update](#), available on the project website, and distributed to the interested email list. A similar reference to the MUTCD warrants for stop sign installation was communicated in the [2017 recommendations](#). There were flaws in the communications, however the current language does not seem like an entirely accurate characterization.

Other?

Process:

There was not an actual process in place, nor a formal Seventh Street evaluation program or process, and many of the changes and communications were on an ad hoc basis.

**Commented [CE4]:** Did we provide information to the citizen group that were distributing information to the public? Also, there was significant City council involvement – did they communicate on behalf of the project?

Suggestions for moving forward:

Develop a process for calming speeds on arterial roads (see additional committee report especially recommendation #3)

Promote the process for traffic calming options for arterial roads

Develop community engagement/public education strategies to promote education and awareness of road classifications and how they are determined

Develop plans that can be evaluated and schedule the evaluation timeline

**Commented [CK5]:** Consider: “The Transportation Commission recommends that Council provide direction and budget for staff to implement the following.” – or similar intro language

**Commented [CK6]:** Does this mean to educate the community about which roads are classified as which type (e.g., local, arterial, collector)? That’s my interpretation so I just want to confirm. If there’s something else this is intended to achieve may need additional clarifying language.

**Commented [CK7]:** Perhaps elaborate a little more here? What type of plans is this in reference to?

Empower and retain city staff so that there is continuity of planning and engagement

[Celebrate successes and communicate improvements](#)

DRAFT