# Overview of Traffic Calming & Sidewalk Request Processes

Presented to City Council, Feb 22, 2023

### Traffic Calming Request Process

- The process was established by *Regulation #96-1*
- In 2011, Council adopted *Guidelines for Installation* (City Code Chapter 13.28.020) which identified siting location recommendations
- Process requires a *petition* to initiate
  - Resident-driven process requires sign-on of 2/3 of households
  - Petition area to include the block of the request and the adjacent block of the same street
  - Requires a community meeting coordinated by petitioners; can be through citizen association (if exists); and report back to City Clerk to confirm the date, location, method of advertising, # of people attending, and disposition of attendees
- Followed by *Public Hearing* 
  - notification to the public provided by City Clerk's office through direct mail and Newsletter
- Approved by Council through *Two Reading Ordinance*

## Initial Traffic Calming Projects- Speed Hump Focused

- For City purposes, use hump and bump interchangeably
- For decades, the installations were exclusively speed humps
- In early 2000's City developed a "more aggressive" speed hump, in response to requests from the community City Standard profile "bump on a hump"
- General Traffic Engineering Standards define a standard speed hump, as in the Montgomery County Standard profile, which is recommended
- There are over 150 speed humps in Takoma Park
- Since 2010 options for traffic calming have been expanded to include measures beyond speed humps

## Speed Hump Comparison

#### City Standard – 5 mph

#### County Standard – 20 mph



City Code Section 13.28 added guidelines including:

- Restrictions on streets with slopes of 8% or more; on cul-de-sacs and dead-end streets
- Must avoid driveway aprons, utility access points
- Placed 150 to 300 feet apart, distance to stop signs 100 feet, distance to intersection 75 feet
- Proximity to street lighting and ability to be seen within 100 to 200 feet (the affect of curves or hills)



## Traffic Calming Options

#### LEAST RESTRICTIVE

- signage
- roadway markings
- change to parking

MODERATELY RESTRICTIVE

- speed humps
- speed tables
- chicanes
- bump-outs
- reduced turn radius at corners
- reduce roadway width

MOST RESTRICTIVE

- one way street
- turn restriction

# Examples of Non Speed Hump Traffic Calming

• In 2008-2010, the City's Planning office worked with 3 neighborhoods on a broader neighborhood traffic calming plan. The City contracted with Traffic Engineering consultants who met with residents, analyzed traffic patterns and spe,eds and developed recommendations. Implementation occurred in 2 of the 3 neighborhoods.

#### Other Examples include:

- Ritchie Ave traffic circle, bump-outs, and speed humps FY12/13
- Erskine St bump-outs at stop sign FY13/14, installed lighted stop sign in 2020
- Flower Avenue and Sligo Creek Parkway collaboration with Montgomery Parks, narrowed roadway, eliminating turning lane. FY15 design, installed in FY20
- Boston Avenue Bump-out at playground entrance, roadway narrowing FY 16
- 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue Bump-outs at intersection FY18
- 4th Avenue Bump-outs, raised crosswalks FY22

### Sidewalk Request Process – Framework

- The Council established an initial process by *Resolution 2010-14*, superseded by *Resolution 2012-16* and again by *Resolution 2015-32*
- Resolution 2010-14 endorsed a priority ranking system developed by Toole Design Group for new sidewalks and ADA sidewalk compliance. Toole Design identified new sidewalk locations by Tier 1,2 or 3 based on evaluation criteria.
- Resolution 2012-16 superseded the priority ranking system and established a community-based method for initiating new sidewalk requests.
- Resolution 2015-32 simplified the initiation process

### Sidewalk Request Process

- Request can be initiated by:
  - Resolution of the Council, an individual Councilmember, or the City Manager
  - 1 or more residents or Neighborhood Association
- City schedules a community meeting, mails notice to the affected area\*, and provides FAQ
- **First neighborhood vote** held on support for developing design; if 50% or more votes received are Yes, design initiated
- Design development performed by a contract engineering firm, includes Right of Way survey and development of design using 11 preference guidelines defined in Resolution
- Community review of design options is an iterative process; notices are mailed to all properties in the affected area; feedback is received and revisions made and presented in follow-up meetings until a final design is established
- Second neighborhood vote held on support for construction; if 50% of responses are Yes, project is moved to the construction queue
- Caveats Council by majority vote can override majority vote of neighborhood
  If sidewalk vote is not approved, it can't be restarted for a 2 year period

\*affected area is defined as the block and adjacent blocks of the same street and one block of cross streets

#### New Sidewalk Installations Since 2012



### Sidewalk Design Preference Guidelines: Section 8 A - K

- Located in ROW when possible; if not an easement agreement is required
- Consider installing partially or fully within existing pavement to reduce added impervious area and reduce private property impacts
- Minimize tree removal; tree inventory and tree protection methods to be used including non-linear sidewalks to accommodate tree space
- Any tree removed, must be replaced, per City replacement criteria, and included in project budget
- Preference for sidewalk location on the side of street with utility poles (already limits tree planting and may have better lighting)
- Sidewalk planning should be coordinated with other planned utility, traffic safety, or tree planting projects
- Any area impacted by sidewalk construction, including private lead walk, retaining wall, plantings, etc., will be addressed and included in project budget
- Stormwater treatment mitigation as required per City Code
- Sidewalk width must meet ADA standards (5 ft minimum); may be wider if specified by Master, Sector or development guidelines, or connects to existing wider sidewalks or is needed to accommodate heavy pedestrian traffic
- Preference for green strip between curb and sidewalk when right-of-way space allows
- City is not exempt from County Sediment and Erosion Control Permit and/or Forest Conservation Plan if project size triggers need

# Historical Expenditures

<u>SIDEWALK DESIGN</u>		SIDEWALK CONSTRUCTION		TRAFFIC CALMING	
FY12	\$48K	FY12	\$314K	FY12	\$10K
FY13	\$92K	FY13	\$272K	FY13	\$150K
FY14	\$169K	FY14	\$329K	FY14	\$26K
FY15	\$55K	FY15	\$385K	FY15	\$23K
FY16	\$112K	FY16	\$237K	FY16	\$10K
FY17	\$62K	FY17	\$0	FY17	\$43K
FY18	\$51K	FY18	\$47K	FY18	\$69K
FY19	\$60K	FY19	\$1,067	FY19	\$10K
FY20	\$0	FY20	\$553K	FY20	\$65K
FY21	\$1,500	FY21	\$1,400	FY21	\$0
FY22	\$117K	FY22	\$38K	FY22	\$21K
FY23	\$74K to date	FY23	\$118K to date	FY23	\$24K to date

### **Recommendations for Process Improvements**

#### Complete Safe Streets Committee (CSSC)

Released recommendations for Council consideration in January 2021

- Simplify process, uniformity
- Be innovative and cost-conscious
- Use data-driven evidence-based criteria in the review process and balance public input with other priorities including racial equity, more holistic approach in planning locations
- Engage community using multiple outreach methods
- Provide updated mapping of sidewalk and traffic calming locations, publish on City website
- Establish annual budget and set priorities

Resolution 2022-41 – Pedestrian and Transportation Safety

- Referenced recommendations of the CSSC
- Referenced County efforts including Action Plan for Vision Zero, Pedestrian Master Plan, Reimagined RideOn, Bicycle Master Plan
- Comprehensive approach that prioritizes pedestrian and non-vehicle safety and emphasizes equity in decision-making
- Address larger geographic areas together and integrate with other City priorities
- Identify areas for reduced speed limits
- Expand process for initiation requests