

MEMORANDUM

To: Bill Cowern
From: Steve Tuttle
Date: March 15, 2007
Project: NTMP Update
Subject: Summary of NTMP Research in Other Communities

At your request, Fox Higgins has completed a study of neighborhood traffic mitigation program policies and procedures used in selected communities in Colorado and other states. Our research included reviewing program documents and performing interviews of program managers. The communities researched included: *Colorado: Broomfield, Westminster, Greenwood Village, Loveland, Lakewood, Golden, Fort Collins, and Colorado Springs. Other States: Seattle (WA), Bellevue (WA), Portland (OR), Vancouver (Canada), Eugene (OR), San Jose (CA), Sacramento (CA), Pasadena (CA), Charlotte (NC), Minneapolis (MN), Madison (WI)*

For this effort, we specifically compiled information relative to the following key policy and procedure areas:

- Project initiation
- Qualifying criteria
- Traffic mitigation tools used
- Project funding mechanisms
- Project approval/consensus
- Project prioritization policies
- Community population
- NTMP annual budget

Summary of Findings:

Project Initiation – How are projects started?

Most communities require some sort of formal request, either a request form, application, or petition. Bellevue allows for electronic submittal of a Citizen Action Request form to initiate a project request. Where petitions are used and a minimum number of signatures is required, the requirement was between 50% of residents within a defined impact area (Colorado Springs, Madison) to 75% (Golden). Portland uses a mailed survey system and requires that 30% of mailed surveys to residents within a defined area must be returned favorable to proceed. San Jose will do data collection and problem assessment from a citizen request but requires a petition to move to higher levels of their program.

Qualifying Criteria – How are neighborhood traffic “problems” defined and must projects meet specific criteria to be included in the program (or various stages within the program)?

Nearly all of the communities surveyed have established minimum volume and speed criteria to “qualify” a project for implementation of traffic mitigation and only allow traffic migration on local and/or collector roadways. Minimum volume criteria, where used, ranges from 200 vehicles per day (vpd) (Bellevue) to 5,000 vpd (Greenwood Village), and may vary for local vs. collector roadways. Some communities (Bellevue, Lakewood) have maximum volume criteria as well. Minimum 85th percentile speed criteria, where used, ranges from 4 mph over the posted speed (Loveland) to 10 mph over the posted speed (Seattle, Greenwood Village). San Jose requires that a project area have greater than 10% of the citywide average of volumes, speeds, and/or accidents along similar roadways. Pasadena offers an alternative criteria to volume and speed by simply requiring that the subject street segment be 1,200’ minimum in length with no stop signs or curves and have less than a 5% grade.

Traffic Mitigation Tools Used – What tools do various communities utilize and have found most successful?

Most communities have a full toolbox of treatments, ranging from educational tools to engineering treatments (both vertical and horizontal devices). These are typically applied on a case-by-case basis and with engineering judgment. However, several communities have either limited or restricted the use of some devices due to previously unsuccessful installations or resource limitations (staff time, budget). Lakewood, for instance, only provides for speed humps with their program. Broomfield specifically excludes speed humps (Colorado Springs is also considering this). Some communities, while not specifically excluding a device, have tailored their programs to favor installation of one or more devices (Seattle, for instance, has a streamlined process for installation of traffic circles, their “favored” device). Minneapolis has had poor experiences with the installation of traffic circles in the past, and is unlikely to utilize them in the future. Some communities such as Bellevue, Broomfield, and Sacramento, utilize a phased approach to traffic mitigation where educational, enforcement, and low-cost tools (Speed Watch, newsletters, speed trailers, signing/markings, etc.) must be implemented and evaluated prior to installation of engineering treatments. In most communities surveyed, however, educational and enforcement tools were simply supplemental to the overall program and were not required to be used first.

Project Funding Mechanisms – How do other communities fund projects?

Most of the communities surveyed use public (City) funds as the primary funding source. Some allow private/resident funds to be used where special circumstances dictate (for example, when public funds aren’t available, the project isn’t high priority enough to qualify for public funds, or enhancements are added to a basic traffic calming design). In some cases, project funding may be shared between the City

and residents. Loveland and Lakewood utilize a 50-50 finding split between the City and residents for installation of engineering treatments (Lakewood only uses speed humps). Golden uses a 50-50 split, but only for projects that do not meet minimum speed and volume criteria. Bellevue specifically does not allow resident funds to be used, due to the social equity issue created by neighborhoods that can afford to pay for devices versus those that cannot. Minneapolis does not allocate any funds for traffic calming devices (all projects are funded by the residents) – City staff indicated that the equity issue has been a concern. Eugene, Seattle, and Pasadena have mechanisms provided for either partial or full resident funding, but these mechanisms are rarely (if ever) used by residents. San Jose has not used resident funding in the past, but is considering allowing for partial or full resident funding due to current budget shortfalls. Where resident funding is used, most communities require that projects still meet minimum speed and volume criteria and be administered by staff.

Project Approval / Consensus – How do communities gauge or document support for implementation of a project?

The most common tools for determining support for the implementation of a neighborhood traffic calming project are balloting and petitioning, though the procedures and approval requirements vary greatly by community. Ballots and petitions are very similar in that they require some percentage of minimum approval of a defined number of affected residents. The minimum approval required to advance a project to construction ranges from simple majority (Portland, Greenwood Village) to 80% (Loveland) for residents within a defined impact area. The impact area in each community is sometimes specifically defined (i.e.: residents within 500' or one block of the project roadway segment) while often it is defined by staff on a case-by-case basis. Where ballots are used, some communities also require that a minimum percentage of the ballots be returned "yes" or "no" (Sacramento requires that at least 30% of ballots be returned, Madison requires greater than 50% returned). Some communities define who is eligible to vote or sign a petition. Eugene allows property owners to sign petitions, not renters or occupants. Seattle allows owners or renters, but just one vote per address. Portland does not allow non-resident property owners to participate in the initial survey, but does allow them to vote in a ballot (for approval of construction) in addition to the occupants of the address.

Project Prioritization Policies – How do other communities prioritize approved projects, or do they implement projects on a first-come, first-serve basis?

The majority of communities surveyed utilize a scoring system to prioritize / rank prospective projects. In most cases, the scoring system is weighted to account for various factors (most commonly speed, volume, accident history, and presence of schools, trail crossings, and pedestrian and/or bicycle generators along within the project area). How each factor is weighted varies by community. Greenwood Village adds "cost-benefit" analysis to the common list of scoring areas. Since projects in San Jose are funded within each Council district, the City does not use a citywide scoring system. Projects in San Jose are primarily constructed on a first-come, first-

serve basis, though some consideration for constructability, cost, and other factors is given within each district each year. Pasadena uses a first-come, first-serve policy for installation of speed humps. For other engineering projects, staff ranks projects given a wide range of considerations (but no formal scoring system). Golden exclusively uses a first-come, first-serve policy for all traffic calming projects.

Community Population

Community population of communities surveyed:

Greenwood Village	14,000	Eugene, OR	323,000
Broomfield:	48,000	Colorado Springs	371,000
Westminster:	107,000	Minneapolis, MN	383,000
Loveland	119,000	Sacramento, CA	400,000
Bellevue, WA	110,000	Portland, OR	545,000
Fort Collins	126,000	Seattle, WA	563,000
Pasadena, CA	134,000	Vancouver, BC	583,000
Lakewood	143,000	Charlotte, NC	796,000
Madison, WI	222,000	San Jose, CA	953,679

NTMP Annual Budgets

Annual NTMP budgets for the communities surveyed varied greatly. Broomfield, Greenwood Village, and Loveland fund projects on a case-by-case basis with no annual budget allocated towards the installation of traffic calming projects. Some communities have temporarily suspended traffic calming funding due to budget shortfalls (San Jose, Portland). Where annual budgets are being used, these range from \$30,000 (Loveland) to \$850,000 (Vancouver), with an average of about \$150,000-\$200,000 per year. San Jose was previously allocating \$2.3 million annually, prior to budget shortfalls.

I hope that the information generated in this analysis and summarized in this memorandum are helpful. Please do not hesitate to call if you have any questions.

SGT/

Attachments:

Summary of Other Neighborhood Traffic Calming Programs – Colorado

Summary of Other Neighborhood Traffic Calming Programs – Other States