Minutes – Executive Policy Committee – February 18, 2020

Report – Standing Policy Committee on Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works – February 4, 2020

Item No. 2 Traffic Calming Initiatives

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:

The Executive Policy Committee laid the matter over for 30 days.

Minutes – Executive Policy Committee – February 18, 2020

Report – Standing Policy Committee on Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works – February 4, 2020

DECISION MAKING HISTORY:

Moved by Councillor Allard,

That the matter be laid over for 30 days.

Carried

STANDING COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:

On February 4, 2020, the Standing Policy Committee on Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works concurred in the recommendation of the Winnipeg Public Service and submitted the matter to the Executive Policy Committee and Council.

STANDING COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:

On January 7, 2020, the Standing Policy Committee on Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works granted a further extension of time of 60 days for the Winnipeg Public Service to report back on the matter.

On November 19, 2019, the Standing Policy Committee on Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works granted a further extension of time to its January 7, 2020 meeting for the Winnipeg Public Service to report back on the matter.

On September 12, 2019, the Standing Policy Committee on Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works granted an extension of time to its November 19, 2019 meeting for the Winnipeg Public Service to report back on the matter

On November 20, 2018, the Standing Policy Committee on Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works directed the Winnipeg Public Service to review the best practices and report back within 240 days with a comprehensive report on traffic calming initiatives and tools, including measures such as speed tables and speed humps, as well as the technologies, criteria, and processes involved.

ADMINISTRATIVE REPORT

Title: Traffic Calming Initiatives

Critical Path: Standing Policy Committee on Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works – Executive Policy Committee – Council

AUTHORIZATION

Author	Department Head	CFO	CAO
D. Patman, P.Eng.	J. Berezowsky	N/A	M. Ruta, Interim CAO

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Community traffic management, also known as traffic calming, is currently directed by public requests for change. Ultimately, the process is fairly self-contained: the public requests a review; the Public Service studies requested locations and determines whether the criteria for implementing speed humps has been met.

A recent review of this process revealed that very few studies actually result in improvements being installed. As such, the Public Service has conducted a review of the process and implementation requirements and has developed recommendations to improve the process and, ultimately, community traffic safety.

The proposed new process contains five steps:

1. Investigation Trigger – triaging the request into either localized or community-wide streams
2. Preliminary Screening – conducting preliminary analysis
3. Prioritization – prioritizing requests against others in the queue
4. Design & Public Engagement – gathering feedback from community members on the option(s) selected through the *Canadian Guide to Traffic Calming*
5. Implementation & Evaluation

If the process is approved, the authority for decision-making on implementation of traffic calming measures would now lie within the process.

The update is intended to provide a better service to the public and facilitate safer road infrastructure in residential areas. It would allow the Public Service to evaluate requests in a more robust manner, consider a larger menu of treatment options, and engage the public in a more meaningful way.

Pending approval, the Public Service would develop engagement methodologies and communications plans to support the new criteria, and then implement the process in a phased approach, evaluating and refining as requests are received.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That the previously approved criteria for traffic calming requests (speed humps) as approved by Council on January 30, 2002, be rescinded, and that the proposed process

for Triaging, Analyzing and Implementing Requests for Traffic Calming Measures, attached as Appendix A, be approved.

2. That the Proper Officers of the City be authorized to do all things necessary to implement the intent of the foregoing.

REASON FOR THE REPORT

On November 20, 2018, the Standing Policy Committee on Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works directed the Winnipeg Public Service to review best practices for traffic calming, and report back within 240 days with a comprehensive report on traffic calming initiatives and tools, including measures such as speed tables and speed humps, as well as the technologies, criteria, and processes involved.

IMPLICATIONS OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS

The process for responding to requests for traffic calming measures would change according to adoption of the recommendations.

The authority for decision-making on implementation of traffic calming measures would now lie within the process, rather than at the committee level.

The Community Traffic Manual would be updated to reflect the new processes and decision-making standards.

The new process would require development of a templated *Traffic Calming Engagement Toolkit*, which would be overseen by the Office of Public Engagement

HISTORY/DISCUSSION

Current Traffic Calming Approach

The Public Service currently provides community traffic management on local streets and public lanes. On these right-of-ways, community traffic management (also known as traffic calming) seeks to mitigate two main concerns: high speeds and high traffic volumes, primarily in residential areas.

As per the Council decision of January 30, 2002, the process for installing speed humps on residential streets is a resident or Councillor makes a request for speed humps, either through 311 or directly; the Public Service studies the area; the Public Service either recommends speed humps or indicates they are not warranted.[1]

Speed humps are only considered warranted on a local street when all of the following conditions are satisfied:

1. The street is a local residential street with an urban cross-section (curb and gutter) and is not a Transit route, Snow Route or a residential collector street; AND

[1] It is important to note that a number of these processes and procedures are over 15 years old, and do not take into consideration recent developments in community traffic management.

2. Residents submit a petition representing a minimum of 70 per cent of the residents in the block on both sides of the street in support of the installation/removal of speed humps; AND
3. At least one of the following speed criteria is met:
    - Average Speed exceeds the speed limit (50 km/hour)
    - At least 15 per cent of vehicles exceed the speed limit by 5 km/hour or more (55 km/hour)
    - At least 10 per cent of vehicles exceed the speed limit by 10 km/hour or more (60 km/hour)

Speed humps are only considered warranted on a public lane when all of the following conditions are satisfied:

1. Residents submit a petition representing a minimum of 70 per cent of the residents/property owners on both sides of the lane in support of speed humps
2. 85th percentile speeds exceed 30 km/h based on a City speed study
3. Minimum lane length between public streets or public lane intersection is 100 metres

A study of 311 requests for the period between 2015 and 2018 indicated that just 32 of 156 requests made for speed humps on local streets met the 70 per cent petition requirement and none satisfied the warrant criteria, resulting in no implementations. For speed humps in back lanes during the same period, 14 requests were made through 311, four met the petition requirement, and two satisfied the warrant requirement and were installed.

The Public Service and elected officials hear frequently that the public is frustrated by the fairly onerous process that very infrequently actually results in changes.

Review of Other Cities' Practices

To identify potential improvements to our process that have been tested and proven elsewhere, the Public Service engaged a local consultant to conduct a study of eight other Canadian jurisdictions' practices regarding traffic calming / community traffic management.

The resulting report acknowledged that the field of community traffic management and traffic calming is relatively new, and that its implementation varies between jurisdictions. As is in other emerging transportation planning fields like active transportation, practices continue to evolve. Despite this jurisdictional variance, Winnipeg in particular stood out as somewhat of an outlier.

Winnipeg's process for community traffic management exists to facilitate only a specific infrastructure solution (speed humps) rather than drawing from a wider toolkit of traffic calming tools and selecting the optimum tool for a specific location or issue. It is problematic to have a limited set of tools that may not be appropriate for the location being studied. The restricted approach was satisfactory in the past as community traffic management and traffic calming were relatively new fields of study; with the maturation of the traffic calming practice, and with more locations in Winnipeg possibly under consideration, a less constrained approach is required.

The 70 per cent petition threshold required in Winnipeg is also larger than what is required in other jurisdictions. Additionally, tenants and those living in multi-family dwellings are not able to participate in the petition as it only considers property owners.

Updates to the Community Traffic Management Approach
It is recommended that the City undertake a series of updates to the community traffic management approach to bring Winnipeg in-line with other jurisdictions, and to better serve our residents and communities.

First, it is recommended that the City adopt, in perpetuity, a reference document to guide decision-making and best practices: the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) and Transportation Association of Canada (TAC) *Canadian Guide to Traffic Calming*, which contains extensive information on a multitude of traffic calming tools. By adopting the document (currently in its second edition) in perpetuity, the City could update its own practices with each new edition and stay current to best practices.

Second, it is recommended that the Public Service change its process for reviewing traffic calming requests to a more flexible approach that looks first at causation, then at potential solutions (rather than automatically exploring the potential for speed humps alone). This process would ultimately be developed in two phases: first, for requests that pertain to singular streets or stretches, secondly for requests that affect larger community areas[2].

The process is specific to localized requests. The process for community-wide requests would be developed in 2020 based on the outcome of a pilot community traffic study currently underway in the Lord Roberts area.

The recommended process is attached to this report as Appendix A.

Next Steps
The update is intended to provide a better service to the public and result in safer road infrastructure in residential areas. The new process would evaluate requests in a more robust manner, consider a larger menu of treatment options, and engage the public in a more meaningful way about traffic calming in their community.

Pending approval of the recommended process, the Public Service would proceed to update Winnipeg's community traffic management documentation and processes as outlined.

Some aspects of this update, such as the points-based prioritization, would be iterative, and therefore the intent of the update is to act as a living, rather than static, process. As community traffic management continues to evolve and mature, the recommended practices would also evolve. It is the intent that Winnipeg remain abreast of best practices; using the most recent version of the ITE/TAC Canadian Guide to Traffic Calming is one such measure to ensure this remains the case.

---

[2] Local traffic calming measures can be studied in-house and completed relatively rapidly with internal resources. Requests that cover larger areas generally require the Public Service to investigate multiple issues on multiple streets in a more in-depth fashion, and with broad public engagement. These investigations take several months, and are most often handled in consultation with an external engineering firm.

The Public Service is currently conducting a trial community traffic study in the Lord Roberts neighbourhood. A study of this type and scale has not been conducted for many years; lessons learned will help to inform the community process going forward and will help define items such as timeframe, appropriate level of public engagement, strengths and weaknesses of public and technical committees.

Concurrent to this update, Public Works staff would:

- Work closely with the Office of Public Engagement to develop the Traffic Calming Engagement Toolkit: a set of templated public engagement materials and tools that would enable Public Works staff to undertake engagement activities with minimal OPE resources.
- Develop a public information plan to ensure Winnipeggers are aware of the new process, how they can request changes, and how they may be asked to participate as requests move through the process.
- Coordinate announcement of the new process with rollout of: internal key messaging; website updates; social media promotion; and updated 311 messaging.

The Public Service would evaluate the process, efficacy of the engagement toolkit and communication activities, and sustainability of allocated resourcing after one year (or sooner if a need arises) to adjust methods moving forward.

FINANCIAL IMPACT

Financial Impact Statement **Date:** January 14, 2020

Project Name:

Traffic Calming Initiatives

COMMENTS:

There is no financial impact associated with the recommendation of this report.

"Original Signed by J. Peters, CPA, CGA"
J. Peters, CPA, CGA
Acting Manager of Finance & Administration

CONSULTATION

This Report has been prepared in consultation with:

Corporate Communications and Office of Public Engagement

OURWINNIPEG POLICY ALIGNMENT

The recommendation of this report is aligned with the key strategic goal of a safe, efficient and equitable transportation system for people, goods and services in the Sustainable Transportation Direction Strategy that supports OurWinnipeg.

WINNIPEG CLIMATE ACTION PLAN ALIGNMENT

Measures taken to address road safety for users of the transportation network align with the Climate Action Plan in a number of ways. There is a linkage between making Winnipeg's transportation network safer and Key Directions 3.1 "Increase Use and Efficiency of Public

Transit Systems", 3.4 "Increase Active Transportation Rates", and 3.5 "Reduce Traffic Congestion". A safer transportation network for all users will encourage active mode use and transit use, and through reducing unsafe activity and incidents which create delay to users, make the network operate more efficiently.

SUBMITTED BY

Department: Public Works
Division: Transportation
Prepared by: David Patman, P.Eng. – Manager, Transportation
Rebecca Peterniak, M.Sc., P.Eng., Community Traffic Engineer
Colleen Flather, M. Sc., P. Eng., Traffic Management Engineer
Date: January 14, 2020

APPENDIX A:
PROPOSED PROCESS FOR TRIAGING, ANALYZING AND IMPLEMENTING REQUESTS FOR TRAFFIC CALMING MEASURES

The proposed community traffic management approach would bring Winnipeg in-line with other jurisdictions and better serve our residents and communities.

This includes changing the process for reviewing traffic calming requests to a more flexible approach that looks first at causation, then at potential solutions (rather than automatically exploring the potential for speed humps alone). This process would ultimately be developed in two phases: first, for requests that pertain to singular streets or stretches, secondly for requests that affect larger community areas[1].

The proposed new process contains five steps:

1) Investigation Trigger
2) Preliminary Screening
3) Prioritization
4) Design & Public Engagement
5) Implementation & Evaluation

Step 1 – Investigation Trigger

Traffic calming investigations would continue to be triggered by one of four contacts: direct contact from citizens; 311 inquiries; direct contact from Councillors; or field observations by staff.

Any investigation triggered by an outside party would begin the same way regardless of whether it applies to a localized area or larger community:

Step 1A: Resident or Councillor requests an investigation of a specific location.
Step 1B: Public Service determines whether this is a localized or community-wide request.

- If localized, the request becomes part of the new process and proceeds to Step 1C.
- If community-wide, the request is deferred until Phase II of the new process is implemented.

[1] Local traffic calming measures can be studied in-house and completed relatively rapidly with internal resources. Requests that cover larger areas generally require the Public Service to investigate multiple issues on multiple streets in a more in-depth fashion, and with broad public engagement. The investigations take several months, and are most often handled in consultation with an external engineering firm.

The Public Service is currently conducting a trial community traffic study in the Lord Roberts neighbourhood. A study of this type and scale has not been conducted for many years; lessons learned with help to inform the community process going forward and will help define items such as timeframe, appropriate level of public engagement, strengths and weaknesses of public and technical committees.

Step 1C: Public Service confirms the location has not been studied within the last five years, develops a petition template that lists affected streets and properties, and distributes it to the requester.

Step 1D: The requester must return the petition signed by 25 per cent[2] of affected residents living in separate households, and approved by the ward Councillor.

Step 2 – Preliminary Screening

The Public Service would conduct a technical review of requests that meet all submission requirements to determine if the location is a candidate for further analysis. Some factors that would be considered in this review are:

- Street classification (residential local, residential collector, or public lane etc.)
- Posted speed limit and technical interpretation of speed study results
- Block length (120-150 metres for street, 100 metres for lanes)
- Route use (truck route or transit route)
- Adjacent land uses (school, multifamily development, shopping, senior residences, community or recreation complexes etc.)
- Traffic volume (local street with volume greater than 1,000 vehicles per day; minor collector street with volume greater than 5,000 vehicles per day; major collector street with volume greater than 8,000 to 10,000 vehicles per day)
- Shortcutting

If a location is not a candidate for traffic calming measures, the request would be closed and the location will be ineligible for further study for a minimum of three years unless there is significant growth or development in the area.

Step 3 – Prioritization

Locations that pass preliminary screening would be prioritized against other requests using a points-based system that explores a number of factors including:

- Street classification
- Presence and condition of bicycle routes and infrastructure
- Presence and condition of sidewalks and other pedestrian infrastructure
- Adjacent land use
- Speeds
- Traffic volumes
- Safety, such as collision history
- Equity, as it relates to the socioeconomic condition of the neighbourhood
- Upcoming renewal/capital projects on the street

[2] A figure of 25 per cent plus Councillor support is much less of a barrier than the current 70% requirement, while still requiring a requestor to complete some legwork and demonstrate that there is a measure of support for the change within the wider community. PWD-Transportation will review the 25% requirement to determine if it needs to be modified after a number of projects have been completed.

By creating a points-based prioritization system[3], the Public Service would ensure that all projects are indexed and evaluated against each other within one system using consistent criteria. Projects that score as the highest priority would proceed to design and engagement. Based on current City resources, it is anticipated that three to five projects could move onto Step 4 each year.

Some community traffic management projects may be quite costly; thus the prioritization of projects is essential so funds are utilized where they can provide the maximum benefit.

Step 4 – Design & Public Engagement

When an investigation reaches this step, the Public Service would develop one or more traffic calming design solutions specific to the location.

The aforementioned *Canadian Guide to Traffic Calming* contains an extensive toolbox of traffic calming measures and would be a main reference document during the design stage. Some tools that could be explored include:

- Vertical deflection measures
    - Raised crosswalks, raised intersections, speed humps, speed tables
- Horizontal deflection measures
    - Chicanes, curb radius reductions, lateral shifts, traffic circles
- Roadway narrowing measures
    - Curb extensions, lane narrowing, on-street parking, raised median islands, vertical centerline treatments
- Surface treatments
    - Textured crosswalk, textured pavement, transverse rumble strips
- Access restrictions
    - Directional closures, diverters, full closures
- Enforcement measures[4]
- Educational measures

Public engagement would occur as part of the design stage to seek input on designs and ensure neighbourhood concerns, needs, and opinions are considered prior to installation and would be consistent with the Engage Winnipeg Policy. The scope of the public engagement would be dictated by the scope and complexity of the problem and possible treatments.

The team anticipates one phase of engagement, which would be classified as a 'involve' type[5]. It is expected that most projects will have one in-person opportunity and one simultaneous online opportunity for engagement. The concerns raised by the public will be considered in

[3] The Public Service would further develop this system upon approval of this report, with plans to evaluate and refine it throughout its infancy.

[4] The Public Service would seek out partnerships with the Winnipeg Police Service, Manitoba Public Insurance, and perhaps others for treatments related to enforcement and education.

[5] From the Engage Winnipeg Policy: "Involve - Participants are engaged to ensure concerns are understood and reflected."

developing the final traffic calming measures to be implemented. This process would also include Councillor out reach.

Step 5 – Implementation and Evaluation

Traffic calming measures would generally be funded by the Traffic Engineering Improvement Program (TEIP) subject to funding being available. If a location is up for capital renewal, it would be ideal for the traffic calming improvements to be included within the capital budget.

On a case-by-case basis, the Public Service may explore installing treatments on a trial basis using non-permanent modular elements to test or pilot solutions at low-cost; the pilot would be in place for a number of months. If the solution is shown to be successful through measured traffic studies, it would be replaced at a later date with a more permanent installation as budget allows. If it is not successful, it could be readily removed and the materials repurposed elsewhere. The Public Service would finalize a manual detailing design specs for trial installations based on Winnipeg's climate and road maintenance standards upon completion of several initial pilots.

For permanent solutions, dependent upon the scope of a project and available resources, the Public Service would consider research one year after implementation.

Community traffic management projects would adhere to the framework, processes and/or guidelines approved by Standing Policy Committee of Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works (SPCIRPW).

An annual summary of traffic calming activities would be provided to SPCIRPW if desired.