

**DRAFT Response to the Community Focus Group RE: the comments on the NSMP that we received.**

Town staff forwarded the DRAFT Neighborhood Speed Management Plan (NSMP) to the members of the Community Focus Group (CFG) for comment in January, 2024. Three members of the CFG responded with comments and the following is a summary of the major comment topics and staff's response. A copy of this document will be included in the Town Council memo being prepared for the upcoming April Study Session.

**Format:** Comment topic / ***town staff response***

1. One member expressed concerns that the meeting minutes for the 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting were unbalanced and favored issues being advocated for by the consultant with little to no emphasis on opposing concerns presented by members of the committee. Another member noted that the meeting minutes in the appendix did reflect the conversation that took place in our CFG meetings.

***Given this mixed feedback and the lack of any specific message that might be missing, staff are not editing the meeting minutes at this time.***

2. Concern was expressed about the emphasis on engineering solutions as opposed to resources already funded by the taxpayers and budgeted by the town (Police enforcement).

***The limitations of police enforcement as an effective tool in reducing speeds on neighborhood streets was discussed in detail at the 1<sup>st</sup> CFG meeting. The Police Chief was in attendance and provided his professional opinion that enforcement alone would not be a sustainable solution to this issue. Town staff believe that an appropriate emphasis on engineering solutions has been included in the NSMP.***

3. There should be a more direct phone number to reach town staff about the program.

***Town staff agree and have edited the NSMP to include a direct Public Works phone number***

4. Concern about disadvantaging a neighborhood based on the bicycle facilities in that neighborhood (i.e. including bicycle facilities in the prioritization process).

***Town staff agree that the use of bicycle facilities as a prioritization factor are confusing and not necessary. They have been removed from the NSMP.***

5. Concern about the use of petitions to determine support for a project before entering the program.

***Almost all of the Peer Cities with speed management programs which were studied had a petitioning requirement. Petitions ensure that town resources are not allocated to streets where the people do not want mitigation. It is important to note that the Town could still build mitigation even if neighbors didn't petition for it, through a town-initiated project, and such language is included in the NSMP.***

6. Concerns about Homeowner Association (HOA) restrictions limiting the use of yard signs.

***The town has been using NSMP yard signs for many months now and there have been no issues with any HOAs seeking to limit their use.***

7. Concern about only having one assessment of traffic calming success for each project.

***Town staff believe that one assessment of traffic calming success will be sufficient and a requirement to do more than this will take NSMP resources away from other projects. It should be noted that town staff are investigating tools which would make less resource intensive data collection possible and this may allow for more after data collection in the future.***

8. Should the NSMP require the use of enforcement (and evaluation of its effectiveness) before pursuing engineering solutions?

***Enforcement has historically been used in the town and the program encourages the use of Police Enforcement on applicant streets, as resources allow. However, it is understood by staff that enforcement alone is not a sustainable, effective solution and therefore it would likely waste town resources to require a documentation and evaluation of enforcement resources on all applicant streets prior to moving to engineering solutions. The NSMP in Boulder previously used a similar strategy and there were no examples of streets that had their problem mitigated through enforcement.***

9. Concern about the application requirement of 500 vehicles per day and whether this unintentionally preclude streets which need the program.

***Many programs surveyed have a minimum traffic volume criteria to ensure that really low volume streets such as short cul-de-sacs are not prioritized. However, it is not the intention to preclude any street that genuinely needs mitigation. Therefore, town staff is lowering this requirement to 300 vehicles per day. This was the lowest threshold found in any of the other programs surveyed.***

10. Why include traffic volume at all as a prioritization criteria?

***Town staff believe that the two most significant factors in prioritizing NSMP mitigation are how fast people are speeding and how many people are speeding. Traffic volume plays a significant role in determining the threat potential of speeding traffic and thus is a valuable prioritization criterion.***