The agenda for the Special Meeting of Council to be held in Room #4 of the Mission Leisure Centre, 7650 Grand St, Mission, British Columbia on Tuesday, April 16, 2019 commencing at 1:00 p.m.

1. CALL TO ORDER

2. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

3. NEW BUSINESS
   (a) Traffic Safety Strategy for Mission
      i. Presentation by Staff (Arthur Kastelein, Manager of Engineering Planning & Design)
      ii. Council/Staff Discussion (including Financial Options)
   (b) Traffic Calming Policy Update
      i. Presentation by Staff (Michele Fernie, Engineering Technologist III – Traffic and Transportation)
      ii. Council/Staff Discussion (including Financial Options)

   Background
   At the March 18, 2019 Regular Council meeting, Council directed staff to schedule a meeting to discuss the Traffic Safety Strategy and the Traffic Calming Policy in more detail. The March 18, 2019 staff reports are attached as background information:
   - Traffic Calming Policy Update (report from March 18, 2019 Regular Council Meeting) Page 14

4. ADJOURNMENT
DATE: March 18, 2019
TO: Chief Administrative Officer
FROM: Arthur Kastelein, Manager of Engineering Planning & Design
SUBJECT: Traffic Safety Strategy for Mission
ATTACHMENTS: A – Table 1. Traffic Safety Strategy – Improving Vehicle, Pedestrian and Cycling Safety in Mission
B – Communication and Education Framework
C – Communication Strategy Checklist

RECOMMENDATIONS: Council consider and resolve:
1. To endorse the Traffic Safety Strategy for the District of Mission as outlined in this report;
2. To hire a new full-time Engineering Technologist position for traffic safety initiatives in 2019, with one-time funding in the amount of $145,000 from General Fund Accumulated Surplus in 2019, and an approximately 0.46% tax increase to provide ongoing funding in 2020 and beyond;
3. To establish a new budget in the amount of $425,000 per year for 2019, 2020, and 2021, for a total of $1,275,000, for capital expenditures for traffic safety issues, with funding from the General Capital Reserve Fund; and
4. That the District’s financial plan be amended accordingly.

PURPOSE:
This report presents a strategy to address emerging traffic related safety issues for consideration by Council, in accordance with Resolution 18/704.

BACKGROUND:
District of Mission Council, at the December 3, 2018 Regular Meeting, resolved:
1. That staff prepare an outline for a strategy that will address emerging traffic related safety issues facing the District of Mission (District) that will include the following:
   - Categorize the traffic safety related complaints received at the District;
   - Identify priority categories and types of works that could be completed to address identified issues;
   - Identify financial and staffing resources;
   - Identify potential partnerships (ICBC, School District #75, and RCMP); and
   - Identify the components of a broad communication/education program.
2. That the outline be discussed at the next Mission Traffic and Transit Committee (MTTC) meeting (February, 2019); and

3. That the MTTC present the outline for the strategy for Council's consideration.

**DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS:**

Like other local governments, the District is able to directly influence traffic safety on and along the roads within its jurisdiction through the infrastructure it can provide along those roads. Signage, lighting, sidewalks, traffic markings, flashing beacons, traffic signals, traffic calming, geometric improvements, etc., are all measures the District can install or construct as necessary. Note this does not include roads outside the District’s jurisdiction, such as Highways 7 and 11.

A review of traffic safety related complaints received by the District results in five broad categories of issues that can be targeted by the District:

- Speeding vehicles;
- Intersection safety;
- Roadway geometry;
- Pedestrian safety; and
- Cycling and other (e.g., rail, heavy vehicle traffic).

These five can be broken down into sub-categories, which lend themselves to identifying works, improvements, and strategies which can be implemented by the District or, in a few instances, by partners such as ICBC, School District, or RCMP.

Attachment A provides an overview of the categories. It also identifies potential mitigation measures, lists agencies which might be involved, and summarizes the steps required to implement improvements. The mitigation measures are primarily focused on those that the District is able to implement, but for completeness it includes measures such as Enforcement and Education, which partner agencies would be asked to assist or lead.

Attachment A was presented to the MTTC meeting held on February 7, 2019, and received general support.

**IMPLEMENTATION:**

Implementing this Traffic Safety Strategy involves a combination of engineering activities, funding, and communications. Over-sight activities are also required, and it can be provided through regular reports to the MTTC.

Implementing the engineering components requires identifying problem sites, setting up evaluation criteria, identifying appropriate mitigation measures, and taking corrective action. Identifying problem sites can be done using ICBC data for motor vehicle accidents, combined with complaints received by the District.

Evaluating sites, identifying appropriate mitigation measures, and taking corrective action will require additional staffing resources. It is anticipated at least one additional position at an Engineering Technologist level will be needed to assist the existing Engineering Technologist, Traffic & Transport.

As well, the resulting construction and/or installation of improvements will require funding. Some measures, such as adding signage, can be installed relatively easily and can be performed by existing personnel or through existing contracts. Others, like overhead flashing beacons and street lighting, generally require engineering consultants and the associated complexities of tendering, over-sight, and inspection of construction projects. Note that measures with large capital costs, such as traffic signals, roundabouts, etc., are not included in this discussion, as they are generally funded by capital budgets, development cost charges, or through grant programs.
A complementary communications and education program has been drafted by the District’s Manager of Civic Engagement and Corporate Initiatives. It requires staff time and has costs for design, printing, advertising, and so on.

An initial review suggests that approximately $1,275,000 is required to acquire, supply, install, construct the mitigation measures, and undertake the communications program identified in the strategy. Spreading the initial $1,275,000 over a reasonable three year period timeframe requires an annual budget of $425,000. Maintaining this strategy into the future requires the same amount of funds annually.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

Adoption and implementation of the Traffic Safety Strategy requires additional staff and capital funds sourced from General Revenue. One additional Engineering Technologist is required, at an annual cost of about $145,000 (wages and benefits). Funding for the new technologist position would be required to be drawn from General Fund Accumulated Surplus for 2019 given that Council has already provided direction to finalize the 2019 budget. General Fund Accumulated Surplus currently has an uncommitted balance of approximately $4.5 million, as compared to a minimum recommended balance of $3.6 million. Ongoing funding for the technologist position will require an approximately 0.46% property tax increase in the 2020 budget.

Capital funds of $425,000 annually for 2019, 2020 and 2021, for a total of $1,275,000, are necessary for design and installation of mitigation measures. Should Council deem this initiative to be of the absolute highest priority, funding for the capital portion could be sourced from the General Capital Reserve Fund, however it will have a significant impact on the District’s ability to fund other priority capital projects and emergent issues. New infrastructure will also have maintenance and operating costs, which will result in increased operating budgets as the infrastructure comes on-line. It is expected these will be relatively low, however the impact is not known at this time, and any impact would put pressure on future budgets.

The General Capital Reserve Fund currently has an uncommitted balance of approximately $1.2 million in years 2019 and 2020, and it is projected to grow by an additional $300,000 in 2021. The recommended funding would severely compromise the District’s ability to initiate new priority capital projects, and would severely limit the District’s ability to respond to emergent issues that require capital funding. While the minimum recommended balance for the General Capital Reserve Fund as per District policy is $6 million, the recommended funding would leave only $700,000 in funds remaining in this reserve. Further, this would limit the District’s ability to fund from reserves any of the over $70 million in additional capital projects that currently sit on the District’s unfunded list, or any other priorities that might result from Council’s strategic plan. Approval of these capital funds would likely cause the District to require long-term borrowing sooner than otherwise, adding additional costs to those projects.

Staff is concerned with this request being considered outside of the established budget cycle, as it prevents Council from being able to consider the request in terms of other priorities that are brought forward for consideration during the budget process. Further, it limits the District’s ability to effectively undertake long-term financial planning.

[Signature]

I have reviewed the financial implications
Kris Boland, Director of Finance
COMMUNICATION:
Attachment A was presented at the February 7, 2019 meeting of the MTTC and received general support.
A communications plan for this strategy was drafted by the District’s Manager of Civic Engagement and Corporate Initiatives – Attachments B & C.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION:
The Traffic Safety Strategy outlined in this report is a response to Council Resolution 18/704, which directed staff to review traffic safety related complaints, categorize and prioritize them, and identify works which would address them.

Focusing on works which the District has jurisdiction over, the strategy identifies five broad categories of complaints, breaks them down into sub-categories, and identifies potential mitigation measures to improve road-way safety.

Implementation of the strategy requires additional staffing resources and capital funding. An additional Engineering Technologist needs to be hired, a three year capital funding allocation of $425,000 per year is needed to implement the initial set of mitigation measures, and annual on-going funding of $425,000 should be allocated to maintain this strategy in the future.

SIGN-OFFS:

Arthur Kastelein, Manager of Engineering Planning & Design

Reviewed by:
Tracy Kyle, Director of Engineering & Public Works

Comment from Chief Administrative Officer:
Reviewed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of Complaint</th>
<th>Description of Safety Issues</th>
<th>Potential Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Agencies to be Involved</th>
<th>Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. Speeding Vehicles</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. On Major roads</td>
<td>Excessive speeds on arterial and collector roads.</td>
<td>Enforcement.</td>
<td>RCMP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Engineering: traffic signal coordination on Cedar Street (400 m intersection spacing).</td>
<td>District of Mission</td>
<td>Investigate coordination on Cedar Street corridor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Education: “Don’t race to red” campaign.</td>
<td>ICBC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Engineering: speed display devices.</td>
<td>District of Mission; ICBC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>District of Mission</td>
<td>Set up evaluation process for site, estimate costs, request funding.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Design of subdivisions.</td>
<td>District of Mission; Planning</td>
<td>Investigate design options, revise standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Enforcement.</td>
<td>RCMP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Enforcement.</td>
<td>RCMP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Enforcement.</td>
<td>RCMP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## B. Intersection Safety

| a. Signalized | Congestion leading to risk-taking, lack of sight lines of opposing vehicles, pedestrian/vehicle conflicts. | Engineering: add signal phases, construct left turn lanes, restrict movements, change layout to roundabout, add anti-skid pavement treatment on the downhill approaches to intersections. | District of Mission; ICBC | Set up evaluation program for review of high accident locations, request funding to improve 1 intersection annually. |
| b. All-way stop | Pedestrian/vehicle conflicts, visibility of stop signs, stop sign compliance. | Engineering: add street lights, add overhead flashing beacons, construct roundabout. | District of Mission; ICBC | Set up evaluation process for sites, estimate costs, request funding. |
| c. Two-way stops | Delays leading to risk-taking, lack of sight lines of opposing vehicles. | Engineering: change to all-way stops, construct roundabouts, install signals, add street lights. | District of Mission; ICBC | As warranted, estimate costs, request funding. |

## C. Road Geometry Issues

| Requests for roadside barriers and curve warning signs. | Engineering: install signs, barriers, street lights. | District of Mission; ICBC | Set up evaluation process for sites, estimate costs, request funding. |
### D. Pedestrian Safety

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a. At road crossings</th>
<th>Vehicles not stopping for pedestrians, pedestrian visibility issues.</th>
<th>Engineering: install crosswalks, street lights, pedestrian-activated flashing beacons, curb bulges.</th>
<th>District of Mission; ICBC</th>
<th>As warranted, estimate costs, request funding.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Engineering: existing non-stop controlled pedestrian crossings.</td>
<td>District of Mission</td>
<td>Update Crosswalk Policy to include RRFB and Special Crosswalk, review all non-stop controlled pedestrian crossings for conformance to current Pedestrian Crossing Control Guide (underway).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Enforcement.</td>
<td>RCMP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Education: encourage pedestrians to make themselves visible.</td>
<td>ICBC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Along roads</td>
<td>Pedestrians walking in travel lanes or too close to traffic, nighttime visibility.</td>
<td>Engineering: sidewalks, street lights.</td>
<td>District of Mission</td>
<td>Set up evaluation process for sites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Education: encourage pedestrians to make themselves visible.</td>
<td>ICBC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### E. Cycling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Lack of comfortable cycling facilities for all ages and abilities.</th>
<th>Engineering: improve on-street and off-street cycling facilities.</th>
<th>District of Mission</th>
<th>Develop a more comprehensive cycling network, develop plans for cycling construction projects, estimate costs, request funding.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Education: encourage and promote cycling as part of a healthy lifestyle.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE:**
- **D. Pedestrian Safety**
  - **a. At road crossings**
    - Vehicles not stopping for pedestrians, pedestrian visibility issues.
    - Engineering: install crosswalks, street lights, pedestrian-activated flashing beacons, curb bulges.
    - District of Mission; ICBC
    - As warranted, estimate costs, request funding.
  - **b. Along roads**
    - Pedestrians walking in travel lanes or too close to traffic, nighttime visibility.
    - Engineering: sidewalks, street lights.
    - District of Mission
    - Set up evaluation process for sites.
  - **c. Near Elementary Schools**
    - Safety at crosswalks.
    - Programming: provide crossing guards.
    - School District 75

**E. Cycling**

- Lack of comfortable cycling facilities for all ages and abilities.
- Engineering: improve on-street and off-street cycling facilities.
- District of Mission
- Develop a more comprehensive cycling network, develop plans for cycling construction projects, estimate costs, request funding.
- Education: encourage and promote cycling as part of a healthy lifestyle.
Traffic Safety Strategy - Communication and Education Framework

Introduction
This framework will help the municipality undertake communication, engagement, and education programs in related to traffic, transportation, and pedestrian safety.

Council has expressed their concern regarding traffic safety, and want to work with partners to improve safety while expanding public engagement and education.

This framework provides the basic structure to support the development and implementation of the Traffic Safety Strategy. It is provided with consideration to the complex multi-stakeholder nature of traffic safety in and around the community, and recognizes that the successful launch of this project depends on dedicated staffing resources.

Driver
Currently, the public is concerned about traffic and pedestrian safety, frustrated with the behaviour of fellow drivers and pedestrians, and frustrated with what they perceive as a lackluster approach to safety at intersections.

Council and staff recognize these concerns, and the Traffic Safety Strategy is the primary response to addressing these concerns.

The main driver for this communications framework is that multi-agency communications are required to support the on-the-ground traffic safety improvements with a coordinated communication and engagement effort if we are to maximize public benefit.

Goals & Outcomes
The primary goal is to support enhanced, coordinated communication and engagement efforts related to the Traffic Safety Strategy. These are mainly led by partner agencies, and the intent is to leverage municipal and other community resources to expand their reach and resonance across the community.

Together with partner agencies we will work to achieve the following outcomes:

- Improved understanding and engagement with existing processes.
- Improved participation in engagement efforts related to traffic safety.
- Improved behaviour (or reduction in negative behaviour) related to traffic safety.
**Implementation**

The project team will need to review and finalize the communication strategy checklist attached. It identifies the six key considerations required for delivering a public engagement initiative, and will form the basis of a complete strategy to support the Traffic Safety Strategy.

To complete a communication strategy, the Manager of Civic Engagement and Corporate Initiatives will facilitate a discussion and the completion of the strategy checklist, and from that complete a formal communication plan and the required project management tools so that the project team is properly resourced moving forward.

Staff recognize some funding will be required to successfully support this initiative, and provide the following preliminary annual budget based on their best estimate of the scale and scope of this project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Promotions &amp; communications</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design and development</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing and advertising</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing costs</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event expenses</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equipment and supplies</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotional material</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL** $19,000

**Tools**

The tools below can be used to support the overall communications objectives. They are listed under their best-use, however there is crossover where individual tools can and do serve multiple purposes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Informing</th>
<th>Engaging</th>
<th>Promoting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public websites</td>
<td>Engage.mission.ca</td>
<td>Promoted posts and online advertising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social media posts</td>
<td>Social media dialogues</td>
<td>Re-sharing partner content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media relations &amp; City page</td>
<td>Project ambassadors at events</td>
<td>Partnered advertising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agendas and webcasts of meetings</td>
<td>Public meetings</td>
<td>Promo items for events and engagement points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Key Audiences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Audience</th>
<th>Current Issues</th>
<th>Desired Outcomes</th>
<th>Tactics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Driving Public</td>
<td>Perception that roads are unsafe due to other-driver-behaviour (ODB), and poor lighting/road surface markings and intersections</td>
<td>Informed with accurate picture of traffic statistics for Mission and region</td>
<td>Update online content and develop brochure on process for distribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disengaged from municipality and partner agency communication channels</td>
<td>Informed with clear and accessible info on process/systems for voicing concerns and potential for change</td>
<td>Review and enhance partnership with CPO and ICBC on in-person initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reengaged with municipal and partner agency communication channels</td>
<td>Municipal channels coordinated with partner agencies to amplify messaging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Media-relations to drive exposure to seasonal messaging on safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrians &amp; Cyclists</td>
<td>Perception roads are unsafe due to driver behaviour, insufficient lighting, and road surface markings</td>
<td>Clear on process and opportunities for requesting upgrades</td>
<td>Online content updated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perception that more and safer sidewalks and walkways are needed</td>
<td>Engaged on annual budget to advocate for their desired outcomes</td>
<td>Media campaign with record and what’s on – article/advertorials published regularly throughout the implementation process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perception that crosswalks are poorly lit and/or marked</td>
<td>Informed with accurate statistics comparing Mission to other municipalities in the region</td>
<td>Develop communication channel to connect with parents through schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Improved visibility through the choice of clothing and safety devices</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Public</td>
<td>Increasing perception that roads are unsafe due to under-lit and/or marked roadways and intersections as well as driver behaviour</td>
<td>Informed with accurate statistics</td>
<td>Online content updated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clear on process and opportunities for requesting work</td>
<td>Media campaign with record and what’s on – article/advertorial published</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Engaged with municipal budget and proper contacts for engagement</td>
<td>Ensure road safety is a component of 2019 citizen satisfaction and asset survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Track and report on all traffic safety improvements completed as part of the program.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Communication Strategy Checklist

What are we trying to achieve?
- Raising awareness & education
- Transforming or resolving conflict
- Exploring ideas & information
- Gathering information to inform decision-making
- Driving action or creating behavioural change

What questions are we asking the public?
- What questions does the public want to address?
- What is the opportunity for engagement?
- What is off the table / not up for discussion?
- What are the risks of not engaging with the public?
- How will our work affect the community?

How will our work or decisions affect the community?
- What's the impact on the whole community?
- What impacts are there on specific areas or groups within the community?

How will community input affect our work & decisions?
- Based on the IAP2 spectrum, what are our commitments to the public and to partners? *See IAP2 Spectrum on p.2

What is the scale of engagement?
- How broad should our reach be for this effort?
- What is our budget for engagement?
  - How is that budget related to the overall project budget?

How do we follow through & report back?
- How do we report back to our partners, the community, and Council?
- How do we continue to engage and work with the community related to this project?

Adapted from the sfu centre for dialogue, civic engage framework for public engagement – sfu.ca/civic-engage
## Communication Strategy Checklist

### IAP2 Spectrum

Developed by the International Association for Public Participation (IAP2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Participation Goal</th>
<th>Promise to the Public</th>
<th>Inform</th>
<th>Consult</th>
<th>Involve</th>
<th>Collaborate</th>
<th>Empower</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To provide the public with balanced and objective information to assist them in understanding the problem, alternatives and/or solutions.</td>
<td>We will keep you informed, listen to and acknowledge concerns and aspirations, and provide feedback on how public input influenced the decision.</td>
<td>To obtain public feedback on analysis, alternatives and/or decision.</td>
<td>To work directly with the public throughout the process to ensure that public concerns and aspirations are consistently understood and considered.</td>
<td>To partner with the public in each aspect of the decision including the development of alternatives and the identification of the preferred solution.</td>
<td>To place final decision-making in the hands of the public.</td>
<td>We will look to you for advice and innovation in formulating solutions and incorporate your advice and recommendations into the decisions to the maximum extent possible.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from the SFU Centre for Dialogue, Civic Engage framework for public engagement – sfu.ca/civic-engage
DATE: March 18, 2019
TO: Chief Administrative Officer
FROM: Michele Fernie, Engineering Technologist III – Traffic and Transportation
SUBJECT: Traffic Calming Policy Update
ATTACHMENTS: A – Neighbourhood Traffic Calming Policy EPW.32(A)
B – Neighbourhood Traffic Calming Policy STR.32

RECOMMENDATIONS: Council consider and resolve:
1. That Neighbourhood Traffic Calming Policy STR.32 be repealed;
2. That Neighbourhood Traffic Calming Policy EPW.32(A), as attached to the report from the Engineering Technologist III – Traffic & Transportation dated March 18, 2019 be approved; and

PURPOSE:
This report outlines the proposed updated Neighbourhood Traffic Calming Policy EPW.32(A), provided herein for Council’s consideration.

BACKGROUND:
Traffic is a major concern on neighbourhood streets in the District of Mission (District). With recent development, many residents have reported increased traffic volumes and speeds on neighbourhood streets. As a result, many residents have requested traffic calming to address speeding, short-cutting, and safety for pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists on their streets.

Although increased development traffic is the reason for recent resident enquiries, traffic issues and requests for traffic calming are not new; on July 21, 2003 Council adopted the Neighbourhood Traffic Calming Policy STR.32 (STR.32), included as Attachment B. This policy was most recently amended on February 2, 2009.

STR.32 has high traffic volume thresholds for neighbourhood streets, resulting in limited eligible projects for the streets it is intended to target. In 2018 staff received Chief Administrative Officer approval to update the Neighbourhood Traffic Calming Policy to address this concern. Requests for traffic calming on existing roads have been placed on hold, pending an update to the Policy.

DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS:
STR.32 put significant emphasis on vehicle volumes, with a required minimum of 1,000 vehicles per day for District funded traffic calming, however any road which had 1,000 vehicles per day qualified for resident funded traffic calming regardless of speeds. Most local roads do not achieve daily traffic volumes that high; this system heavily favors collector roadways. The Transportation Master Plan identifies expected daily traffic of up to 1,000 vehicles per day on local roads.
The process to update the Policy included a review of several lower mainland municipalities’ traffic calming policies. All policies reviewed included a warrant system utilized to determine if traffic calming should be installed, the specified criteria, and the applicable funding source. How these factors varied are identified below:

- **Warrant Systems** – single or dual criteria, multi-criteria scoring, multi-warrant, and petition only
- **Criteria (number of occurrences in reviewed policies)** – speed (6), volume (6), pedestrian generators (4), cycling (4), transit/emergency access routes (3), accident history (3), road classification (4), non-local traffic (3), sidewalks (1), and grades (1)
- **Funding Source** – municipally funded, resident funded, or a combination of both, with funding source based on the warrant or specific criteria.

The updated Neighbourhood Traffic Calming Policy EPW.32(A) (Policy) is largely similar to STR.32 in regards to the consultation and approval process; the warrant process is where it predominantly differs.

The main purpose of the Policy is to reduce vehicle speeds where the majority of traffic is driving inappropriately. It is not intended to address locations where a small number of motorists are speeding; enforcement is the more appropriate response in those cases. To ensure that the District installs traffic calming that addresses the majority of drivers, the Policy includes a minimum 85th percentile speed threshold of 10 km/h above the posted speed limit. If the threshold is met, the Policy utilizes a multi-criteria scoring system to determine if traffic calming is warranted, which includes traffic speeds, daily traffic volume, proximity to schools and parks, preventable crash history, and the existence of cycling routes.

Not all roadways are eligible for traffic calming, specifically arterial roads, emergency routes, Priority #1 snow plow routes, and locations with grades greater than 8%. Additionally, special attention must be taken when considering traffic calming on transit routes, or Priority #2 snow clearing routes.

STR.32 included discrete warrants for District funded and resident funded traffic calming projects, whereas the updated Policy utilizes the scoring from the warrant process to determine the applicable funding source.

The process identified in the Policy is comprehensive and will require significant staff time to investigate and implement. At the current staffing level, only a single “active” traffic calming project development can proceed at any time. An “active” traffic calming project commences once a preliminary petition is deemed to have sufficient support, and extends until:

- Funding is successfully secured; or
- Project is cancelled due to:
  - Insurmountable objections; or
  - Lack of support.

Once funding has been secured or the project is cancelled, the highest scoring and sufficiently supported petition qualifies for consideration as the “active” project.

During the review of neighbouring municipality’s traffic calming policies, it was noted that Chilliwack has placed a moratorium on all traffic calming projects. The moratorium is a result of negative feedback regarding increased emergency services response times, speeding relocated to adjacent streets, residents feeling “stuck” with the traffic calming devices, the perception that drivers are speeding despite the speed humps, and lastly that drivers circumvent the speed humps by driving on resident’s lawns.
To decrease the likelihood that similar concerns occur in the District, staff recommends the first traffic calming project based on the updated Policy be conducted as a pilot program, with a minimum six month waiting period to collect sufficient feedback from residents, and traffic data to determine the traffic calming effectiveness.

A District Traffic Calming Guide is being developed to supplement the Policy, and will be available on the District website and provided to proponents with the preliminary petition form.

COUNCIL GOALS/OBJECTIVES:

This report addresses Council’s goal of improved public safety by reducing vehicle speed and cut-through volumes on District roads. Reduced vehicle speeds have been proven to decrease the number and severity of collisions, particularly when an incident involves a pedestrian or cyclist.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

While this report has no direct financial implications, the proposed policy does identify that the District may be required to fund certain traffic calming projects, subject to Council approval. Depending on the popularity of the Policy, a significant amount of staff time and resources may be required to investigate and action this Policy before any construction even occurs. In regards to construction costs, there is currently no annual funding available for traffic calming. If District-funded traffic calming is warranted and supported, funding will be requested on a project-by-project basis; should funding not be available, the project would be added to the list of unfunded capital projects. Individual traffic calming projects may be eligible for ICBC funding, or in some cases could be funded by area residents through a Local Area Service tax.

It’s important to consider that implementing a new policy that requires funding, where no funding is identified, can put Council in a difficult position as requests likely would come forward outside of the established budgeting process, therefore without the ability to prioritize against other pending requests for funds.

I have reviewed the financial implications
Kris Boland, Director of Finance

COMMUNICATION:

The Neighbourhood Traffic Calming Policy EPW.32(A) will be included in the District’s Policy and Procedure Manual. The District’s website includes a traffic page with information regarding traffic calming. Links to Neighbourhood Traffic Calming Policy EPW.32(A) and the Traffic Calming Guide will be included.

Development of the Policy involved consultation with internal stakeholders, including public works and Mission Fire Rescue, and the external stakeholders from the Mission Traffic and Transit Committee, including BC Transit, RCMP, and ICBC.

Any traffic calming projects borne of this Policy will also involve consultation with a resident committee, as well as the internal and external stakeholders identified above.
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION:

Concerns regarding speeding and increased vehicle traffic often lead to requests for traffic calming. The District's Neighbourhood Traffic Calming Policy STR.32 has high traffic volume thresholds for neighbourhood streets, resulting in limited eligible projects for streets it is intended to target. The policy needed to be updated, and the process for the update included a review of neighbouring municipality's traffic calming policies, and consultation with internal and external stakeholders. Neighbourhood Traffic Calming Policy EPW.32(A) is an updated policy that sets the criteria for the evaluation and prioritization process for traffic calming requests, and as well as the funding, approval, and implementation of traffic calming projects on District roadways.

SIGN-OFFS:

Michele Fernie, Engineering Technologist III – Traffic and Transportation
Reviewed by:
Tracy Kyle, Director of Engineering & Public Works

Comment from Chief Administrative Officer:
Reviewed.
BACKGROUND:
The District of Mission receives numerous requests each year for Traffic Calming on neighbourhood roads. Traffic Calming measures such as speed humps/tables, curb extensions, raised medians, and traffic circles are designed to encourage safe driving by slowing down the speed of vehicles and reducing the volume of traffic on local roads.

Traffic Calming can be controversial, and general support of the residents and owners of parcels in an area is desirable before Traffic Calming measures are implemented. The measures may also require funding contributions from residents and owners. This policy sets out the processes for determining the level of support, the type of funding, and the apportionment of that funding.

Traffic Calming projects are intended to be small scale neighbourhood-level projects, with low implementation costs. Projects which are projected to cost more than $50,000 will be considered Local Area Service projects, and will be processed using the District’s Tax Policy for Local Service Areas.

PURPOSE:
The Neighbourhood Traffic Calming Policy (Policy) sets the criteria for the evaluation and prioritization process for Traffic Calming requests as well as the funding, approval, and implementation of Traffic Calming projects on District roadways.

This Policy is intended to address existing road conditions. While it is not intended to guide new development, any Traffic Calming measure installed on newly constructed roads is also subject to Section 2 of this Policy.

POLICY:
1. Definitions
   “Ballot Sheet” means a ballot mailed to all parcel owners and residents in the Benefiting Area, affording each parcel one vote in the Traffic Calming initiative in their neighbourhood.
“Benefiting Area” means the area which bounds the properties that face, flank or back onto the section of highway proposed to receive Traffic Calming and may be responsible for costs associated with the work. This area will include, at a minimum, the entire block where Traffic Calming measures are proposed.

“Council” means the duly elected officials of the District of Mission, those being the Mayor and Councilors.

“Director” means the Director of Engineering and Public Works or their designate.

“District” means the District of Mission.

“Funding Parties” means the owners or residents of parcels who have indicated a willingness to fund the proposed Traffic Calming measures.

“Highway” means any public street, road, lane, and any other public way.

“LAS” means Local Area Service, a municipal service that is to be paid for in whole or in part by an LAS tax, in accordance with the established LAS Bylaw.

“Official Ballot for Traffic Calming” means an official Ballot Sheet and information package mailed out to all owners and residents of parcels in the Benefiting Area.

“Parcel” means any lot, block or other area in which land is held or into which it is subdivided, but does not include a highway.

“Preliminary Petition” means a petition form issued to the Proponent whereby signatures are requested from parcel owners or residents that benefit from or abut the proposed Traffic Calming project.

“Proponent” means the owner(s) or resident(s) of a parcel who have requested Traffic Calming for their street or neighbourhood.

“Traffic Calming” means physical features installed on a road to reduce the speeds at which vehicles travel, to discourage through traffic, to improve traffic safety, and to improve comfort levels for all road users. Traffic Calming measures may include speed humps, curb extensions, and mini-roundabouts or traffic circles.

2. Traffic Calming

2.1 All Traffic Calming measures installed in the District of Mission shall conform to the standards established in the Transportation Association of Canada’s Canadian Guide to Traffic Calming (February 2018) and any revisions thereto.

2.2 In general, Traffic Calming measures will only be installed in residential areas or on a roadway adjacent to a park or school. Traffic Calming measures will generally be limited to the following measures and applications:
### Traffic Calming Measure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traffic Calming Measure</th>
<th>Location Applicability</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Emerg/ Priority #2 Snow Route</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Rural Local</td>
<td>Collector</td>
<td>Arterial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VERTICAL DEFLECTION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raised Crosswalk (only considered where there is an existing marked crosswalk, or a crosswalk is warranted)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speed Cushion</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speed Hump</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speed Bump</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HORIZONTAL DEFLECTION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicane</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curb Radius Reduction</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Circle / Mini-Roundabout</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ROADWAY NARROWING</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curb Extension</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-Street Parking (as appropriate by road cross-section)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centre Median</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NON-PHYSICAL MEASURES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transverse Rumble Strips</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-Road Pavement Markings (&quot;Sign&quot;, converging chevrons)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speed Display Devices</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speed Watch</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Appropriate</strong></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Use with Caution</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not Appropriate</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3 Other measures will only be considered in the event that the above measures would not, in the opinion of the Director, adequately address the identified traffic issues or concerns. The above notwithstanding, traffic control signs other than those associated with the above noted measures will not be considered for use as Traffic Calming measures. Signs are considerably less effective than structural measures in achieving speed and volume reductions or decreasing shortcutting traffic, and generally require enforcement for compliance.
2.4 Vertical and horizontal deflection Traffic Calming measures will not be considered where:
   a) Grades are greater than 8 percent;
   b) Emergency access route would be significantly impacted; or
   c) Location is a Priority #1 snow clearing route, in accordance with Snow Plowing Policy EPW.25(C).

2.5 Caution must be exercised when considering Traffic Calming measures for transit routes and Priority #2 snow clearing routes.

2.6 Stop signs shall not be considered for Traffic Calming. The purpose of a stop sign is to assign right-of-way at an intersection and they are only installed where MUTCD warrants are met. Unwarranted stop signs have low compliance rates, potentially leading to increased accidents, additional noise and air pollution, and increased speeds between intersections.

2.7 Traffic Calming measures within or fronting new developments will be considered at the development application review stage.

3. Initiation
   3.1 A request for Traffic Calming is generally initiated by a resident or business. Residents and businesses can request Traffic Calming in writing via email, letter or by completing a Traffic Inquiry Form. The Traffic Inquiry Form is available on the District’s website.

   3.2 Staff will conduct an initial assessment to determine if a similar request has been submitted in the past five (5) years. If a request has been submitted and reviewed, staff will investigate if traffic patterns have changed significantly thereby necessitating a new investigation. If a previous request has been unsuccessful in the past five years, staff will document the findings and notify the Proponent.

   3.3 Staff will undertake a traffic study which will include vehicle speeds, traffic volumes, road classification, nearby pedestrian generators, and collision history. A minimum 85th percentile speed threshold of 10 km/h above the posted speed limit is required to proceed. If the minimum threshold is not met staff will document the findings and notify the Proponent that the Traffic Calming project will not be proceeding.

   3.4 If the minimum threshold is met, the data gathered during the traffic study will be scored based on the warrant criteria and weighting for Traffic Calming warrant in accordance with Appendix A.

4. Evaluation and Funding Options
   4.1 The warrant process will result in a numeric score ranging from 10 to 60. This score will determine the applicable funding source. Traffic Calming requests that score 40 points or greater may be considered for District-funding, while requests that score between 20 and 39 may be approved to be funded by residents. Traffic Calming requests which score less than 20 will not be approved. If Traffic Calming is not warranted staff will document the findings and notify the Proponent that the Traffic Calming project will not be proceeding.

   4.2 District-funded Traffic Calming projects will be prioritized based on the warrant score, and are subject to Council approval and available budget. Traffic Calming requests which meet the warrant for District funding, but for which funding is not currently available will be placed on the District’s unfunded budget list to be considered in a subsequent year.
4.3 Traffic Calming projects with warrant scores below the District-funded threshold, but above the minimum threshold of 20 points may be funded directly by residents in the Benefiting Area. Costs associated with resident-funded Traffic Calming will be 100% borne by owners.

4.4 Traffic Calming projects which satisfy the warrant score for District-funded Traffic Calming, but do not receive District funding in a given year, may be funded by residents. Costs associated with these types of Traffic Calming projects will be 100% borne by owners.

5. Project Development – Neighbourhood Support

5.1 If Traffic Calming is warranted, the Benefiting Area will be defined. The Benefiting Area will be used to determine which residents are to be consulted in the Preliminary Petition, open house, and Official Ballot for Traffic Calming. The extents of the Benefiting Area are influenced by the nature of the traffic concerns. It may be confined to a single street if speeding is the major concern, or include an entire neighbourhood in the case of non-local or short-cutting traffic into local streets. For a local road, the Benefiting Area should be comprised of one block of the local road, at a minimum; while for a collector road, the Benefiting Area will encompass a larger area.

5.2 A Preliminary Petition may be circulated by the Proponent to gauge neighbourhood support. The Proponent will be provided with:
   a) District of Mission Traffic Calming Guide; and
   b) Applicable Preliminary Petition form (Appendix B).

5.3 The Proponent has up to sixty (60) days to circulate the Preliminary Petition for Traffic Calming and return it to the District. If the Preliminary Petition is not returned, the District will not take any further steps with respect to the proposed Traffic Calming.

5.4 Sufficient support is deemed to exist when at least fifty percent (50%) of the residents of parcels (based on one vote per parcel) located in the proposed Benefiting Area have indicated their support for the proposed Traffic Calming on the Preliminary Petition.

5.5 If the Preliminary Petition fails to achieve sufficient support, the Traffic Calming request will be closed and the location will not be considered for Traffic Calming for a period of one year. Staff will document the findings and notify the Proponent.

5.6 If the Preliminary Petition is returned within sixty (60) days and the Director is satisfied that there is sufficient support for the proposed Traffic Calming project, staff will:
   a) Form a residents’ advisory committee of up to four owners or residents of parcels located in the Benefiting Area;
   b) Meet with residents’ advisory committee to review areas of concern and discuss possible Traffic Calming measures to mitigate issues;
   c) Develop one or more options which meet the criteria of this policy and TAC guidelines;
   d) Consult with the RCMP, Mission Fire and Rescue Service, transit and Public Works;
   e) Prepare a cost estimate for each option; and
   f) Meet with the residents’ advisory committee to obtain input on the proposed options.
g) Schedule an open house. All owners and residents in the Benefiting Area will be invited to attend and provide input on proposed options. Notice of the open house will be posted in the newspaper and District website. If concerns or objections are identified which cannot be reasonably solved, the Traffic Calming request will be closed. Staff will document the findings and notify the Proponent.

h) Finalize the preferred option’s design based on feedback from the open house and revise the estimate as required. If the cost estimate of the preferred option exceeds the allowable maximum for Traffic Calming projects, the Local Service Area Tax Policy will be applied.

6. Funding Approval

6.1 Based on feedback at the open house, staff will request approval from Council to initiate the Official Ballot for Traffic Calming process, or the LAS Tax Policy, and, in the case of a District-funded project, also request approval of funding-in-principal.

6.2 If Council approves the request to initiate the Official Ballot for Traffic Calming process, staff will mail an information package to owners and residents of parcels in the Benefiting Area. The mail out will include a cover letter, project costs, and in the case of a resident-funded project the estimated cost plus a 5.5% administration fee to each parcel; a map of the proposed works; a Ballot Sheet (Appendix C); and a pre-paid, pre-addressed return envelope.

6.3 Each parcel is allocated a single vote in the process. If a parcel is owned by two or more persons the Ballot Sheet must be signed by the majority of owners. If the resident is not the owner and the support of the owner and resident are not the same, the vote for the parcel is considered neutral.

6.4 Ballot Sheets are to be returned to the District within sixty (60) days, or another period of time as specified by the Director. Ballot Sheets received after sixty days will not be considered in the determination of sufficiency and validity of the Official Ballot for Traffic Calming.

6.5 The Director will determine the sufficiency and validity of the Official Ballot for Traffic Calming. To be certified as sufficient and valid:

   a) A minimum fifty percent (50%) of parcels located in the Benefiting Area must submit a Ballot Sheet; and

   b) A minimum of two-thirds (66.7%) of parcels in the Benefiting Area must support the project before it can proceed, even if a lesser number of owners/residents are willing to fund a resident-funded project.

6.6 If the Official Ballot for Traffic Calming is not certified as sufficient and valid by the Director, the District will provide written notice to the owners/residents of parcels in the proposed Benefiting Area and will not take any further steps with respect to the proposed Traffic Calming, nor will any further requests for Traffic Calming be considered for five years, unless significant traffic pattern changes take place in the area.

6.7 If the Official Ballot for Traffic Calming has been certified as sufficient and valid by the Director, Council may choose to:

   a) Approve construction and funding of a District-funded Traffic Calming project;

   b) Defer construction and funding of a District-funded Traffic Calming project to a subsequent year;
c) Approve construction of a resident-funded Traffic Calming project; or
d) Cancel the Traffic Calming project.

6.8 If Council approves the construction of a resident-funded Traffic Calming project, all Funding Parties will be contacted to provide a deposit for their share of the estimate plus a 5.5% administration fee.

6.8.1 In the case of a change in willingness to fund the Traffic Calming project by one or more parties, staff will contact the remaining Funding Parties to solicit sufficient funds for the project. If funding in the amount of the estimate and administration fee is not available, the Traffic Calming project will be placed on hold for one (1) year.

6.8.2 If funding is not secured within the year, the Traffic Calming project will be cancelled, and further requests for Traffic Calming will not be considered for an additional four (4) years. Any funds collected will be returned to the person(s) that provided the deposit.

7. Implementation

7.1 Once funding is secured, the Traffic Calming project will proceed and the measures will be implemented.

7.2 Construction of approved Traffic Calming projects may be delayed by the Director to coordinate with other construction projects.

7.3 Where possible, the Traffic Calming measures will be initially installed on a temporary basis. If after a monitoring period of at least six months the temporary measure is achieving the initial objectives then the permanent installation may be considered. This approach is not possible for measures involving vertical deflection such as speed humps, raised crosswalks, etc.

7.4 For resident-funded Traffic Calming projects, if the actual cost of installation is less than the estimate and administration fee, the difference will be refunded to the Funding Parties in proportion to their contributions. If the cost of installation is more than the estimate and administration fee, the District will fund the additional expense.

8. Evaluation

8.1 Evaluation of the performance of temporary measures will be conducted using a similar process to the Traffic Calming warrant.

8.2 For permanently installed measures staff will monitor the Traffic Calming measure to assess performance; however, residents will not be contacted for further input.

8.3 Once installed, Traffic Calming measures will generally remain in place. The process for removing Traffic Calming measures will follow the same initiation, project development, approval, and implementation procedure as a Traffic Calming request would. Resident requested Traffic Calming removal will be 100% resident funded.

8.4 If Council decides to remove resident-funded Traffic Calming measures, the District will pay for the removal and if this occurs within two (2) years of the installation, it will refund the Funding Parties their contributions to the project.

RELATED POLICIES, PROCEDURES, AGREEMENTS AND/OR BYLAWS:
Development and Subdivision Control Bylaw 5650-2017
Local Area Service Tax Policy FIN.53(C)
Snow Plowing Policy EPW.25(C)

*** END OF POLICY ***
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### APPENDIX A

**WARRANT CRITERIA FOR TRAFFIC CALMING STUDIES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Basis for Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speed</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>85th percentile vehicle speeds (1 point for every km above existing speed limit, up to a maximum of 20 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Volume</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Average daily traffic (varies based on road classification)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• 10 – Local &gt; 750 vehicles per day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• 5 – Local &gt; 500 vehicles per day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• 10 – Collector &gt;3,000 vehicles per day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• 5 – Collector &gt; 1,500 vehicles per day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>School frontage located within 150 m of location (scoring varies based on level of school)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• 10 – Elementary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• 5 – Middle School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• 3 – High School or Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Park frontage located within 150 m of the proposed location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crash History</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Greater than 1 preventable accident per year for the last 5 years (based on ICBC data)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike Route</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Location is on a bike route</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Total</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

40 points or greater - may be considered for District-funded Traffic Calming  
20 to 39 points - may be considered for resident-funded Traffic Calming  
20 points or less - will not be considered for Traffic Calming  

District-funded Traffic Calming projects will be prioritized according to their score.
APPENDIX B

TEMPLATE PRELIMINARY PETITION FOR DISTRICT-FUNDED TRAFFIC CALMING

Traffic calming generally involves the use of physical features installed on a road to a) reduce the speeds at which vehicles travel, b) discourage through traffic, c) improve traffic safety, and d) improve comfort levels for all road users. Typical traffic calming measures include speed humps, curb extensions, and traffic circles.

A request has been received from residents of your neighbourhood for the District of Mission to initiate a traffic calming project on <STREET(S)>.

Please refer to the provided map for the extent of the neighbourhood covered by the request.

Before the District can proceed with this request, it is necessary to determine whether or not residents of the neighbourhood generally support traffic calming. In accordance with the District's Neighbourhood Traffic Calming Policy, for traffic calming to proceed to the next step at least 50% of the addresses below must support traffic calming. If supported, the following steps include identification of options, preparation of cost estimates, and an open house.

By signing below I am indicating my support in principle for a traffic calming project in my neighbourhood:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name: (Please print)</th>
<th>Address:</th>
<th>Signature:</th>
<th>Provide phone no. if you wish to volunteer for the resident advisory committee (max. 4 people)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;i.e. 8645 Stave Lake St&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;Address&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;Address&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;Address&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;Address&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;Address&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Return this petition to the District of Mission Engineering Department on or before <DATE>. 
TEMPLATE PRELIMINARY PETITION FOR RESIDENT-FUNDED TRAFFIC CALMING

Traffic calming generally involves the use of physical features installed on a road to reduce the speeds at which vehicles travel, to discourage through traffic, to improve traffic safety, and to improve comfort levels for all road users. Typical traffic calming measures include speed humps, curb extensions, and traffic circles.

A request has been received from residents of your neighbourhood for the District of Mission to initiate a traffic calming project on <STREET(S)>. Please refer to the provided map for the extent of the neighbourhood covered by the request.

Before the District can proceed with this request, it is necessary to determine whether or not residents of the neighbourhood generally support traffic calming. In accordance with the District's Neighbourhood Traffic Calming Policy, for traffic calming to proceed to the next step at least 50% of the addresses below must support traffic calming. If supported, the following steps include identification of options, preparation of cost estimates, and an open house.

This traffic calming project does not warrant District funding in accordance with the District’s Neighbourhood Traffic Calming Policy. Costs for this project will be borne 100% by residents. **The intent of this petition is to determine neighbourhood support in principle; signing this petition carries no financial obligation.**

By signing below I am indicating my support in principle for a traffic calming project in my neighbourhood:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name: (Please print)</th>
<th>Address:</th>
<th>Signature:</th>
<th>Provide phone no. if you wish to volunteer for the resident advisory committee (max. 4 people)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;i.e. 8645 Stave Lake St&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;Address&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;Address&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;Address&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;Address&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;Address&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Return this petition to the District of Mission Engineering Department on or before <DATE>.  

The District of Mission is considering the installation of the following traffic calming measures, as indicated on the map:

1. <TRAFFIC CALMING MEASURE 1>; and
2. <TRAFFIC CALMING MEASURE 2>.

Please check one of the following:

☐ I/we support the above noted traffic calming
☐ I/we DO NOT support the above noted traffic calming

Owner Name (print)  Signature
______________________________________________

Owner Name (print)  Signature
______________________________________________

Owner Name (print)  Signature
______________________________________________

Owner Name (print)  Signature
______________________________________________

Ballot must be received at the District of Mission Engineering Department by close of business on <DATE>.

Note: Each parcel is allocated a single vote in the process.

- If a parcel is owned by two or more persons the Ballot Sheet must be signed by the majority of owners.
- If a parcel is occupied by other than the owner, the occupant may vote. However, if the owner and occupant votes differ, the votes will cancel each other.
The District of Mission is considering the installation of the following traffic calming measures, as indicated on the map:

1. <TRAFFIC CALMING MEASURE 1>; and
2. <TRAFFIC CALMING MEASURE 2>.

Please check one of the following:

☐ I/we DO support the above noted traffic calming

☐ I/we DO NOT support the above noted traffic calming

This traffic calming project does not warrant District funding. The costs of this project are to be borne by the benefiting neighbourhood. If you support the identified traffic calming measures please check one of the following:

☐ I am/we are willing to fund a portion of the traffic calming measures, understanding that if others are unwilling to contribute that the cost may increase. Any increase in cost will be communicated to all funding parties prior to the project proceeding.

☐ I/we DO NOT wish to financially contribute to the construction of traffic calming measures. I/we understand that if others are also unwilling to fund the project then the project will not move forward and traffic calming in this location will not be considered again for five (5) years.

Owner Name (print) __________________________ Signature __________________________

Owner Name (print) __________________________ Signature __________________________

Owner Name (print) __________________________ Signature __________________________

Owner Name (print) __________________________ Signature __________________________

Ballot must be received at the District of Mission Engineering Department by close of business on <DATE>.

Note: Each parcel is allocated a single vote in the process.
- If a parcel is owned by two or more persons the Ballot Sheet must be signed by the majority of owners.
- If a parcel is occupied by other than the owner, the occupant may vote. However, if the owner and occupant votes differ, the votes will cancel each other.
1.0 Purpose

This policy identifies standards and provides a procedure for consideration, evaluation, funding, and implementation of requests for traffic calming devices on residential streets.

2.0 Standards

All traffic calming devices installed in the District of Mission shall conform to the standards established in the Transportation Association of Canada’s Canadian Guide to Neighbourhood Traffic Calming - December 1998 and any revisions thereto.

In general, traffic calming devices will be installed only on urban residential streets except as noted herein, and will be limited to the following:

- Raised crosswalk
- Road markings
- Collector standard speed hump (3.0 metre wide top)
- Chicane
- Curb extension
- Curb radius reduction
- Traffic circle

Other devices will only be considered in the event that none of the above devices would, in the opinion of the Director of Engineering, address the issue under consideration.

The above notwithstanding, traffic control signs other than those associated with the above noted devices will not be considered for use in traffic calming solutions. The primary purpose of traffic control signs is to regulate traffic and not to calm traffic.

Signs are considerably less effective than structural measures in achieving speed and volume reductions or controlling shortcutting traffic and require greater enforcement for compliance.

It is particularly critical that stop signs only be installed where MUTCD warrants are met. Experience in other municipal jurisdictions has demonstrated that unwarranted stop signs...
may cause accidents, generally breed contempt for other necessary stop signs, create
added noise and air pollution, and may increase rather than decrease speeds between
intersections controlled with stop signs.

Installation of traffic calming devices will be subject to the following restrictions in relation
to road classification, transit and school bus routes, truck routes, priority snow clearing
routes and adjacent land use designation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traffic Calming Measure</th>
<th>Road Classification</th>
<th>Type of Route</th>
<th>Land Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arterial</td>
<td>Collector</td>
<td>Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raised Crosswalk</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Markings</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speed Hump</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicane</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curb Extension</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curb Radius Reduction</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Circle</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

√ = use; x = don’t use; A = Avoid wherever possible; * = avoid use where trucks turn right on a truck route

3.0 Funding

Traffic calming requests which meet District funded project warrants will be paid for by the
District subject to availability of budget and Council approval. Requests will be processed
on a first come first served basis and those which meet District funding warrants but are
submitted after all current budgetary funds are committed will be placed in a first come
first served waiting list for subsequent years.

Requests which do not meet District funded project warrants but do meet resident funded
project warrants must be paid for by the residents in the benefiting neighbourhood
through direct funding by the residents. A two thirds majority of the residents must
approve the project before it can proceed even though a lesser number of residents may
be prepared to cover the costs.

Residents whose requests meet District funded project warrants but whose requests have
been placed in a subsequent year’s waiting list due to budgetary constraints will have the
option of paying for the projects through a direct funding mechanism as noted above to
advance the project.

4.0 Warrants

A warrant calculation process must be completed before a traffic calming project request
is allowed to proceed through to the implementation process.
a) **District Funded**
   - Minimum 1000 vehicles per day (24 hour 2 way total); *and*
   - Measured 85th percentile speed > 10 km/h over posted speed limit; *or*
   - Minimum average of 1 accident per year over the past two years with speed listed as a contributing factor.

b) **Resident Funded**
   - Combined number of vehicular speed and volume points > 20 where points are calculated as follows:
     - 2 points for each km/h the measured 85th percentile speed is over the posted speed limit; *plus*
     - 2 points for each 100 vehicles per day (24 hour two way total)
   
   Note: calculated points will be rounded to the nearest whole number.

If both warrants fail the individual(s) who made the request will be notified that no further action will be taken.

5.0 **Determination of Benefiting Neighbourhood Boundaries**

In responding to a traffic concern on a particular street, any potential effects of proposed solutions on adjacent streets must be considered. Each request must be evaluated on a site specific basis in order to determine a reasonable boundary for the extent of traffic calming works and the associated benefiting area. Some public input may be required in defining the extent of the traffic concern and in identifying areas potentially impacted by proposed traffic calming measures.

The extent of the study area is to a degree influenced by the nature of the traffic concerns. It may be confined to a single street if speeding is the major concern or be expanded to include an entire neighbourhood bounded by arterial and collector streets if the issue is excessive infiltration of non local traffic into local streets.

The benefiting area will be used to determine which residents are to be consulted in both the threshold warrant process and the selection and implementation of measures as well as to define the extent of local improvement areas or similar areas for direct resident paid projects and for soliciting feedback after installation.

6.0 **Consultation and Approval Process**

Once it has been established that both warrants have been met, the following consultation process will be followed.

- Residents’ committee of up to four members is formed with staff’s assistance.
- Staff meet with residents’ committee to review possible calming measures which could address the issues of concern and obtain input.
- Staff develop one or more options which meet the criteria of this policy and the TAC Guide in consultation with the RCMP, Fire Department and Public Works, prepare a
cost estimate for each and meet with the residents’ committee to obtain input on the proposed options.

- An open house is scheduled and all residents in the benefiting area are invited to attend and provide input on proposed options.
- Staff finalize the proposed calming project details, revise the estimate if required and determine resident acceptance of the proposed measures.
- In the case of a District funded project a questionnaire including a sketch of the proposed works will be circulated to all residents in the benefiting area and the results of the questionnaire will be forwarded to Council for approval or shelving of the project. A two thirds majority of residents based on a minimum questionnaire return rate of two thirds must be in favour in order for the project to proceed.
- In the case of a resident funded local improvement project, staff will prepare a questionnaire including a sketch of the proposed works for circulation among neighbourhood residents by the residents’ committee members. If a 2/3 majority approve, based on a minimum questionnaire return rate of two thirds, then the residents committee will be asked to deposit an amount with the municipality equal to the estimated cost of the work before the work proceeds. Staff will obtain quotations from contractors to install the works. If the low bid exceeds the amount of the deposit the residents shall deposit the difference before the work proceeds. If the cost of the work is less than the deposit the difference will be refunded.

7.0 Implementation and Monitoring

Where possible the traffic calming devices will be initially installed on a temporary basis. This approach is not possible for calming devices involving vertical deflections such as speed humps, raised crosswalks, etc. If after a monitoring period of at least six months the device has been demonstrated to be achieving the initial objectives then the permanent installation will be constructed.

Evaluation of performance of temporary devices will be done by obtaining data on traffic characteristics as well as by sending a questionnaire to residents in the benefiting area. If the device falls short of expected performance as indicated by traffic data or if the response to the questionnaire on a minimum 50% return results in two thirds or more of respondents unsatisfied, the matter will be referred back to the original residents’ committee for review, and the consultation and approval process may be repeated for another option.

For permanently installed devices staff will obtain traffic data to assess performance; however, residents will not be contacted for further input.

8.0 Device Removal

Once installed, traffic calming devices will generally remain in place unless residents petition Council for the removal. Should such cases arise, a procedure similar to that set out in section 6.0 herein would be followed with respect to removal of the devices.