

**DUBLIN CITY COUNCIL
WORK SESSION
MARCH 6, 2023**

Minutes

Mayor Fox called the Monday, February 6, 2023 work session to order at 6:08 p.m.

Council members present: Ms. Alutto, Ms. Amorose Groomes, Vice Mayor De Rosa, Mayor Fox, Mr. Keeler, and Ms. Kramb and Mr. Reiner.

Staff present: Ms. O'Callaghan, Ms. Readler, Mr. Ranc, Ms. Rauch, Mr. Rayburn, Deputy Chief Tabernik, Chief Paez, Mr. Ament, Ms. Willis, Ms. Wawszkiewicz, Mr. Rogers, Mr. Earman, Mr. Brown, Mr. Frantz, Ms. Weisenauer, Ms. Goliver.

Also present were: Katie O' Lone, Senior Planner/Project Manager, Toole Design Group.

Pledge of Allegiance

Mr. Reiner led the Pledge of Allegiance.

Proposed Speed Management Program

Ms. Willis stated that staff is bringing the topic of the proposed Speed Management Program back to Council for review and feedback. The project team has been working on this program since early 2022 with the assistance of Toole Design Group. The proposed program includes technology, innovation and traditional solutions in the toolbox. She introduced Katie O' Lone, Project Manager, from Toole Design Group to lead the presentation to Council.

Ms. O' Lone started her presentation with why a program like this is so important. As speeds increase, the likelihood of a crash increases as well, which brings a greater chance for severe injury or fatality. She reviewed the project timeline from the adoption of the current Traffic Calming Policy in 2004, which focused on the overall roadway environment and the safety of all users to this present discussion. She stated that throughout this project process, the team has researched policies, reviewed best practices, conducted engagement and drafted this proposed Speed Management Program. Regarding public engagement, over 400 people were reached as a result of e-mail outreach, pop-up events, online surveys and public meetings. The key takeaways from these interactions were that residents showed an interest in the following:

- Sidewalks and shared-use paths;
- Technology and innovative solutions; and
- Enforcement and physical measures such as roundabouts, speed bumps, pavement markings and safe crossings etc.

Ms. O' Lone compared the existing Neighborhood Traffic Calming Program to the new proposed Speed Management Program. She stated the existing program focuses on driver speeds through education and enforcement and requires a cumbersome process. In contrast, the proposed program focuses on the safety of all roadway users, uses a more data driven approach, and suggests flexible solutions to encourage driving at posted speed limits. The existing program required a budget and programming process for each implementation; whereas the proposed program allows for faster implementation. The existing program does not reference technology as much as the proposed program, which considers new driver feedback signs, vehicle and mobile app technology and Connected Dublin initiatives. The thresholds have also been updated in the program allowing for three categories of solutions. The three categories are:

1. 1 to 5 mph over the posted speed limit;
2. 6 to 10 mph over posted; and
3. More than 10 mph over posted or 1% excessive speeds.

There are specific highlights of the proposed program that Ms. O' Lone addressed to encourage discussion and garner feedback. Specifically, she highlighted the Vision and Goals, public awareness campaigns, vertical deflection, innovation and technology solutions and driver feedback sign guidance.

The Vision and Goals

The Vision was stated as:

The Speed Management Program will provide a framework for a data-driven approach to speed management. The program goals and strategies focus on creating safe and comfortable streets for all road users across Dublin including people walking and rolling.

The proposed goals are:

- Reduce traffic-related fatalities and serious injuries in the City of Dublin for all roadway users, including those walking and rolling.
- Reduce excessive speeding across Dublin. Excessive speeding is defined as traveling more than 15 mph over the speed limit.
- Develop strategies to address speeding concerns on Dublin streets.

Public Awareness Campaign

Ms. O' Lone stated that a new tool in the proposed program's toolbox is a public awareness campaign. This involves social media, email, fliers, newsletters and signs to help people understand that small changes can make a big difference. This solution can be used in any of the speed categories mentioned earlier.

Vertical Deflection

Ms. O' Lone shared that vertical deflection refers to elevations in the pavement that self-enforce a slower speed for motorists. Previous Council members removed the vertical deflection measure from the existing program due to a delay in emergency response vehicle transport. She provided a visual representation of two examples of vertical measures including a speed hump and a speed cushion. Public engagement has included feedback to explore vertical deflection measures further. She stated that the project team wanted to introduce speed cushions into the conversation about vertical deflection because emergency vehicles can drive through them with little to no delay. Research has shown that when vertical measures are spaced appropriately, between 250 to 500 feet, driving speeds stay within 20 to 30 mph. This solution would only be proposed in category 3. She stated that numerous studies have shown that the delay can range between 0-10 seconds for vertical deflections. Speed humps delay between 1 and 9.4 seconds, but speed cushions are between 0 and 1 second of delay per vehicle. Washington Township Fire Department was consulted and they did express concern for the comfort of patients in the emergency vehicles. The project team has proposed to limit the use of vertical deflection measures to non-primary emergency vehicle routes. She mentioned a few other considerations around vertical deflection measures:

- Increase in noise levels
- Property value impact perception

- Signage and striping requirements
- Consideration for category 3 solutions.

Innovation and Technology Solutions

Ms. O' Lone stated that there are many current technologies that Dublin can continue using and/or could expand upon. Driver feedback signs can be programmed to offer different messages to drivers at different speeds. Dublin currently uses corridor progression to control traffic through traffic signals technologies. These technologies allow the drivers that are driving the speed limit to arrive at a green light in the corridor while drivers that are speeding are much more likely to arrive on a red light. Ms. O' Lone also shared some of the heightened awareness crossing systems available such as LED light crosswalk signs and leading pedestrian intervals that allow pedestrians to cross the street fully before giving the driver the green light. She gave a high-level review of some of the emerging technologies such as: a Connected Dublin technology currently in development would warn equipped drivers of a speeding violation and speed safety cameras involving targeted mailings to remind drivers to drive safely. There are also vehicle technologies that support speed compliance.

An innovative way to make the road seem smaller, thereby lowering speeds, is through traditional road narrowing. Road narrowing could include painting edge lines and delineators. This solution is included in category 2 and 3 of the speed management toolbox. Another innovative way to narrow the street is through tactical urbanism. Tactical Urbanism can include such things as flower boxes strategically placed, curb extensions, painted medians, and chicanes. Streetscape improvements could also be utilized to narrow the roadway such as textured surfaces or adding permanent planters. Streetscape improvements is included in the category 3 solution.

Ms. O' Lone introduced the idea of a business district. The benefits of doing this would be that speed limits can be changed without doing a speed study and would therefore be more streamlined. An Ordinance would define the purpose and the boundary. This would allow 25 mph speed within the business district.

Driver Feedback Sign Guidance

Ms. O' Lone wanted to discuss and seek guidance on rotating driver feedback signs versus permanent driver feedback signs. Mobile speed trailers and rotating driver feedback signs can be used for solutions in category 1, where speeding is less severe. They can also be used as temporary solutions in categories 2 and 3. Permanent driver feedback signs are solutions for category 2. Rotating driver feedback signs would be placed on residential streets for approximately two to four weeks. Permanent driver feedback signs would be placed on: non-local streets, on streets with a presence of pedestrian/bicycle crashes within the past five years, or within 500' of a school, community center or community park.

Ms. O' Lone reviewed the three categories of solutions.

- Category 1 Solutions: 1 to 5 mph. This is the lowest speeding threshold category and these solutions are lower in cost and faster to install. All category 1 solutions are included in category 2 solutions as well.
- Category 2 Solutions: 6 to 10 mph. Included with the category 1 solutions are police observations and engagement, street width reduction using pavement markings, tactical urbanism and permanent driver feedback signs.

- Category 3 Solutions: more than 10 mph. These solutions are reviewed on a case-by-case basis and require additional study and funding. Solutions in this category include:
 - High visibility enforcement;
 - Signs and markings;
 - Traffic circles;
 - Chicanes;
 - Reduced number of lanes;
 - Street width reduction;
 - Technology;
 - Roundabout;
 - Median; and
 - Curb extensions/pavers.

Discussion Questions for Council

Ms. O' Lone stated that there are five questions that staff have brought forward to gain discussion and feedback from Council. They are:

1. Is City Council supportive of the Vision Statement and Goals?
2. Should the program include vertical deflection such as speed cushions, in the toolbox for Category 3 Solutions?
3. Does City Council have feedback regarding Tactical Urbanism? Is City Council supportive of a pilot project implementing Tactical Urbanism solutions in Dublin?
4. Does City Council have feedback regarding formally establishing a business district boundary?
5. Are there other elements City Council would like in the Speed Management Program not included in this memo?

Mr. Keeler asked about intersections that are part of the Connected Dublin project in addition to the intersection of Coffman Road and Emerald Parkway. Ms. Willis stated that there are three other intersections in Dublin that use the same technology as the Coffman/Emerald intersection. There are more intersections in Dublin with connected vehicle technology. In response to his question regarding speed monitoring, Ms. Willis stated that they can track trends, but not by vehicle.

Mr. Reiner asked how big the speeding problem is in Dublin. He stated that speed humps were put into some neighborhoods, but they were taken out due to not being effective. He stated that some roads need them now. The speeding problem that he has experienced has been young people.

Vice Mayor De Rosa asked about the resident survey responses. She stated that she was aware that some residents had very strong feelings about this and would like to see the actual responses. She asked, from an enforcement perspective, what we do today (how many tickets, how many stops, etc). Deputy Chief Tabernik stated that they take every traffic/speeding complaint seriously and send the traffic enforcement officers to the residents directly so the resident can speak with the officer. He shared that they get a large number of traffic complaints, crossed with the number of accidents, they try to devote resources when the two line up – indicating that there is a problem in a particular area. He stated that the category 3 solutions are the high visibility enforcement, but there are many engagement and educational opportunities in the other categories as well.

Vice Mayor De Rosa asked how many tickets are being written now and how many will be written under this program. Deputy Chief Tabernik did not have the numbers readily available but offered to provide them to Council apart from the meeting.

Chief Paez stated that, at the start of his career here in Dublin, there was an emphasis on that being the only corrective measure to deal with the speeding problem. He stated that since that time, there has been more of an exploration with the engineering of design solutions that could help us with this problem. The goal continues to be increased safety throughout the community.

Vice Mayor De Rosa stated she would like to know how many tickets are currently written in a month and with the implementation of a new program, how enforcement will be handled. She asked if this program is implying that no more tickets will be written. Ms. Willis stated that in category 3, one of the solutions is high visibility enforcement which would mean targeted enforcement in certain areas and citations would be issued at the Officer's discretion. Enforcement is definitely a part of the program.

Vice Mayor De Rosa stated that she would like to see the enforcement stated more clearly in the program materials. She knows that residents will expect to see that in any solution.

Ms. Krumb asked if the current system is complaint driven. Deputy Chief Tabernik stated that, from a speed management perspective, it is complaint driven. He stated that it is also historical in nature. If there is a history of speed issues and/or accidents in a particular area, the police will monitor more closely.

Mayor Fox restated Chief Paez's comments that the design changes in the roadways have made a difference. He provided Bright Road as an example of design changes that happened over time having a positive impact on, not only safety, but speed issues as well. Mayor Fox asked Chief Paez if these solutions, such as driver feedback signs, make a difference. Deputy Chief Tabernik stated that he would defer to the transportation staff, but he did provide an example of the signs definitely working while they are in place (Wyandotte Woods Blvd).

Mr. Reiner stated his pride for how the staff and Police are aware and attuned to issues that need addressed.

Ms. Amorose Groomes provided her feedback on each of the questions (listed above):

1. She stated that she liked the Vision statement.
2. As to the vertical deflections question, maybe in certain circumstances, but she is not necessarily supportive of them used widely because of the noise issue and road clearing issues.
3. She would be supportive of trying tactical urbanism solutions on neighborhood streets, but not on thoroughfares. She does not want to create bottlenecks in areas where there are not neighborhood streets.
4. With regard to the business districts, she stated it is more about neighborhood versus commercial districts. She added that it may depend on where the business district is.
5. She used the carrot or the stick analogy and said she would like to understand the ways we use both. For younger drivers, a speeding ticket is a powerful tool in those age groups. She suggested finding the balance.

Ms. Alutto shared her responses to the proposed questions, as follows:

1. She is supportive of the Vision statement.
2. Vertical deflection should only be used in dire circumstances because it is loud.
3. Tactical urbanism depends on the roadway and where it is. She stated that she is supportive of them in the right locations.
4. She is interested in the business districts, but would need to understand more about it, where they would be located and the cost/benefit analysis.
5. She would like to see more data about: how many traffic stops (not just tickets because some people are given warnings), what was the speed range they were traveling before being stopped and where are the areas the complaints are correlating with accidents.

Ms. Krumb offered the following feedback in response to the questions:

1. She is supportive of the Vision statement and the goals.
2. She stated that vertical deflection could be a limited option in certain circumstances.
3. She stated having tactical urbanism, like vertical deflection, is a good thing, but it would really depend on the location and circumstance.
4. The business district boundary is a great thing. She is strongly supportive of doing that on Riverside Drive near the Bridge Street District. The boundary should not include Emerald Parkway.
5. She would like to see more enforcement data. There are strategic times and places during the year, for example the start of school, that the enforcement with education could make a difference.

Mr. Keeler provided his responses to the questions posed as:

1. He stated that the Vision statement should emphasize that it is data driven. He stated that the goals do not include noise. He would like to see noise added somewhere.
2. He is not a fan of vertical deflection.
3. He is in favor of tactical urbanism. He shared that he thought it was a cool concept.
4. He is supportive of business districts and he does feel having that on Riverside Drive is appropriate.
5. He agrees that having the presence of the police and the signage is a deterrent.

Mr. Reiner agreed with Mr. Keeler that the noise at Bridge Park during the summer is a problem. Mayor Fox asked Mr. Reiner for his thoughts around the business districts. He stated that he didn't think there was necessarily an issue. He believes that staff and the police have it managed.

Vice Mayor De Rosa provided her responses to the questions, as follows:

1. She would like to see the Vision statement include something about the residents feeling safe and comfortable with the speed management program.
2. She is supportive of vertical deflection in certain areas. She is in favor of an experiment around that.
3. She is supportive of tactical urbanism and she has seen it be effective in Europe. She suggested starting with Tullymore Drive because it is not safe.
4. She is supportive of business districts.
5. She stated that enforcement needs to be included in this program.

Ms. Amorose Groomes stated that the solution of sending letters with your picture is a powerful tool that could be utilized around school districts. Every parent that opens a letter like that will have a conversation with their young driver.

Mr. Keeler stated that word of mouth can be an effective tool as well. Drivers thinking that enforcement tools are being deployed but they don't know where can be effective.

Mayor Fox provided her responses to the questions, as follows:

1. She likes the Vision statement. It would be nice to add a statement about resident safety and comfort.
2. Her support for vertical deflection is very limited. She does not like to see things in the roadway that cause an issue for emergency response or snow removal.
3. She would be supportive of tactical urbanism. She believes it works.
4. She is supportive of business districts. She added that it is a good tool for the toolbox.
5. She stated that trees can slow traffic as well because it gives the appearance of a narrower space. She suggested the use of parklets. She is also in favor of textured road surfaces. She would like to see enforcement included as well.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:08 p.m.



Presiding Officer - Mayor



Clerk of Council