

## **Document 3 - Summary of Changes to the 2004 ATM Guidelines**

### *Transitioning from the 2004 Area Traffic Management Guidelines to the new Neighbourhood Traffic Calming Process*

The new Neighbourhood Traffic Calming (NTC) Study Process replaces the existing 2004 Area Traffic Management (ATM) [Process] Guidelines. It is intended to streamline how the City manages requests for permanent traffic calming on streets that cannot benefit from roadway modifications through other City Programs. For more information on the NTC Study Process, see Documents 1 and 4. The table below summarizes key differences between the two.

**Summary of key changes between the existing 2004 ATM Guidelines and the new 2019 NTC Study Process**

<b>Request Management Consideration</b>	<b>2004 ATM Guidelines</b>	<b>NEW 2019 NTC Process</b>	<b>Notable Changes / Rationale</b>
<b>Street Types</b>	Requests for any street classification can qualify	Requests for only Local, Collector, and Village Main streets can qualify	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Focus resources on streets within neighbourhoods</li> <li>• Meaningful traffic calming retrofits on Major Collectors and Arterials are too costly for the NTC Program and may sometimes be inappropriate</li> </ul>
<b>Study Types</b>	Localized	Local Traffic Calming (LTC)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• defined study area</li> <li>• focus is on addressing speeding and driver behaviour concerns</li> <li>• no consideration of solutions to address volumes and access to roadway</li> <li>• helps make project timelines more predictable</li> </ul>
	Comprehensive	Neighbourhood Traffic Management (NTM)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• focus key physical changes on “key corridors” in study area</li> <li>• helps better manage public expectations</li> </ul>
<b>Complaint History</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requests are more likely to qualify and prioritize well if there is a history of complaints</li> </ul>	The history of complaints (either through complaints directly to the City or through Police Data) does not factor in the qualification and prioritization processes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Frequency of complaints are not necessarily indicative of the severity of the traffic issue(s)</li> <li>• puts communities with lower tendencies of complaining at a disadvantage and vice versa</li> <li>• time needed to collect Police Data can be substantial and can lengthen processing time significantly</li> </ul>

Request Management Consideration	2004 ATM Guidelines	NEW 2019 NTC Process	Notable Changes / Rationale
<b>Collisions</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requests qualify if subject street experienced a collision involving vulnerable street users</li> <li>• Qualified requests get prioritization points based on collisions rates</li> </ul>	Request qualification and prioritization focusses on underlying issues that create higher probability of serious collisions (i.e. speeding), not the resulting collisions themselves*	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the <u>rate</u> of collisions on neighbourhood streets is highly variable given the frequent combination of low traffic volumes and few collisions that are typical for Local and Collector streets. This means one or two collisions, independent of type / cause, can skew results significantly.</li> <li>• there are many collision types for which traffic calming measures may not address the problem to any value</li> <li>• It is difficult to use collision rates, which do not account for type or cause of collisions, for distinguishing locations where traffic calming would be beneficial</li> <li>• Speeding, a key condition increasing probability of serious collisions, is already considered</li> <li>• Collision data alone, does not provide a fulsome picture as it does not capture important data points for “near misses” and unreported collisions</li> </ul>
<b>Speed</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 85<sup>th</sup> percentile speed of 50km/hr or 95<sup>th</sup> percentile speed of 60km/hr are one of the traffic criteria used to qualify and prioritize</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Average speed of 45km/hr or 85<sup>th</sup> percentile speed of 55km/hr is a criterion used to qualify</li> <li>• Local streets and Collector streets have different point allotments for the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile speed and 95<sup>th</sup> percentile speed in prioritization</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The change in criteria will affect the number of qualifying studies</li> <li>• The prioritization process favours Local streets, which will allow for more streets to be addressed</li> </ul>

\*The history of collisions will continue to be reviewed (patterns, severity, etc.) however, to be collected and reviewed as part of the initiated studies to identify potential solutions, but not as a requirement for qualifying and prioritizing requests.

Request Management Consideration	2004 ATM Guidelines	NEW 2019 NTC Process	Notable Changes / Rationale
<b>Total Traffic Volumes</b>	Minimum traffic volume thresholds are one of the traffic criteria used to qualify and prioritize	Requests do not need to meet any minimum total traffic volume requirements to qualify for a study	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For Local Traffic Calming Studies, the vehicular traffic volume criterion was removed given the focus of these studies is on solutions that encourage appropriate speeds and driver behaviour - rather than access to the roadway</li> <li>• Given the highly variable nature of Local and Collector streets across the City, it is difficult to determine an appropriate total volume threshold that is simply based on roadway classification</li> </ul>
<b>Through traffic volumes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Through traffic volumes are one of the traffic criteria that could be used to qualify</li> <li>• Requests are more likely to prioritize well the higher the through traffic volumes are</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requests for Local Traffic Calming studies do not need to meet any minimum through traffic volume requirements</li> <li>• Requests for Neighbourhood Traffic Management studies can qualify if they meet minimum thresholds</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Local Traffic Calming studies will not consider solutions to address volumes and access to the roadway to help simple requests be processed and studied in more predictable and shorter timeframes</li> <li>• Quantifying cut-through traffic volumes and building consensus on solutions aimed to address volume and access concerns has historically required significant resources; this will only now be reserved for the larger Neighbourhood Traffic Management studies</li> </ul>
<b>Land Use Context</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recognizes schools and parks, but does not consider older adult facilities and childcare facilities for qualification or prioritization</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In addition to schools and parks, streets with older adult facilities and daycares are more likely to qualify and are allotted points for prioritization</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adding these elements helps prioritize requests where higher risk vulnerable road users may be more prevalent</li> </ul>

<b>Request Management Consideration</b>	<b>2004 ATM Guidelines</b>	<b>NEW 2019 NTC Process</b>	<b>Notable Changes / Rationale</b>
<b>Pedestrian Facilities</b>	Recognizes only the number of sidewalks on the subject street based roadway classification	Incorporates number of sidewalks as well as pedestrian crossing facilities (average spacing between formal crossings) for prioritization	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Takes into greater account pedestrian safety and comfort</li> </ul>
<b>Cycling Facilities</b>	Not considered	Based on subject street's volume and speed data, cycling facility deficiencies are identified and awarded points in prioritization process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recognizes cycling safety and comfort</li> </ul>
<b>Equity</b>	Not considered	Qualified requests are allotted points in the prioritization process if the subject area is in a disadvantaged neighbourhood	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adding this element helps to "level the playing field" for requests for streets located in disadvantaged neighbourhoods during the prioritization process</li> </ul>
<b>Breadth of Benefit</b>	Not considered	Qualified requests are allotted points in the prioritization process based on the development context of the area	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In general, the more people in immediate proximity to the street that can benefit from the project, the more points are allotted in prioritization to help ensure high value return for resources deployed</li> </ul>