

Comment origin	Comment	Response/Notes
June TAB public hearing notes	Name change to Neighborhood Street Management Program (NSMP) - mention of speed does not address traffic volume.	<p>The name change was driven by the desire to use a name that provided clear priorities of the program. Staff thinks that Neighborhood Speed Management Program (NSMP) is the best descriptor as it implies both a reduction in speed and a management of the impacts. Staff did not think that suggested names like "speed reduction" and "traffic management" would match the goals and policies of the program as well as speed management. While impacts to traffic volume could occur in some cases, the program is not intended to directly manage traffic volume.</p>
June TAB public hearing notes	Should there be a threshold for entering the program?	<p>Based on our prior speed mitigation program, we expect a lot of applications, many of which will be for roadways that have little speeding traffic. There are two ways to handle this. We can either have a speed threshold which limits access to prioritization for physical mitigation; or we can allow all streets into the program and those that have little to no speeding will be low priority and will not receive engineering treatments. Staff believes the most honest approach is to limit access to the program. Any applicant will have access to education and encouragement tools of the NSMP as well as available enforcement resources. This has been clarified in the guidelines.</p>

Comment origin	Comment	Response/Notes
June TAB public hearing notes	Traffic volume discussion (speed is prioritized) – maybe needs discussion in the guidelines	The intention of the program is to address speeding behavior on neighborhood streets. If treatment proposed to reduce speeding causes significant displacement of traffic volume, those impacts will be assessed and mitigated if necessary. This has been clarified in the guidelines.
June TAB public hearing notes	Desire to retain some future flexibility in the program	The city staff does not recommend changing the program mid-stream, but will use opportunities to monitor program objectives and improve the program. Staff will keep the TAB apprised of program progress and will ask for their feedback in suggested program modifications.
June TAB public hearing notes	Why the TAB input is needed for "simple" projects?	There was interest from the public to have the TAB provide recommendations and to hear comments from the public on program processes. Staff recommends TAB's review of proposed simple projects before implementation.
June TAB public hearing notes	What to do when projects do not qualify or are not prioritized – should there be a statute of limitations for projects? Can you reapply for the program each year?	The guidelines have been revised to include a two-year retention for all applications. Applications that have obtained the appropriate number of signatures during the petition process will be automatically evaluated and ranked for a second consecutive year, if not selected for engineering treatment in the first year. After two years, applicants will need to resubmit their applications.
June TAB public hearing notes	What is the process/policy for treatment removal?	The guidelines have been revised to include information about project removal. Completed NSMP projects are not eligible for removal for a period of three years after completion. Neighborhoods interested in having engineering treatments removed will use the standard application process for the program and will be expected to provide funds for deconstruction of the device(s).

Comment origin	Comment	Response/Notes
Email to TAB	<p>The petition requirement is too high a burden on those who want to suggest that improvements be made to their streets. Twenty neighbors or 30 percent of households on the block requires a significant "campaign" on the part of the person who has identified an issue--and that shouldn't be the point. The point shouldn't be how many people on a street are friends, well-networked, and good "salespeople"; the main point should be the safety of residents. In other words, the petition places emphasis on the wrong thing, particularly given that working parents are going to be among those most likely to notice and care about the need for traffic calming measures. A fairer petition limit might be three to four neighbors or 10% of households. [From the draft plan: "The applicant must collect signatures from either 20 neighbors or 30 percent of households on the block (including a side of the street adjacent to where traffic calming is desired)."]</p>	<p>The program is designed to balance ease of use with appropriate neighborhood involvement. Historically physical mitigation has been a very controversial topic with many people not wanting to see mitigation in their neighborhood. It is reasonable that residents wanting mitigation in their neighborhood confirm that there is adequate support from their neighbors before the City expends time and resources evaluating the street.</p>
Email to TAB	<p>The process for both the simple and particularly the complex projects seems a bit belabored/bureaucratic. Is there some way to streamline things for busy working families who want to see change happen in a reasonable timeframe?</p>	<p>The current proposal is much more streamlined and less bureaucratic than its predecessor. Staff is only recommending steps we feel are absolutely necessary given the historic controversy that has existed with physical mitigation. This was iterated by the community during the program development process as well.</p>
June TAB public hearing notes	<p>Do the days of data collection have to be Tues-Thurs or can we be flexible for streets that may be observing the situation on different days?</p>	<p>Yes - days can be flexible. Staff will determine the appropriate days to collect data on a case by case basis. Clarification has been added to this effect.</p>
June TAB public hearing notes	<p>Emphasize education and enforcement activities as part of the program</p>	<p>Clarification has been added to the NSMP Guidelines that this is occurring throughout the process rather than being implemented in future years</p>

Comment origin	Comment	Response/Notes
Email to TAB	Related to the point, above, what happens if neighbors on four corners of an intersection or on different parallel/adjacent streets/cul-de-sacs wish to sign the petition? The draft language wouldn't count them all towards the limit because they don't technically live on the same block. I'd suggest some broadening language, such as, "...on the same block, or in adjacent/affected areas."	Clarification has been added: "The applicant must collect signatures from either 20 neighbors or 30 percent of households on the same block (including a side of the street adjacent to where traffic calming is desired, or households on at least one entire street block adjacent to an intersection where traffic calming is desired)".

Comment origin	Comment	Response/Notes
<p>Email to TAB</p>	<p>We are neighbors on the corner of Table Mesa and we both have children. In addition to us, there are many children in the area near the intersection and many who travel on the route adjacent to the intersection as at least three parks are within two blocks of our homes. Those children do not necessarily live on our block; however, they need to travel up or down our block in order to get to school (Bear Creek Elementary has a car free commute that goes right across our corner multiple times per year), the bus stop (which is on the side of my property facing Table Mesa), or one of the three parks that are within two blocks of our houses, not to mention it is the faster route to/from the Table Mesa Shopping Center.</p> <p>The cars travel way too fast as they come down Table Mesa from the West or as they pass over Table Mesa from the North. We have previously expressed there have been at least two accidents on our corner in the past year. My cat was also hit by a car traveling too fast on Table Mesa--the second accident required us putting him to sleep. Do we need to wait until a human being is harmed before action is taken? I should hope the City of Boulder could be a little more proactive given its resources and human capital.</p> <p>I will work to comply with whatever bureaucratic process your staff comes up with; however, I hope the process you ultimately decide to put in place is less bureaucratic and overly cumbersome to working families with young children.</p>	<p>Comment noted - see response to comment #8</p>

Comment origin	Comment	Response/Notes
Email to TAB	Concern about the exclusion of minor arterial and arterial roads	<p>The NSMP is focusing its efforts on local and collector residential streets. Issues of speeding on arterial streets can be addressed through other city work efforts such as corridor studies.</p> <p>It should be highlighted that the map provided in the original guideline draft was inaccurate. A revised map has been attached to the guidelines that accurately shows the street classifications. While there are some residential roadways that are classified as minor arterials, the <del>major</del> roadways discussed in the public process to date (Baseline, Balsam, Edgewood and portions of 9th Street) are all classified as Collectors and would be program eligible.</p>
June TAB public hearing notes	Add process flow chart to Appendix of guidelines	Yes and change has been made
June TAB public hearing notes	Fix Prioritization Criteria chart to clarify scoring for buffered bike lanes and protected bike lanes	Yes and change has been made
June TAB public hearing notes	Clarify that speed humps will be replaced through street maintenance	Yes and change has been made
June TAB public hearing notes	How flexible is the treatment toolkit?	All treatment methods are considered. Staff will consider effectiveness of reducing speed as a priority - This has been clarified in the guidelines
June TAB public hearing notes	Clarify that traffic volumes under 1000 vpd receive one point	Yes and change has been made
June TAB public hearing notes	Data collection - include subarea breakdown - not just the total	Comment noted and the subarea points will be noted.
June TAB public hearing notes	Clarify that volume metric is based on rounding up traffic volume to the nearest hundred vehicles per day	Yes and change has been made

Comment origin	Comment	Response/Notes
June TAB public hearing notes	Add evaluation discussion to guidelines	Yes and change has been made
June TAB public hearing notes	Clarify how neighborhood can augment funding for projects	Yes and change has been made
June TAB public hearing notes	Technical difficulties accessing guidelines online	Will work with city communications staff to make sure that everything is working properly for the next version
June TAB public hearing notes	Public comment: Very effective and efficient use of time. Pleased with process.	Comment noted - thank you.
June TAB public hearing notes	Why 1000 vehicle per day as criteria?	Providing 1 point for every increment of 1,000 vehicles per day on a roadway is a good way to limit points for traffic volume (focusing instead on speed and other factors) while still providing a meaningful point difference in lower volume local roadways and higher volume collector roadways. This metric could change in the future if we see that points are not being allocated in a reasonable fashion.
June TAB public hearing notes	Designs should consider the entire streetscape design as effective traffic calming - hoping to minimize the use of speed humps	The program will balance and investigate complimentary effectiveness of treatments to reduce speeds and meet other neighborhood priorities. Speed humps will be the most common type of physical mitigation for simple projects.
June TAB public hearing notes	How can TAB influence prioritization?	TAB is offered the opportunity to adjust the ranked list of projects based on additional considerations, including funding availability.
June TAB public hearing notes	Keep flexibility in the scoring criteria for poor sightlines, grades, special need populations.	As suggested, a category of points that staff can add for unusual factors has been included. However, in an attempt to maintain simplicity and objectivity for project scoring, these types of criteria are not included at this time. These are important considerations for projects as design treatments are proposed.