

Richmond Transportation Committee

I've read the Review of Proposed Alternative Road Safety Enhancement Measures and am left even more concerned about the speed hump proposal for River Road.

This project, when first proposed to council, assured it would go forward with the condition of agreement from residents. The majority were opposed. Had the survey been inclusive all all directly affected, I believe the results would have been even more conclusively against this project.

I have spent some time researching other jurisdictions in which speed humps were under consideration. All that I have found required community consensus, and none involved a remotely comparable number of speed humps.

This process has taken on an unnecessarily divisive dimension, polarizing residents against visiting weekend cyclists. This conflict has been driven in part by the exclusion of residents, but the inclusion of cyclists, at the developmental stages. This set the stage for the problem we now have.

The way in which this matter has been handled, and the tensions it has generated, should be reason enough to pause and reconsider this entire project.

I have written to one of the visiting cycling groups, the Gastown group, the group that lost a member in the terrible, non-speed related accident on River Road that set this entire scenario into motion. I asked, in good will, if they would consider engaging with us to find solutions mutually. I have yet to receive a reply. Just as we've seen that the road routinely isn't being shared, as evidenced by Arline Trividec's video, nor is the process that has gotten us into this mess.

This process should have never favoured the interests of one group over another.

Let's compare how this issue compares to how speed humps are handled in other local jurisdictions:

Vancouver: The city policy states directly "We don't install speed humps on streets that are emergency response routes, or used by trucks in industrial areas. I would like to say that River Road is frequently the route taken by emergency vehicles, and is frequently the only point of access, depending on the location of the emergency. Unlike other parts of the city, we do not have a myriad of roads connecting to this street. Everyone has to travel for miles to find another through street.

In addition, parts of River Road are zoned industrial and well used by trucks, thanks to the last major decision made for our community, namely truck parks.

When a citizen or group in Vancouver requests speed humps, it is a requirement that at least 30% of notified residents respond, with at least 50% support... Consensus is key.

Abbotsford: In October 2016, City Council approved speed humps on three city streets, a process that saw the approval of residents and the up front inclusion of emergency services. As a result. 2 streets now have 5 speed humps, a third has 2.

Here in Richmond, the majority of residents reject the proposal for an additional 20 speed humps, on top of the existing 6, for total of 26. The most recent report, despite the knowledge that residents are opposed, ignores concerns as well as alternatives and recommends increasing the number to 76 or more, depending on how you interpret the report which in my view was poorly prepared. It also suggests decreasing the speed limit to 30km. As

racing bikes can exceed this speed, would the proposed speed reduction apply to cyclists, and if so, how would it be enforced? This is just one of the numerous oversights of this report.

Please tell me if or where there is a precedent for the placement of 76 or more speed humps on any road in this province?

I previously submitted a letter from the B.C. Ambulance Service that confirmed response times are affected by speed humps. Let's compare how this fact is dealt with in other jurisdictions.

In July of last year, the City of Nanaimo, with the support of residents, moved to install speed humps along Ross Road to curb an area with a confirmed speeding problem.

However, when the city consulted with emergency services, they determined that Ross Road was a priority response route and concern was immediately raised that response times could be adversely affected.

The City of Nanaimo then decided to do a pilot with emergency services in order to determine if response times could be, as they stated, significantly affected.

Nanaimo's City Transportation Manager, Jamie Rose stated that "It's not a bad thing to trial traffic calming in any situation, but in this one in particular, it's even more warranted just to figure out what the impact on emergency services operations is."

What a contrast in comparison to the approach being taken on River Road, given that the Nanaimo project involves 2 speed humps in comparison to the now-suggested of 76 or more for our community.

The report that was recently released is appalling in its vague generalizations, simply stating that yes, ambulances may have to travel at a lower rate of speed, but providing neither any studies or hard data to measure the delay being created by this project, not even so far as a comparison between 6, 26, 76, or more speed humps.

How can 2 speed humps be a point of concern for one community, but the quantities under consideration for our community be acceptable? Exactly how much time will be lost with the varying number of speed humps proposed? What specific tests or measurements are planned or have been performed?

In closing, the most recent report is not an examination of alternatives as it is so self-titled, but rather, a document lacking critical analysis in favour of simply reinforcing the option preselected for us, against the will of the majority of residents.

Surely, we can do better. Thank you.