TO: Mayor and Town Council
FROM: Garrett Toy, Town Manager
SUBJECT: Discuss/consider the options for the Cascade Drive striping project and provide direction to staff

RECOMMENDATION
Discuss/consider the options for the Cascade Striping project and provide direction to staff.

BACKGROUND
At its December 4th meeting, the Council received a report from staff and Parisi Transportation, the traffic engineer, regarding the traffic calming purpose of the Cascade Drive striping project, the comments received from the neighborhood meeting on November 21st, and options to consider. After much deliberation, the traffic engineer was requested to prepare revised plans based on the Council’s direction.

The Council further discussed the project at a special December 18th meeting including the objective of the scheduled resident meeting on December 21st. Staff also summarized the direction received from Council and improvements made to date such as painting red curbs in the area. At the meeting, Mayor Goddard recused herself from the discussion citing a potential conflict because she lives along Cascade in the restriped area. The Council appointed Councilmember Hellman to replace Mayor Goddard on the ad-hoc Council subcommittee assigned to work with the neighborhood.

Councilmembers Hellman and Reed co-facilitated the meeting with residents on Saturday, December 21st at 10:00am in the Women’s Club. Twenty-one (21) residents plus the two traffic engineers signed in. We referred to this group as the “Cascade Working Group.” At this meeting, Councilmember Reed clarified that he misspoke at the December 18th Council meeting when he stated that a fatality had occurred in the area he referred to as “dead man’s” curve. Police Chief Morin indicated that according to PD records, which go back 20 years, no fatalitiy has ever occurred in that area. Anecdotally, no one in PD recalls any fatalities in the area.

At the Working Group meeting, David Parisi and Andrew Lee, the traffic engineers from Parisi Transportation, summarized the changes to the project based on the direction received from the Town Council at its December 4th meeting. These changes included:

- Install curve warning signs at appropriate locations with advisory speeds (15 mph).
- Remove the “25” pavement marking and replace with “15” mph markings.
- Remove signs that may be unnecessary (e.g., SLOW CHILDREN PLAYING sign).
• Add new pedestrian and bicyclist signs.
• Reduce the regulatory speed limit to 15 mph prior to the traffic calming section of Cascade (i.e., two-way section).

NOTE: The traffic engineer conducted a speed survey to support the reduction in speed. The Town Council had previously indicated they would support a reduction in speed if verified by the traffic data.

Town staff also reported at the meeting that we have painted some red curbs and were continuing to monitor the situation to determine if additional no parking markings are required in the area.

At its January 15, 2020 meeting, the Council received a report on the Cascade Working Group meeting. The Council also considered and approved the traffic engineer’s recommendation that the fog line (i.e., white line) in the inside of the curved sections of Cascade be reduced from 4 ft to 3ft. This line movement (reduction) was phased in along the two curves (approx. 50 ft along each curve).

On Saturday, February 8th from 10:00am to 12 noon, another meeting of the Cascade Working Group was held. At the February 8, 2020 Cascade Working Group meeting, the Town committed to capture broader neighborhood and community input on the restriping project via an on-line survey. We also discussed a monitoring period.

DISCUSSION

Originally, we were planning to report back to the Council in April/May regarding the striping project. However, Council priorities have changed significantly since March and there was no real opportunity to discuss this matter given other pressing issues.

This report provides a summary of the on-line survey and options for the Council to consider.

ONLINE SURVEY RESULTS

The online Cascade Striping survey opened in March and closed on August 27, 2020. A total of 177 responses were submitted, of which 105 were registered responses. Of the 105 registered responses, 101 were Fairfax residents and 4 were not. There were 72 unregistered survey respondents. Registered responses allow us to determine if respondents live in Town and ensures registrants do not vote more than once. There is no way to ascertain to what extent unregistered respondents are Fairfax residents or not.

Attachment A contains the summary of both registered and unregistered respondents. Attachment B contains the summary of only the registered respondents. In general,
there were very few percentage differences of more than 2% between the registered only and combined surveys. To simplify the analysis, we focused solely on the combined survey results.

Questions 1 & 2 focused on where respondents lived and how often they drove on Cascade Drive. Of the 177 responses, 113 (66.9%) said they lived in the Cascade neighborhood and, of those 113, 73 lived on Cascade Drive.

Question 3 asked those who did not live in the Cascade neighborhood how often they drove on Cascade Drive. Only 20 people responded that they drove on Cascade at least once a week.

Question 4 asked respondents if they felt safer or less safe driving on Cascade than before the striping project. Approximately 54% (94) of the responses said they felt less safe. Approximately 21% (36) said they felt safer and 22% said it felt about the same.

Question 5 asked respondents if they felt safer or less safe walking or bicycling on Cascade than before the striping project. Approximately 37% (65) of the responses said they felt less safe. Approximately 31% (53) said they felt safer and 16% said it felt about the same.

Question 6 asked about overall impression. Approximately 58% (102) respondents indicated they strongly disliked or disliked the project. Approximately 30% (53) respondents liked or strongly liked the project. Twenty-one (21) people were neutral or unsure.

Question 7 asked for preferences regarding the project. Approximately 41% (71) selected the option to "eliminate the striping and restore to the previous condition". In contrast, 38% (66) said to "make the striping permanent" or add "dashed" line in the curved areas. Approximately 14% (24) said to monitor the project and 5% (9) offered modifications to the project. We obviously do not know how the people who selected "monitor the project" would respond now.

Interestingly, the 71 responses for the option to “eliminate and restore the original striping” option was significantly less that those who disliked or strongly disliked the project (102). Similarly, the number of respondents (66) who selected “keep the project or modify with a dashed line" was more than the number of respondents that strongly liked or liked the project (53).

Question 8 allowed respondents to provide comments or to propose modifications to the striping project. Attachment C contains a list of the 53 verbatim comments received. The comments may shed some light on the responses to Question 7.
Question 9 addressed a monitoring period. Only 25 responses were received.

Question 10 allowed for additional comments. Attachment C also contains the 89 verbatim comments received. The comments may shed some light on responses to the survey.

Please remember that on-line surveys are not intended to be scientific surveys, but rather a tool for the Council to gather public input on issues and to consider such input in their decision-making process.

OPTIONS

The Council has the following options to consider:

1) Remove the striping and restore to the previous condition (i.e., double yellow center line). However, there may be some signage and areas where the white fog line is that the Council may want to retain.
2) Make the striping project permanent.
3) Make additional improvements/modifications such as adding a dashed yellow centerline striping though the curves or pedestrian signage. We requested the traffic engineer to prepare a plan for the dashed yellow line (See Attachment D). The addition of a center line in the curves would inform drivers of where they need to enter the curved areas.

We also requested the traffic engineer to conduct another speed survey because we thought that may be helpful to the Council in its deliberations. The Summary Table below compared August 2020 to samples collected in Dec. 2019. The average speeds sampled were slightly lower than 2019, but nearly the same in the eastbound (EB) direction, while the westbound (WB) direction had a greater decrease in speeds. The 85th percentile speeds remained the same at 21 mph.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>EB Cascade</th>
<th>WB Cascade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>85th %ile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>19.06</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>18.94</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The traffic engineer will be available at the Council meeting to answer any questions.

FISCAL IMPACT
At the December 4th Council meeting, the traffic engineer stated design costs are covered through the Safe Routes to School program and will continue to be covered under that
program. However, approximately $2,025 in Parisi Transportation design costs were not covered by the program for various reasons. This covers the period from 2016 thru February 2020. There will be additional costs for the update traffic survey and centerline plan.

ATTACHMENTS
A. Summary of combined survey
B. Summary of registered responses only
C. Summary of comments
D. Centerline plan