

### ***Step 1 – Existing Measures or Seasonal Traffic Calming***

The first gate assessed whether the site has existing or approved traffic calming measures in place, such as bollards or speed humps. Where measures were identified, sites were directed to continue under the existing program and were not escalated further within the RSIF framework.

### ***Step 2 – Roadway Suitability for Lane Narrowing***

Roadway width and cross-section were assessed to determine suitability for lane narrowing using pavement markings. Where feasible, lane narrowing was selected as the preferred treatment, as it provides a passive, self-enforcing reduction in operating speeds by altering driver perception of available roadway space. This measure is cost-effective, operationally efficient, and minimizes impacts to emergency services, transit, and maintenance operations. Where lane narrowing was feasible, no further escalation was required.

### ***Step 3 – Seasonal or Non-Resident Speeding Influence***

Where lane narrowing was not physically feasible, staff assessed whether elevated speeds or traffic volumes were predominantly seasonal or driven by non-resident motorists. This assessment was informed by traffic data and ASE results. At sites where speeding was attributed to unfamiliar or seasonal drivers, radar speed display boards were selected to provide real-time speed awareness. While not intended as a standalone traffic calming measure, radar boards represent a proportionate response to behaviour-driven speeding and serve as an effective reinforcement tool.

### ***Step 4 – Suitability for Speed Humps***

Where speeding was persistent and not primarily seasonal, roadway geometry, function, and operational considerations were assessed to determine suitability for speed humps. While speed humps are an effective physical traffic calming measure, they carry notable operational impacts related to emergency response, noise, maintenance, and public acceptance. As such, speed humps were recommended only at four locations where other measures were infeasible or unlikely to address observed conditions, and where the roadway context supported their installation.

### ***Step 5 – Oversized Signage or Exceptional Measures***

As a final standard option, roadways were assessed for suitability for oversized signage, generally limited to rural or gateway-type environments with low driveway density and limited streetscape sensitivity. Oversized signage was not recommended within residential interiors due to visual impacts and diminishing effectiveness over time.

# Road Safety Initiative Fund

## Site-Specific Traffic Calming Methodology

