RPAC Monthly Meeting

7:04 PM Called to order by Eric Fulton, Chair

7:05 PM Introductions

7:09 PM Administrative Items

- Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes
  - February and March meeting minutes approved
  - April meeting minutes will be approved in June
- CVP Evan Glass Rescheduled for July 14 Meeting
- August Meeting
  - skip formal meeting, replace it with a fun gathering

7:10 PM City Updates - Bryan Barnett-Woods

MWCWG Transportation Land Use Connections Project – Fleet & Monroe Complete Streets
- Project will start in earnest in Fall
- Consultant selection and project scoping will occur in summer
- Project extents are Fleet St. from Maryland Ave to Richard Montgomery HS; Monroe St. from E. Middle Ln to Fleet St

Town Center Road Diet
- Construction bid advertised
- Overall construction - expected to start in summer and end in January

Mayor and Council VZ Agenda Item
- Postponed to June, potentially July
Twinbrook Pedestrian Bridge Project
- 100% proposals - proceeding to next step in June

Maryland Transportation Alternatives/Safe Routes to School grant program - Twinbrook Pedestrian Improvements
- Due on Monday (5/16)
- Feasibility study of seven sidewalks and eight intersection safety audits in the Twinbrook neighborhood

SHA Upgrades to Atlantic & Viers Mill
- Work order put in to install flexible bollards at intersection, harden center lines and crosswalk improvements

Potomac Valley Road Sidewalk & Notification of Future Sidewalk Community Meetings
- Potomac Valley Road - sidewalk planned on west side from New Mark Esplanade to Maryland Ave. Some residents opposed, another in favor. City looking to mitigate issues of residents to find a way to move forward.
- Bryan has asked staff to notify him and RPAC of any upcoming community meetings.

Bryan also visited Fleet & Monroe to do pedestrian counts for signals — and counted students who were on the pedestrian connection there.

7:30 PM Incident & Enforcement Update - Deputy Chief Laura Lanham, RCPD

April incident report reviewed - Deputy Chief Laura Lanham

Traffic Enforcement Cameras Discussion - Socrates Yiallouros
- Explanation of how City’s photo enforcement works
- Started in 2007
- Starting in 2012 riding the County contract
- 17 speed cameras - 9 portable, 6 fixed pole, 2 mobile vans
- Red light cameras - 10 cameras in the City
- Red light cameras can catch illegal rights, lefts, crosswalk incursion

Eric comment/question to Socrates
- Confirming that restrictions on speed cameras (only in locations 35 MPH or less and only enforced when drivers
- What is done with data that is aggregated by the cameras? - shared with T&T, data is used in deployment

Judy - how can data be used to affect public behavior?
- Some stats are posted on the City website
Socrates - Speed cameras can only be placed in school zones and residential zones, state law

8:14 PM  State Legislative Update - Del. Julie Palakovich-Carr

Thank you to John Becker for asking Del. Palakovich-Carr to join us

As of 2019 Maryland as a state is pursuing Vision Zero
Real champion for reforming SHA and how they approach traffic incidents
Vision Zero is not a rebranding of pedestrian safety, it is a new way of making streets safer

Legislation to have SHA do more in-depth review of pedestrian/bicyclist fatalities to make them safer was introduced - bill shifted to public transparency with SHA for the flaws in design, goes into effect in October, state must post the review of all pedestrians and bicyclist fatalities

Dave Stinchcomb
• Process by the state for addressing injury incidents
• Julie - SHA is opaque

Eric - What about car collisions?

Judy
• Injury severity - is there anything at the grassroots level that we can do to change the culture?
• Julie: the pedestrians need to embrace their culture
• Pedestrian culture needs to be created

Marissa
• SHA audits
• Lowering of speed limit consistently along Veirs Mill
• RBAC did their own counts

Bryan - Advocate using the SHA report data

Kathleen - the federal standard for crossing time - does city/county/state adhere to the federal standard? - City uses MUTC standard for crossing a street

Judy
• BRT on the agenda on Monday night
• ADA lens is being ignored

Eric - Summation

Julie - Proactive walks/rolls where you can note and report all the issues
**8:55 PM  Open Discussion**

Jonathan - time spent crossing - can we advocate for a better metric?

Vincent - RedGate plans, white lines on edge of walkways, lip on edge of paths

Judy - we should work more closely with the Environment Commission

The meeting was adjourned at 9:05 PM.

The next RPAC meeting is Thursday, June 9, 2022.

**Resources**

- RPAC Home Page
- Pedestrian Master Plan Home Page
- Vision Zero Home page

**Additional information regarding Automated Enforcement Cameras:**

1. Can the City expand the number of installations throughout town? Is it a cost issue? We are now at a point where we can negotiate with Conduent regarding potentially expanding the Automated Enforcement Program with additional camera systems, both red-light and speed monitoring systems (SMS) (See answer to # 2). There will be additional costs to the city if it adds additional systems. The City pays Conduent a monthly fixed fee for each SMS and pays a fee to Conduent per citation issued for the red-light program.

2. Is the contract with our vendor about to expire (June?), and if so, will the City be renewing and seamlessly? Our current contract which we are “riding” through Montgomery County expires May 9th. Montgomery County has been working on an RFP for a few years and they just recently signed a new long-term contract with Conduent that went into effect March 31st. The contract has a term of five (5) years with the option to renew the term five (5) time(s) for one (1) year(s) each. We are now in negotiations with Conduent to ride the new Montgomery County contract. The negotiations with Conduent includes discussing procuring updated Automated Enforcement Equipment for both the Red-light and Speed camera program as well as the option to add additional cameras in the future.

3. What is the difference in the criteria for installing a “permanent” versus a “temporary” placement of Speed Cameras? What is the criteria or analysis that is employed in the first place?

   Criteria per [Maryland Law](#) for SMS deployment: SMS can only be deployed on streets
that are within school zones and residential districts. Additionally, the roadways speed limit cannot exceed 35mph, vehicles must travel 12mph or above posted speed limit for ticket issuance.

A full study is conducted prior to establishing a site code for the deployment of SMS. The study begins with an initial site survey to determine that the roadway meets the above-mentioned criteria. The site survey also determines if roadway is feasible to support a SMS, including looking at items such as roadway curvature, grade, and a suitable location for the placement of a SMS that would not pose a hazard to public safety i.e., not placed on sidewalk etc. If it passes the initial survey phase, we will next deploy a test SMS to gather driver speed data, as well as to look at collision data for the location to see if a SMS is warranted. If after collecting the data, it is determined a SMS is warranted for the location we next determine if roadway is an SHA road and if so, we would need to submit a request to install a SMS on their road. If it is a city roadway, we would move directly to the next step of creating a site code, install photo enforced signage, and put out a public notice of a new SMS site. Once signage is installed a 30-day warning period ensues before the SMS goes live and citations are issued.

Installing a fixed pole (“permanent”) SMS, has the additional steps of obtaining work order permits, once permits are received the fixed poles can be installed. This endeavor requires working with utility companies such as Pepco to provide a power source to the fixed pole and Comcast or Verizon to provide hardline communications wiring to the site. PCU (“temporary”) SMS systems are much more flexible in that work order permits are not required, and no construction is involved. The PCU SMS systems is contained within a compact housing unit and is powered by batteries. They can easily be rotated to different approved sites around the city. Additionally, if there are any power or communications issues with the fixed poles, we are at the mercy of working with Pepco and Comcast to resolve the issue which can sometimes be a lengthy process, whereas any issues with PCU’s are generally resolved the same day by Conduent technicians.

4. Do we have Speed Cameras that are not functioning? Have there been delays on the part of our vendor in effecting repairs when needed? We currently have 17 SMS, in the following configuration, six (6) fixed poles, nine (9) PCU’S and two (2) mobile vans. Additionally, there are 4 inactive, dummy fixed poles in the city. The mobile vans have to be taken out of service periodically for regular maintenance other than that all SMS are currently functioning. In addition, to the 17 SMS, the city has 10 red-light camera systems. We have experienced maintenance issues with the red-light systems over the past year due to a myriad of issues including aging infrastructure, power source (Pepco) and hardline communications wiring (Comcast) issues which has resulted in a decrease of issued citations. We have been working with Conduent on these maintenance issues and have made significant progress over the last several months which has resulted in a recent increase in issued citations.

5. If we currently ride a contract through the County, could the City procure the camera vendor directly ourselves? The City could potentially procure the vendor on its own through an RFP or IFB, however since Montgomery County recently signed a long-term contract with Conduent we are exploring riding that contract (See answer to # 2)
6. Can we install Speed Cameras on Veirs Mill and Baltimore Road? Veirs Mill Rd. is an SHA roadway and therefore we would need SHA approval to deploy a SMS on Veirs Mill Rd. Unfortunately obtaining SHA approval is a timely endeavor. The City in conjunction with Conduent began the process of requesting approval from SHA to deploy SMS in the 900 Blk. of Veirs Mills Rd. in November of 2021. This is an ongoing process.

We currently have a fixed pole SMS located at the 2100 Blk. of Baltimore Rd. S/B as well as site codes set up for mobile van deployments for the 300 Blk. of Baltimore Rd. both E/B and W/B. The mobile vans are regularly deployed within the 300 Blk. of Baltimore Rd.

from Bryan Barnett-Woods to Everyone: 7:50 PM
https://marylandsha.secure.force.com/customercare/request_for_service

from Bryan Barnett-Woods to Everyone: 7:58 PM
https://www.rockvillemd.gov/276/Speed-Camera-Tickets

from Dave Stinchcomb to Everyone: 8:06 PM
Thanks Bryan - I will submit a request to evaluate the signal timing at Hungerford/355 and Frederick Ave.

from Kathleen Kleinmann to Everyone: 8:08 PM
Maryland newly posting officer involved fatalities, especially vehicle related.
https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCq0pjwZBn9wkBZ4xw6lPXgw

from Bryan Barnett-Woods to Everyone: 8:10 PM
https://www.rockvillemd.gov/275/Red-Light-Tickets

from Bryan Barnett-Woods to Everyone: 8:46 PM