



**Town of North Stonington  
Board of Selectmen Meeting  
North Stonington Education Center & Zoom Meeting  
June 22, 2021  
6:00 PM**

Public will be able to attend the meeting in person or via Zoom with the following link:  
<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/86400214889?pwd=R25lYm9leUVhNXc0c0tsQW92NXhLQT09>

Or via Zoom App-Enter Meeting ID: 864 0021 4889

Passcode: 322270

Or listen only via telephone by calling 646 558 8656 and enter Meeting ID: 864 0021 4889

**AGENDA**

1. Call to order/Roll Call
2. Public Comments on Agenda and Non-Agenda Items\*
3. NSVFC Tanker Truck Update
4. NSVFC Carryover Discussion
5. Tax Relief Program Discussion
6. RFP – Water Testing
7. American Rescue Funding Discussion
8. Speed Hump Update
9. Tax Refunds
10. Selectman Expenses Discussions
11. Minutes
  - a. June 8, 2021 Special Meeting
  - b. June 8, 2021
  - c. June 17, 2021 Special Meeting
12. Public Comments on Agenda Items\*
13. Adjournment

\*The Board of Selectmen respectfully requests that public comments do not exceed two (2) minutes per person in respect for everyone's time.



**North Stonington Volunteer Fire Company, Inc.**  
**Board of Trustees**



**To:** 1<sup>st</sup> Selectman Urgo, Selectman Carlson, Selectwoman Kincaid

**Date:** May 12, 2021

**RE:** Fiscal Year 2020-2021 Per Diem Funding Carryover

Board of Selectmen:

As the Board of Trustees begins the planning for this fiscal year's budget close-out, the question that is being forwarded to you is whether any remaining funds in the current year's line *B26.14 NSVFC Per Diem Staffing* can be carried over into subsequent fiscal years, versus returning any remainder to the General Fund.

The benefit of the funding carryover is that it would allow for some additional coverage during unanticipated emergencies without depleting funding needed for the remainder of the fiscal year. Any remaining monies in *B26.14* would be retained in that account solely and not available for balancing of other Line overages.

Please provide us with your decision as soon as possible so that we can continue with our close-out planning.

Thank you for your continued support.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "K. Bond".

K. Bond, Company Secretary

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "C. Steinhart IV".

C. Steinhart IV, Board Chairman

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "C. Steinhart V".

C. Steinhart V, Fire Chief

A handwritten signature in red ink, appearing to read "K. Bergel".

K. Bergel, Company President

## Tax Relief

### 12-129n Local Option Tax Relief

Must be a minimum 65 years of age (either the husband or wife of the married couple)

Must be record owner or hold life use to property

Can be the surviving spouse (no age sited) if the couple was on the program before the death of one of them

Resident of the town for one year prior to receiving the benefit

Town fixes the income levels

Town fixes the benefit amount

If the benefit amount is in excess of 75% of the property tax liability, then a lien is required

The program does not have an asset test.

Current income and benefits for the year 2020

#### Homeowners

##### Income and Grant Information – 2020 Benefit Year

Income		Tax Credit %		Tax Credit Maximum		Tax Credit Minimum	
<u>Over</u>	<u>To</u>	<u>Married</u>	<u>Single</u>	<u>Married</u>	<u>Single</u>	<u>Married</u>	<u>Single</u>
\$ -0-	\$18,900	50%	40%	\$1,250	\$1,000	\$ 400	\$ 350
\$18,900	\$25,300	40%	30%	\$1,000	\$ 750	\$ 350	\$ 250
\$25,300	\$31,500	30%	20%	\$ 750	\$ 500	\$ 250	\$ 150
\$31,500	\$37,600	20%	10%	\$ 500	\$ 250	\$ 150	\$ 150
\$37,600	\$45,800	10%	0%	\$ 250	\$ -0-	\$ 150	\$ -0-

For the local option to the Elderly & Disabled Homeowners program, my recommendation is to use the program under CGS §12-129n. Continue to use State of Connecticut Income limits and to increase the benefit available under the local option by giving the same benefit. The effect is to double the benefit.

The minimum benefit would be \$300 for a married couple earning \$45,800 and \$300 for a single person earning \$37,600.

The cost to the town if the program was in effect for this year, using 28.6 mills would be \$47,607.90.



Town of North Stonington  
Highway Department  
11 Wyassup Rd  
North Stonington, CT 06359  
860-535-0924

To: Board of Selectman,

On Monday May 17<sup>th</sup> I spoke with New London Highway public works director Dave (860) 447-5237 with regards to their application. He advised me that the speed humps were installed by contractor and suggested we do same. He further explained that they have had nothing but problems (Damaged vehicle complaints) he suggested that we stay away from installing them.

On Thursday May 27<sup>th</sup> I went to New London by the train station to measure the current installed speed humps there. While I was there I videotaped a 39 second segment showing vehicle not slowing down for the speed humps.

After I have completed a research on speed hump vs speed bump vs speed tables. Per the MUTCED (Municipal Uniform Traffic Control Electronic Device) Manuel I have learned that the installation has to be specific to recommended design and application set forth by (ITE) Institute of Transportation Engineers and OLR research report.

Taking my current research into consideration it is my opinion if the board of selectman wishes to move forward with speed hump application that they be installed by a contractor with the knowledge of the recommended installation practices previously mentioned.

Respectfully Submitted,

Don Hill  
North Stonington Highway Foreman  
(860) 535-0924

# Updated Guidelines for the Design and Application of Speed Humps

Margaret Parkhill, P.Eng., Rudolph Sooklall, M.A.Sc, Geni Bahar, P.Eng.

## Abstract

Speed humps have gained acceptance as a traffic calming device by North American and international jurisdictions. However, design and application varies widely between jurisdictions, and speed humps often meet resistance from residents and road users. In 1997, the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) published a Recommended Practice for the design and application of speed humps. The recommended practice is now being updated to provide state-of-the-practice guidelines for speed humps and speed tables.

To update the ITE speed humps recommended practice, the experiences of agencies implementing speed humps were obtained through an extensive literature review. The literature review was supplemented with an online survey targeting North American and international jurisdictions.

This paper provides an overview of the recommended framework for an agency to follow to implement speed humps or speed tables in their jurisdiction. This framework is based on the experience documented by dozens of agencies. The framework includes:

- Develop and follow a formal public consultation process;
- Determine the needs of the street or neighborhood;
- Construct and maintain speed humps; and
- Monitor and evaluate speed hump effectiveness.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Speed humps are one tool available in the traffic calming toolbox, and have gained acceptance by North American and international jurisdictions since their development in the early 1970s by the Transport and Road Research Laboratory (TRRL) in Great Britain. However, design and application varies widely between jurisdictions, and speed humps often meet resistance from residents and road users.

In 1997, the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) published a Recommended Practice for the design and application of speed humps. Research has been conducted and lessons have been learned through experience regarding the design and implementation of speed humps since the publication of this guideline.

As a result, ITE initiated an update to the Recommended Practice to provide state-of-the-practice guidelines for the design and application of speed humps. State-of-the-practice guidelines were obtained through an extensive literature review on relevant published material. The knowledge base gained from the literature review was supplemented through an on-line survey of jurisdictions implementing speed humps. The on-line survey was designed to capture

information to fill the knowledge gap from the literature review. Jurisdictions in the United States, Canada, and internationally provided their experiences; close to 300 responses to the survey were received.

Guidance was also provided by an ITE Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) whose members have extensive experience in speed hump design and implementation. The update is currently under review, and is expected to be published later this year.

This paper provides an overview of the recommended framework for an agency to follow to implement speed humps or speed tables in their jurisdiction. This framework is based on the experience documented by dozens of agencies. The framework includes:

- Develop and follow a formal public consultation process;
- Determine the needs of the street or neighborhood;
- Construct and maintain speed humps; and
- Monitor and evaluate effectiveness.

Other common speed control measures currently used by various agencies are documented in ITE's "Traffic Calming: State of the Practice". (Ewing 1999)

## 1.1 Speed humps vs. speed bumps

A speed hump is a raised area in the roadway pavement surface extending transversely across the travel way. Speed humps are sometimes referred to as "pavement undulations" or "sleeping policemen". Most agencies implement speed humps with a height of 3 to 3.5 inches (76 to 90 mm) and a travel length of 12 to 14 feet (3.7 to 4.3 m). Speed humps are generally used on residential local streets.

A speed bump is also a raised pavement area across a roadway. Speed bumps are typically found on private roadways and parking lots and do not tend to exhibit consistent design parameters from one installation to another. Speed bumps generally have a height of 3 to 6 inches (76 to 152 mm) with a travel length of 1 to 3 feet (0.3 to 1 m).

From an operational standpoint, speed humps and bumps have critically different impacts on vehicles. Within typical residential operational speed ranges, vehicles slow to about 20 mph (32 km/h) on streets with properly spaced speed humps. A speed bump, on the other hand, causes significant driver discomfort at typical residential operational speed ranges and generally results in vehicles slowing to 5 mph or less at each bump.

Speed bumps of varying design have been routinely installed on private roadways and parking lots without the benefit of proper engineering study regarding their design and placement. Speed humps, on the other hand, have evolved from extensive research and testing and have been designed to achieve a specific result on vehicle operations without imposing unreasonable or unacceptable safety risks.

## 1.2 Speed tables

Speed tables are essentially flat-topped speed humps, and may have a textured material on the flat section with asphalt or concrete for the approaches. Speed tables are sometimes referred to as “trapezoidal humps” or “speed platforms”. If marked as a pedestrian crossing, speed tables may also be referred to as “raised crosswalks” or “raised crossings”.

Most agencies implement speed tables with a height of 3 to 3.5 inches (76 to 90 mm) and a travel length of 22 feet (6.7 m). Speed tables generally consist of 10 foot (3.1 m) plateau with 6 foot (1.8 m) approaches on either side that can be straight, parabolic or sinusoidal in profile. The longer lengths of speed tables provide a gentler ride than speed humps and generally result in vehicle operating speeds ranging from 25 to 30 mph (40 to 48 km/h) on streets depending on the spacing between speed tables. Speed tables are generally used on residential collectors, emergency routes or transit routes.

The City of Portland, OR has designed “split” speed tables for designated emergency routes. Split speed tables are also 22 feet (6.7 m) long and extend from curb to centerline on opposite sides of the street. Split speed tables are separated by a longitudinal gap that allows fire trucks to weave around the split speed humps in slalom-like fashion. The Portland Department of Transportation is currently testing this alternative speed table design. Split speed tables are not included in this paper.

## 2. PUBLIC CONSULTATION PROCESS

Traffic calming activities are carried out to reduce traffic speeds and volumes. Based on the experience of most agencies, it is critical to obtain the support of a substantial majority of all residents in a neighborhood targeted for traffic calming measures, including speed humps, prior to implementation. Therefore, it is important for agencies to develop a working relationship with communities and have well defined administrative procedures in place.

Based on a survey of agencies in North America and around the world, the large majority of agencies (77%) have a formal public consultation process for implementing speed humps.

It is recommended that each agency, prior to installing speed humps, develop a formal process for speed humps. Five key elements are recommended:

1. Appropriate legislation (policies, ordinances and regulations);
2. Request procedure;
3. Evaluation of requests;
4. Consultation (with the public and other agencies); and
5. Removal procedure.

### 2.1 Appropriate legislation

Statutory authority, constitutionality, and tort liability are the legal issues surrounding speed hump installation that jurisdictions should take into consideration. A jurisdiction must have the legal authority to implement speed humps on a given class of roadways, while respecting the

constitutional rights of affected landowners and road users, and minimizing the risks to road users. (Ewing 1999)

Before initiating a speed hump installation program, it is recommended that appropriate policies, regulations, and/or ordinances are developed to govern elements such as the community involvement process, hump design and location criteria, cost sharing relationships, installation and maintenance requirements, and evaluation/modification procedures. It is also important to clearly define the project area, that is, the area expected to be affected by speed hump implementation. For example, any property located within 250 feet (76 m) from the first and last speed humps is considered by the City of Beaverton (OR) to be part of the project area.

It is important that jurisdictions review state and municipal ordinances and regulations to ascertain if existing legislation could affect the implementation of speed humps. Existing legislation may have to be modified, or new legislation developed, before proceeding with speed hump installation (TAC 1998).

## 2.2 Request procedure

Speed hump installation may be requested by a single resident, though additional support from the community is generally needed at a later stage in the process for the project to remain eligible. The request procedure should clearly outline the expectations of all potentially impacted parties and the timing of their participation in the various stages of the process. The following components are recommended for inclusion into a speed hump request procedure:

- Develop a request or petition form which residents can use to request speed humps in their neighborhood. Many agencies have petition forms available on the internet, which residents can download, collect signatures, and return to the appropriate department;
- Identify the department that will be responsible for receiving speed humps requests and coordinating the overall process;
- Screen all requests received to determine eligibility. Common eligibility criteria include the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile speed, the posted speed limit, and the average daily traffic. Some agencies also require support from a certain number or percentage of affected residents in order for a request to be eligible; and
- If a request meets all eligibility requirements, obtain wider community support before proceeding to the evaluation stage. Define the project area for the speed hump request in order to determine who to include in the process. Speed hump projects typically extend between higher-order streets.

The eligibility criteria will vary depending on the needs of each jurisdiction. Therefore, it is recommended that each implementing agency develop a customized speed hump request procedure with input from other relevant agencies (e.g., emergency services, transit agencies). Before proceeding to evaluation of a request, the eligibility criteria should be met.



## 2.3 Evaluation of requests

To evaluate the merit of installing speed humps, it is recommended that eligible requests be ranked to determine priority levels. Some agencies use a points system to evaluate and rank projects with points allocated based on certain elements, such as:

- Speed;
- Traffic volumes;
- Collisions (e.g., speed-related);
- Proximity to schools or other land uses where high numbers of children could be present, such as parks or playgrounds;
- Lack of sidewalks; and
- Designated bicycle routes.

During evaluation, traffic conditions in the neighborhood should be observed and data collected, such as daily traffic volume and operating speed. The data collection required will be determined by the evaluation criteria developed for the jurisdiction.

As part of the evaluation of requests, consideration should be given to the objectives of the installation (e.g., reduced speed, reduced infiltration or cut-through traffic). The objectives of the installation will guide the monitoring and evaluation of speed humps after implementation. Collection of data is a key part of the evaluation of speed humps both before and after implementation.

For those projects which receive the highest ranking, a preliminary design plan can be developed to show the potential locations of speed humps prior to initiating public and agency consultation.

## 2.4 Public and agency consultation

Consultation of proposed speed hump installations should include:

- Property owners, residents, and business owners. Special consultation should be considered with those residents or landowners directly adjacent to proposed hump locations;
- Emergency services (police, fire, ambulance, etc.); and
- Other groups such as school districts, nearby hospitals or emergency medical centers, transit operators, road maintenance workers, snow plow operators, and waste collection agencies.

At least one public meeting is recommended to have an open discussion of speed humps. Notification of the meeting should be provided well in advance, and the meeting should be held as close as possible to the study area. However, a single method of public involvement may not be suitable for every situation. More complex or controversial requests will require greater public education and involvement throughout the process.

At the public meeting, the scope and timing of the project can be discussed and the preliminary design plan should be presented for comments from all parties. Comment sheets could be distributed at the meeting, and collected at the end of the meeting. A deadline for resident comments after the meeting should be established. All comments received should be considered

fully in the decision-making process to arrive at the final design plan.

Most agencies perform another survey at this stage, and require a higher level of support from the public to continue with the implementation of speed humps. In order to gauge support, a mail-out questionnaire or survey can be conducted. Some agencies require the support of at least 67 percent of all residents before speed humps are installed. This ensures that a substantial majority of the affected people agrees with the project and there is a general acceptance of the final design plan.

## 2.5 Removal procedure

Most agencies require speed hump removal requests to be supported by a majority of residents, although poor traffic operations, emergency services or transit agencies may also initiate the removal procedure. Monitoring and evaluation of speed hump installations will assist in the determination of any unexpected problems that may have been created.

The removal procedure will vary depending on the needs of each jurisdiction. Therefore, it is recommended that each implementing agency develop a customized speed hump removal procedure with input from other relevant agencies (e.g., emergency services, transit agencies).

# 3. DETERMINE NEEDS OF THE STREET OR NEIGHBOURHOOD

Speed humps should be implemented only to address documented safety or traffic issues supported by a traffic engineering review. It is recommended that an engineering review be conducted to identify, quantify, and document the existing traffic issues on the street and in the neighbourhood. Issues could include speeding, cut-through traffic, or safety. It is important to review existing conditions and determine if there is a measurable problem, rather than a perceived problem (TAC 1998). Documented issues can then be used to support the implementation of speed humps, and to measure their effectiveness if implemented (Ewing 1999).

Installing speed humps in a community can be met by resistance from residents, thus community support and involvement are important for increasing awareness of speed humps and creating an atmosphere of acceptance and ownership (TAC 1998). By explaining the full context, setting residents' expectations appropriately, and discussing the potential benefits and disbenefits of speed humps and other traffic calming treatments, consensus on the most appropriate treatment for the neighbourhood is more likely achievable.

## 3.1 Roadway characteristics

In the United States and Canada, speed humps are generally installed on roadways functionally classified as local streets and neighbourhood or residential collector streets as defined in AASHTO's "A Policy on Geometric Design of Highways and Streets" (AASHTO 2004, pg 12; TAC 1998).

Many agencies install speed humps on roads with an urban cross-section (i.e., curb and gutter). Streets where speed humps are applied may or may not have sidewalks or bicycle facilities (such as on or off road trails). The surrounding land use for streets where speed humps are applied is generally residential in nature, and may include schools, parks or community centers.

Speed humps can be used on one-way or two-way streets (TAC 1998). Speed humps are not recommended on streets with more than two travel lanes. In addition, the pavement should have good surface and drainage qualities. The location of individual speed humps will depend on the presence of on-street parking, driveways, intersections, and other roadway features. Figure 1 shows a speed hump installed on a street with parking and bicycle lanes in the City of Portland, OR.

Speed humps are generally not recommended for use on bus routes or emergency vehicle routes (Ernish et al. 1998), or on streets that provide access to hospitals and emergency medical services. Speed tables may be more appropriate, and could be applied after consultation with representatives of the emergency services. The use of alternative traffic calming measures may also be considered for use on bus or emergency vehicle routes.



**Figure 1: Speed hump on residential street with parking and bicycle lanes in Portland, Oregon**

Photo by: Scott Batson (City of Portland, Oregon)

### 3.2 Traffic characteristics

Traffic operation elements include traffic speeds, traffic volumes and mix (including cut-through traffic), emergency vehicle access, transit routes, vehicle and cargo damage, and environmental impacts. The decision to install speed humps includes consideration of the posted speed limit and the operating speed of traffic. Speed humps are usually recommended only on streets where the

speed limit is 30 mph (50 km/h) or less. Speed humps are generally not considered appropriate where the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile speed is 45 mph (70 km/h) or more.

Spacing and location of the speed humps and the length of the road segment where the hump is installed affects operating speeds. The research available suggests that speed humps should be no more than 500 feet (152 m) apart where the desired 85<sup>th</sup> percentile operating speed is between 25 and 30 mph (40 and 48 km/h). Short road segments may require only a single speed hump even where two could be installed as acceleration opportunities are limited on a short segment.

The final locations of the humps are dependent on site specific considerations, making the determination of actual spacing and final location a complex task. After the general spacing and layout of the speed humps have been established, the final location of each hump is determined by considering vertical alignment, horizontal alignment, intersections, driveways, street lighting, on-street parking, pedestrian crossings, installation angle, and drainage and utilities.

Several studies have shown that speed humps reduce vehicle speed as measured by the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile speed, the percentage of drivers traveling over the speed limit, and the percentage of drivers traveling 10 mph or more over the speed limit.

The installation of speed humps should also consider traffic volumes in terms of the total volume of traffic, the presence of cut-through traffic, and the traffic mix. Each street requires individual assessment prior to implementation. An area-wide approach is needed to avoid simply diverting traffic from roads with speed humps to parallel untreated roads, but the extent of the diversion problem is unclear at present.

Speed humps have been shown to reduce traffic volumes. The combined results for speed humps and speed tables investigated in the City of Portland (OR) showed an average traffic reduction of 28 percent.

### 3.3 Pedestrians and bicyclists

The consideration of all road users, especially pedestrians and bicyclists, is another key component of the engineering review conducted prior to the installation of speed humps. Speed humps and speed tables are two traffic calming techniques that can be used to facilitate pedestrian and bicyclist movement and improve the safety of these road users (Zegeer 1998).

Speed tables can serve as raised marked crosswalks when they extend from curb to curb (Figure 2) and provide a flat surface suitable for pedestrians to use. Speed tables can facilitate pedestrian flow while providing vehicle speed control at the crosswalk location (Ewing 1999, Ernish et al. 1998). Parabolic or circular speed humps are too rounded or sloped for pedestrians to safely use.

Where a speed table is used as a raised pedestrian crosswalk, crosswalk design elements can be incorporated. Design element considerations include the following:

- The markings must be visible to motorists, especially at night. Inlay tape and thermoplastic are generally recommended for crosswalk pavement markings on speed tables (PBIC 2006)

- Granite and cobblestones finishes are not recommended because, although aesthetically pleasing, the surface may become slippery when wet, and may be difficult to cross for pedestrians who are visually impaired or using wheelchairs (PBIC 2006).



**Figure 2: Raised pedestrian crosswalks can control vehicle speeds on local streets at pedestrian crossings**

Photo by: Dan Burden

In general, bicyclists do not require extensive special provision (TAC 1998). Bicyclists may, however, be concerned that the vertical deflection of the speed hump will be uncomfortable and inconvenient and that abrupt slopes could even throw a bicyclist from their bicycle (PBIC 2006). Additional elements that could be considered to accommodate bicyclists include (DeRobertis and Wachtel 1996):

- Using a tapered edge before the curb to reduce the likelihood of pedal impact on hump. If this gap is too wide, it may promote gutter running by motor vehicles;
- Using speed humps that are less than 4" high;
- Providing adequate warning signs and markings;
- Ensuring that speed humps are far enough from intersections so bicyclists do not have to negotiate humps while turning; and
- Ensuring that speed humps are not installed on streets with vertical grade greater than 5 percent.

#### 4. CONSTRUCT AND MAINTAIN SPEED HUMPS

Speed humps and speed tables are most often constructed on existing roadways (i.e., retrofit); however, speed humps and speed tables may be constructed on new roadways or during resurfacing projects.

It is recommended that jurisdictions planning to implement speed humps or speed tables develop standard construction procedures. Following these procedures will ensure more uniform speed humps and speed tables are constructed throughout the jurisdiction. The procedures should be used by both municipal staff and private contractors engaged to work on municipal roads.

The construction procedures should contain detailed working drawings showing development of the desired profile and allowable tolerances for speed hump height. Material specifications and construction guidelines can also be included.

Agencies have reported that parabolic or sinusoidal cross-sections are more difficult to construct than circular speed humps or speed tables with straight approaches. However, many agencies have successfully constructed parabolic and sinusoidal cross-sections within acceptable tolerances. This success is often related to the use of a speed hump profile template which is used to verify that the speed hump dimensions and profile are accurate within reasonable tolerances. Figure 3 shows the use of a speed hump profile template in Beaverton, OR to construct a parabolic speed hump. If the profile is incorrect, the effect of the speed hump will likely change, which might result in unanticipated or reduced effectiveness.



**Figure 3: Use of speed hump profile template in Beaverton, OR**

Photo by: Jabra Khasho (City of Beaverton, Oregon)

Care should be taken in the initial installation and monitoring of speed humps to minimize the risk of edge raveling and profile deformation exceeding established tolerances. It is important to maintain the appropriate design relationship between the hump or table and the street so the device continues to perform its intended purpose within allowable tolerances. From the experiences of several agencies, speed humps constructed of asphalt concrete tend to deform over time in the direction of traffic flow, while rubberized speed humps may develop ruts along



the wheel paths or curl up along the edges. Ambient temperature during construction as well as sufficiency of the bond between the new asphalt and the existing street also play a role in the durability an asphalt hump.

If maintenance activities, such as utility work or pavement resurfacing, result in speed hump pavement markings being reduced or eliminated, they should be promptly replaced or supplemented with temporary signs providing the same warning to motorists.

Experience has shown that speed humps and speed tables are generally not damaged by snow plowing activities. Snow removal crews in Montgomery County (GA) reported minimal impact or cost associated with speed humps (Wainwright 1998). The City of Edmonton (AB) experienced some damage to parabolic speed humps from snow plows; however, in most cases there was no damage since snow plow operators do not plow down to the pavement on local streets where speed humps are located. For jurisdictions which experience substantial snowfall, it is recommended that snow plow operators be informed of all streets with speed humps before the winter season starts.

## 5. MONITOR AND EVALUATE EFFECTIVENESS

Speed hump installations affect residents and road users; traffic speeds, volumes and travel time; roadway safety, noise levels and emissions. It is important to monitor and evaluate the effect of each speed hump or speed table installation project. Minimum monitoring and evaluation includes data collection and analysis of vehicle operating speed and traffic volume changes including traffic diversion. More extensive evaluation may include gathering feedback from residents and road users.

The type, number, and extent of studies performed to evaluate speed humps may vary based upon the particular circumstances and objectives of each installation. However, some review could be performed after each installation to determine if the desired results were achieved, or if unexpected problems were created. If the installation of speed humps resulted in undesirable safety or traffic operations issues, consideration can be given to mitigation efforts including possible removal of the humps.

Monitoring and evaluation may include several aspects of the speed hump installation, including impacts on residents, traffic operations and safety, and on the environment.

## 6. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Speed humps and speed tables are two of several geometric design techniques that may be used to control vehicular traffic speeds along a roadway. Positive results in terms of reduced operating speeds and reduced traffic volumes have been documented after speed hump installation.

The experiences of various agencies currently implementing speed humps across North America are documented in the updated ITE Recommended Practice along with findings from published research work. The ITE Recommended Practice also provides details on the design of speed humps and speed tables.

This paper provides an overview of the recommended framework for an agency to follow to implement speed humps or speed tables in their jurisdiction. This framework is based on the experience documented by dozens of agencies. General considerations for the implementation of speed humps as a traffic calming measure were discussed along with the importance of community involvement.

## 7. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors would like to acknowledge the significant contributions of the Technical Advisory Committee for this project, as well as the hundreds of respondents to our on-line survey.

This paper was originally published in the conference proceedings of the CITE 2007 Conference held in Toronto, Ontario, Canada.

## 8. AUTHOR INFORMATION

Margaret Parkhill, P.Eng., Project Manager  
Tel: 905 882-4100 x 5236  
mparkhill@itransconsulting.com

Rudolph Sooklall, M.A.Sc, Transportation Planner  
Tel: 905 882-4100 x 5365  
rsooklall@itransconsulting.com

Geni Bahar, P.Eng., Vice President  
Tel: 905 882-4100 x 5247  
gbahar@itransconsulting.com

iTRANS Consulting Inc.  
100 York Blvd., Suite 300  
Richmond Hill, ON L4B 1J8  
Fax: 905 882-1557  
www.itransconsulting.com

## 9. REFERENCES

AASHTO (American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials). 2004. A Policy on Geometric Design of Highways and Streets, Fifth Edition. Washington, DC.

DeRobertis, M., Wachtel, A., 1996. Traffic Calming: Do's and Dont's to Encourage Bicycling, Presented at the Institute of Transportation Engineers Annual Meeting Compendium, Website accessed August 2006, <http://www.ite.org/traffic/documents/AIA96E98.pdf>



Ernish, E., Harrison, P., Yuwan, J. 1998. "Streets For People; Traffic Calming in your Neighborhood", Neighborhood Streets Network,  
[http://safety.fhwa.dot.gov/ped\\_bike/docs/streets4people.pdf](http://safety.fhwa.dot.gov/ped_bike/docs/streets4people.pdf)

Ewing, R., Traffic Calming: State of the Practice, Institute of Transportation Engineers, Washington, DC, Prepared for U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Association, Office of Safety Research and Development and Office of Human Environment, August 1999

Pedestrian and Bicycle Information Center (PBIC), Website accessed August 2006,  
<http://www.walkinginfo.org/>

Transportation Association of Canada (TAC). 1998. Canadian Guide to Neighbourhood Traffic Calming, Ottawa, ON, Canada.

Wainwright, W. S. 1998. Montgomery's County Speed Hump Program: A Love-Hate Story, Presented at the Institute of Transportation Engineers 68<sup>th</sup> Annual Meeting, Held in Toronto, ON.

Zegeer, C. V. 1998. Committee Chair, ITE Traffic Engineering Council Committee TENC-5A-5, Design and Safety of Pedestrian Facilities, A Recommended Practice of the Institute of Transportation Engineers, Washington, DC.

REFUNDS PER PROCEDURE NAME	Account # PROPERTY DESCRIPTION	AMOUNT
PORSCHE LEASING LIMITED PO BOX 24329 NASHVILLE, TN 37202	2019-03-0054656	1905.68

<b>Total per Procedure</b>	<b>\$</b>	<b>1,905.68</b>
<b>Refunds Per Selectmen Adjustments</b>	<b>\$</b>	<b>-</b>

<b>Total per Selectmen</b>	<b>\$</b>	<b>1,905.68</b>
----------------------------	-----------	-----------------

<b>Grant Total</b>	<b>\$</b>	<b>1,905.68</b>
--------------------	-----------	-----------------

**REQUEST FOR ABATEMENT OR REFUND OF PROPERTY TAXES**

Sec. 12-81(20), Sec. 12-124, 12-125, 12-126, 12-127, 12-127a, 12-128, 12-129 Rev. as Amended  
This is to certify that PORSCHE LEASING LTD

has presented satisfactory proof that he/she is entitled to an exemption on the assessment list of 10/01/2019

- ☐ Sec. 12-81 (20) Servicemen Having Disability Rating.
- ☐ Sec. 12-124 Abatement to poor.
- ☐ Sec. 12-125 Abatement of Taxes of Corporations.
- ☐ Sec. 12-126 Tangible Personal Property Assessed in more than one Municipality.
- ☐ Sec. 12-127 Abatement or Refund to Blind Persons.
- ☐ Sec. 12-127A Abatement of Taxes on Structures of Historical or Architectural Merit.
- ☐ Sec. 12-128 Refund of Taxes Erroneously Collected from Veterans and Relatives.
- ☒ Sec. 12-129 Refund of Excess Payments.

**RECEIVED**

JUN 10 2021

Ryan, LLC

PORSCHE LEASING LTD

Porsche Leasing Limited  
PO Box 24329  
Nashville, TN 37202

2019-03-0054656

54656

/AL03883/WP0CF2A76JL196092



\*2019030054656\*

To \_\_\_\_\_ Collector of **NORTH STONINGTON** State of Connecticut.

I hereby apply for refund\* of such part of my tax as shall represent:

The service exemption or Sec. 12-129 Refund of Excess Payments.  
(State reason -- Cross out service exemption if it does not apply)

*****							
		Tax	Interest	Lien	Fee	Total	Overpaid Tax
Total Due	07/01/2020	951.40	0.00	0.00	0.00	951.40	
Total Paid	07/24/2020	2,857.08	0.00	0.00	0.00	2,857.08	-1,905.68 ***
<hr/>							
Adjusted Refund		-1,905.68	0.00	0.00	0.00	1,905.68	

**PLEASE READ, SIGN, AND DATE BELOW:**

I am entitled to this refund because I made the payments from funds under my control, and no other party will be requesting this refund. I understand that false or deliberately misleading statements subject me to penalties for perjury and/or for obtaining money under false pretenses.

X Phyllis McCauley  
Print Name

X Phyllis McCauley 6/10/21  
Signature of Taxpayer Date

**COLLECTOR'S RECOMMENDATION TO THE GOVERNING BODY**

To the First Selectman, or \_\_\_\_\_  
It is recommended that refund\* of property taxes and interest in the amount of 1,905.68  
be made to the above-named taxpayer in accordance with the provisions of Section (s):

Sec. 12-129 Refund of Excess Payments.

DATED AT NORTH STONINGTON, CONNECTICUT THIS 17 DAY OF May 2021

Donna Spelman  
Tax Collector 6/14/21

**ACTION TAKEN BY GOVERNING BODY**

The First Selectman, as authorized by the Board of Selectman, or \_\_\_\_\_  
approved on the \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 20\_\_\_\_. It was voted to refund  
Property Taxes and Interest amounting to \$ \_\_\_\_\_ to \_\_\_\_\_.

First Selectman

Other Governing Body

Mail To :

NORTH STONINGTON TAX COLLECTOR  
40 MAIN ST  
NORTH STONINGTON, CT 06359



**Town of North Stonington  
Board of Selectmen Special Meeting  
Zoom Meeting  
June 8, 2021  
5:30 PM**

Public will be able to attend the meeting via Zoom with the following link:

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/81086909587>

Or via Zoom App-Enter Meeting ID: 810 8690 9587

Or listen only via telephone by calling 646 558 8656 and enter Meeting ID: 810 8690 9587

**DRAFT MINUTES**

1. Call to order/Roll Call: 5:30pm, First Selectman Urgo, Selectman Carlson and Selectwoman Kincaid.
2. Executive Session
  - a. Negotiations SUFA Animal Shelter/Wintechog Hill Road
  - b. Negotiations Discussion 298 Norwich Westerly Road
  - c. Motion by Selectman Carlson to enter into executive session at 5:32pm, 2<sup>nd</sup> by Selectwoman Kincaid. Motion approved 3-0-0.
  - d. The board exited the executive session at 6pm.
3. Adjournment: motion by First Selectman Urgo to adjourn at 6pm, 2<sup>nd</sup> by Selectman Carlson. Motion approved 3-0-0.

\*The Board of Selectmen respectfully requests that public comments do not exceed two (2) minutes per person in respect for everyone's time.

Respectfully submitted,

Bailey Talbott



**Town of North Stonington  
Board of Selectmen Meeting  
Zoom Meeting  
June 8, 2021  
6:00 PM**

Public will be able to attend the meeting via Zoom with the following link:

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/86851030489>

Or via Zoom App-Enter Meeting ID: 868 5103 0489

Or listen only via telephone by calling 646 558 8656 and enter Meeting ID: 868 5103 0489

**DRAFT MINUTES**

1. Call to order/Roll Call: 6pm, First Selectman Uργο, Selectman Carlson, Selectwoman Kincaid and Administration & Finance Officer Christine Dias in attendance.
  - a. Motion by Selectman Carlson to add item "Update Regarding Solar Project on Route 184, 2<sup>nd</sup> by First Selectman Uργο. Motion approved 3-0-0.
2. Solar Project Route 184 Update
  - a. First Selectman Uργο, Planning & Zoning Officer Juliet Hodge and Town attorney attended the evidentiary period for the solar project. Juliet Hodge provided an update regarding the evidentiary period, the public comment period and 30-day window for written testimony to be accepted by the Siting Council. The evidentiary session will continue, information regarding the continued session will be announced June 9, 2021.
3. Public Comments on Agenda and Non-Agenda Items\*
4. Pawcatuck Neighborhood Center Social Services North Stonington Hours
  - a. First Selectman Uργο provided an update on Social Services provided by the Pawcatuck Neighborhood Center (PNC). A staff member from PNC will be available at the Town Hall on Tuesdays from 9am – 4pm and can provide assistance with food insecurity, rental and mortgage assistance, fuel and energy assistance, SNAP benefits, WIC benefits, transportation issues, senior concerns and activities, and social issues. A reoccurring Facebook event will be created as well as a press release for the newspapers.
5. Discussion of Negotiation 298 Norwich Westerly Road
  - a. The RFP closed on Friday, June 4, 2021 at 1pm. Selectman Carlson will be leading negotiations and will provide an update during the next meeting. After negotiations, the lease will go to a Town Meeting.
6. NSVFC Carryover Funds Discussion

- a. The board discussed the request from the North Stonington Volunteer Fire Company. The Board of Selectmen requested that the NSVFC would go through the process of additional appropriation.
7. Recap of All Boards and Commissions American Rescue Fund Discussion
  - a. The board discussed the meeting and feedback received both during and after the meeting of all boards and commissions. Discussion of the American Rescue Fund will continue.
8. Town Meeting and Referendum Advertising
  - a. The board discussed mailers, the newspapers as well as banners and signs. A special meeting to continue discussing Town Meeting mailers and advertising.
9. Call for Town Meeting
  - a. The board discussed moving the budget to a Town Meeting. Those interested in attending can do so either virtually or in-person. Pre-registration is required for those interested in attending virtually and must register by Noon on Monday, May 10, 2021.
  - b. First Selectman Urgo read aloud the Call for Town Meeting; please see the attachment for the full call. Motion by Selectman Carlson to approve the call as read, 2<sup>nd</sup> by Selectwoman Kincaid. Motion approved 3-0-0.
10. Setting of Mill Rate Discussion and/or Action
  - a. The board discussed the Mill Rate for the Town.
  - b. Motion by Selectman Carlson to set the Mill Rate at 28.6 Mills, 2<sup>nd</sup> by Selectwoman Kincaid. Motion approved 3-0-0.
11. Treasury Authorization Coronavirus Funds
  - a. The board discussed the Treasury Authorization Coronavirus Funds, in order for dispersal of funds; a signature from the CEO of the Town is required to accept the funds. Approval of the funds will also be brought to a future Town Meeting for approval.
  - b. Motion by Selectman Carlson to give the authority to the First Selectman to accept Treasury Authorization Coronavirus Funds, 2<sup>nd</sup> by Selectman Urgo. Motion approved 3-0-0.
12. Tax Refunds

Motion by Selectman Carlson to approve tax refunds as presented, 2<sup>nd</sup> by Selectwoman Kincaid. Motion approved 3-0-0.

Naccarato, Pamela	\$229.46
VCFS Auto Leasing Co	\$270.89

### 13. Selectman's Expense Line Discussion

- a. There was no discussion.

### 14. Additional Appropriation Request

- a. Motion by Selectwoman Kincaid to approve the additional appropriation request and send it to the Board of Finance, 2<sup>nd</sup> by Selectman Carlson. Motion approved 3-0-0.

### 15. Discussion of Future Town Meeting

- a. The board discussed holding a special meeting after the Board of Finance meets to call for a Town Meeting after the referendum for the upcoming Town Meeting.

### 16. Minutes

- a. March 23, 2021 Special Meeting
  - i. Motion by Selectman Carlson to approve minutes as presented, 2<sup>nd</sup> by Selectwoman Kincaid. Motion approved 3-0-0.
- b. May 25, 2021
  - i. Motion by Selectman Carlson to approve minutes as presented, 2<sup>nd</sup> by Selectwoman Kincaid. Motion approved 3-0-0.
- c. May 28, 2021 Special Meeting
  - i. Motion by Selectman Carlson to approve minutes as presented, 2<sup>nd</sup> by Selectwoman Kincaid. Motion approved 3-0-0.

### 17. Public Comments on Agenda Items\*

### 18. Adjournment

- a. Motion by Selectman Carlson to adjourn at 7:29pm, 2<sup>nd</sup> by Selectwoman Kincaid. Motion approved 3-0-0.

\*The Board of Selectmen respectfully requests that public comments do not exceed two (2) minutes per person in respect for everyone's time.

Respectfully submitted,

Bailey Talbott



**Town of North Stonington  
Board of Selectmen Special Meeting  
North Stonington Education Center & Zoom  
June 17, 2021  
12:00 PM**

Public will be able to attend the meeting in person or via Zoom with the following link:  
<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/81946117839?pwd=M0xMcE9IZWN4R3EraklHUkdIRS9WZz0>

9

Meeting ID: 819 4611 7839

Passcode: 040724

Or listen only via telephone by calling 646 558 8656 and enter Meeting ID: 810 8690 9587

**DRAFT MINUTES**

1. Call to order/Roll Call: 12pm, First Selectman Urgo, Selectman Carlson, Selectwoman Kincaid and Administration & Finance Officer Christine Dias in attendance.
2. COVID protocols for June 28 referendum discussion
  - a. The board discussed COVID protocols for the upcoming referendum due to some concerns.
3. Opportunity for vaccinations on referendum day
  - a. The board discussed a potential vaccination clinic during the referendum. First Selectman Urgo will speak with Steve Mansfield of Ledge Light Health District . put it in weekly update
4. Discussion of referendum advertising
  - a. Selectwoman Kincaid created draft mailers for the upcoming referendum. The board discussed changes to the mailers.
  - b. The board discussed the voting signs that are placed around Town on election days.
5. Call for Special Town Meeting
  - a. First Selectman Urgo led the discussion on an upcoming Town Meeting regarding Town projects,
  - b. First Selectman Urgo read aloud the call for Town Meeting. Motion by Selectman Carlson to approve Town Meeting as read by First Selectman Urgo, 2<sup>nd</sup> by Selectwoman Kincaid. Motion approved 3-0-0.
6. Adjournment: Motion by Selectman Carlson to adjourn at 12:28pm, 2<sup>nd</sup> by Selectwoman Kincaid. Motion approved 3-0-0.



\*The Board of Selectmen respectfully requests that public comments do not exceed two (2) minutes per person in respect for everyone's time.

Respectfully submitted,

Bailey Talbott