

Green Orchard Place & Ramona Drive Proposed Speed Humps

Public Works Department

City Council Meeting
April 22, 2025

RiversideCA.gov

1

BACKGROUND

1. Neighborhood Traffic Management Program (NTMP) includes the traffic calming tools for various road types.
2. In 2014, use of speed humps were discontinued.
3. On May 2024, the City Council reinstated the use of speed humps as one of the alternatives in the secondary options of the NTMP.
4. Scheduled on the 3/5/25 Transportation Board Meeting. Due to lack of quorum, meeting cancelled & item forwarded.




2

RiversideCA.gov

2

LOCATION MAP (GREEN ORCHARD PLACE)

Request for speed humps along Green Orchard Place between Kingdom Drive and Lone Peak Court.



3




RiversideCA.gov

3

LOCATION MAP (RAMONA DRIVE)



Request for speed humps along Ramona Drive between Brockton Avenue and Magnolia Avenue



4



RiversideCA.gov

4

STREET VIEW PHOTOS / EXISTING CONDITIONS



Looking eastbound
Green Orchard Pl at
the intersection of
Kingdom Dr

Looking westbound on
Green Orchard Pl at
the intersection of
Lone Peak



5

STREET VIEW PHOTOS / EXISTING CONDITIONS



Looking southbound on
Ramona Dr at its
intersection with
Brockton Ave

Looking northbound
on Ramona Dr at its
intersection with
Magnolia Ave



6

SPEED HUMP CRITERIA CHECKLIST (GREEN ORCHARD)

PETITION REQUIREMENTS	DATA	CONFORMANCE		
		YES	NO	COMMENTS
Petition contains: ▶ Signatures from a minimum of 70% of adjacent residents indicating support for speed hump installation (each parcel represents one vote)	92%	X		11 of 12 *Submitted on 9/10/2020
QUALIFYING & TRAFFIC DATA CRITERIA ALL 8 MUST BE MET				
1. The street segment must be a local residential street with no more than one lane in each direction	2 lanes		X	Classified as a Collector roadway.
2. The legal speed limit is 25 MPH	35 MPH		X	35 MPH Posted Speed
3. Street width may not exceed 40 feet	40 feet	X		Parking on both sides of the street
4. Street does not have a vertical grade of 8% or greater	Max Grade 4.5%	X		Max Grade for entire length
5. Street is not a cul-de-sac under 800 feet in length	1,150 feet	X		Continuous road east of Lone Peak Court
6. Minimum average daily traffic volume of 750 vehicles	1,456 ADT	X		ADT = Average Daily Traffic (weekday)
7. Maximum average daily traffic volume of 1,999 vehicles	1,456 ADT	X		Traffic data from January 2025
8. Minimum combined 85 th speed of 37 MPH	39 MPH	X		Survey of 39 mph *Posted Speed limit of 35 mph
SUMMARY – ARE ALL 8 ABOVE CONDITIONS SATISFIED?			X	

Other Conditions (Fire Department, Ward location):	Fire Dept rec - Type II Speed Hump per Std Plan 251, Ward 4 Location
Collision History Review:	1 unsafe speed collision 6/24/22 in the Past 5 years (2020-2024).
Special Circumstances:	Cut-through traffic from Overlook Pkwy. No schools or senior centers nearby.

Traffic Count Data:

*1,456 Average Daily Traffic (ADT)

*39 Miles Per Hour (MPH) 85th percentile speed survey

7



RiversideCA.gov

7

SPEED HUMP CRITERIA CHECKLIST (RAMONA DR)

PETITION REQUIREMENTS	DATA	CONFORMANCE		
		YES	NO	COMMENTS
Petition contains: ▶ Signatures from a minimum of 70% of adjacent residents indicating support for speed hump installation (each parcel represents one vote)	70%	X		14 of 20
QUALIFYING & TRAFFIC DATA CRITERIA ALL 8 MUST BE MET				
1. The street segment must be a local residential street with no more than one lane in each direction	2 lanes		X	One each way. Collector in General Plan (4 lanes)
2. The legal speed limit is 25 MPH	25 MPH	X		Prima Facie Speed Limit
3. Street width may not exceed 40 feet	28 Feet Width	X		Parking on one side (residential side only)
4. Street does not have a vertical grade of 8% or greater	1.15%	X		
5. Street is not a cul-de-sac under 800 feet in length	1,580 feet	X		Continuous Road
6. Minimum average daily traffic volume of 750 vehicles	1,785 ADT	X		ADT = Average Daily Traffic (Weekday)
7. Maximum average daily traffic volume of 1,999 vehicles	1,785	X		Traffic count data from January 2025
8. Minimum combined 85 th speed of 37 MPH	35 MPH		X	Over posted speed limit by 10 MPH
SUMMARY – ARE ALL 8 ABOVE CONDITIONS SATISFIED?			X	

Other Conditions (Fire Department, Ward location):	Fire Dept rec - Type II Speed Hump per Std Plan 251, Ward 1 Location
Collision History Review:	7 collisions in the Past 5 years (2020-2024), 6 occurred at intersection of Magnolia & Ramona. Other is ped crossing roadway (ped-veh)
Special Circumstances:	Adjacent to Central Middle School, Riverside City College & Riverside Church

Traffic Count Data:

*1,785 Average Daily Traffic (ADT)

*35 Miles Per Hour (MPH) 85th percentile speed survey




8




RiversideCA.gov

8

SPEED HUMP (TYPE II) PROPOSED







*Fire Dept recommendation - Speed Hump (Type II)



RiversideCA.gov


9

PROPOSED SPEED HUMP LOCATIONS (GREEN ORCHARD)

 Potential Speed Hump Locations (x2)

 Potential Sign Locations (x4)




RiversideCA.gov

10


PROPOSED SPEED HUMP LOCATIONS (RAMONA)



Potential
Speed Hump
Locations
(x3)



Potential Sign
Locations
(x6)



11



RiversideCA.gov

11

DISADVANTAGES OF SPEED HUMPS

Disadvantages of speed humps include:

- Capital cost (minimum 2 to 4 speed humps per street);
- Tendency to speed in between humps;
- Noise from braking
- Potential delays to emergency vehicle response times (use Type II)
- Diversion of traffic



12



RiversideCA.gov

12

ADVANTAGES OF SPEED HUMP INSTALLATIONS

Vehicle Speed Reductions in the range of 5mph-13mph

Countermeasure	Safety Focus	Area	Roadway	Reference	Sites	Speed Limit (mph)	Volume (vpd)		Mean Speed (mph)			85 th %tile Speed (mph)		Δ (mph)	Period	Location	Notes
							Before	After	Before	After	Change	Before	After				
Vertical Deflections Within the Roadway																	
Speed Hump—rounded, raised area placed across the roadway, typically 12 to 14 feet long	pedestrian	urban	local	1 (1999)	178	—	48 to 11544	46 to 110443	—	—	—	35	27	-8	—	various	
	pedestrian	urban	local	2 (2005)	7	—	400 to 4362	401 to 3384	—	—	—	32	26	-6	—	VA	
	pedestrian	urban	local	3 (2000)	4	—	475 to 1506	433 to 1343	—	—	—	36	31	-5	—	WA	
	pedestrian	urban	local	4 (2005)	1	25	1300	—	22	23	1	37	29	-8	1-mon	FL	
	pedestrian	rural/urban	local	5 (2002)	3	25	218 to 746	—	24	18	-6	28	22	-6	1-mon	IA	
	pedestrian	urban	—	1 (1999)	4	—	—	—	—	—	—	36	29	-7	—	—	with speed table
	pedestrian	urban	—	1 (1999)	2	—	2456 to 3685	2593 to 2931	—	—	—	38	25	-13	—	—	with choker

Source: Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Engineering Speed Management Countermeasures, 2014.



13

RiversideCA.gov

13

STRATEGIC PLAN ALIGNMENT



Strategic Priority 2 – Community Well-Being

Goal 2.4 – Support programs and innovations that enhance community safety, encourage neighborhood engagement, and build public trust

Cross-Cutting Threads



Community Trust



Fiscal Responsibility



Sustainability & Resiliency



Equity



Innovation



14

RiversideCA.gov

14

RECOMMENDATIONS

That the City Council approve the following:

1. Proposed speed humps along Green Orchard Pl between Kingdom Dr and Lone Peak Court;and
2. Proposed speed humps along Ramona Dr between Brockton Ave and Magnolia Ave.



15

RiversideCA.gov