



## Takoma Park City Council Meeting – October 4, 2023 Agenda Item 2

### **Presentation**

Presentation about the status of City pedestrian and transportation planning projects, policies, and initiatives.

### **Recommended Council Action**

Review presentation and discuss the next steps for Council consideration of policy and regulatory direction or amendments.

### **Context with Key Issues**

As part of on-going efforts to improve pedestrian and traffic safety in the City, on October 26, 2022, the City Council passed a Resolution on Pedestrian and Transportation Safety (2022-41). The resolution directed City staff to work on a number of policies and procedures to improve the pedestrian and transportation safety in the City. Additionally, the City Council passed an Ordinance Approving the Installation of Traffic Calming on the 6500 Block of Second Avenue (2023-3) that requested that City staff provide an update on the actions approved in Resolution 2022-41).

### **Council Priority**

Advancing a Community of Belonging  
Environmentally Sustainable Community  
Engaged, Responsive, Service-Oriented Government  
Community Development for an Improved & Equitable Quality of Life

### **Environmental Considerations**

The City's pedestrian and transportation planning efforts influence the safety and well-being of pedestrians. The sense of security, comfort, and ease by which people can get around the City without fossil fuel-powered modes of transportation has a tangible impact on the city's carbon emissions. The City's Safe Routes to School program works on safe options for students to get to and from school safely, with a particular focus on safe walking and biking. The goals of reducing climate impact via improved pedestrian and bicycle facilities directly supports goals and recommendations laid out in the City's 2020 Sustainability and Climate Action Plan in addition to the County's Bicycle Master Plan and draft Pedestrian Master Plan.

### **Fiscal Considerations**

There is no fiscal impact from actions taken as a part of this presentation. However, the recommendations referenced within the presentation, if enacted, have a broad range of fiscal impacts, ranging from none to large expenditures on staffing and technical assistance.

### **Racial Equity Considerations**

Different policies, procedures, and initiatives to improve pedestrian and transportation safety in the City would have varying impacts on the City's goals to improve racially equitable outcomes for residents. Black, Indigenous, and People of Color (BIPOC) in Takoma Park are less likely to own a car than White residents in the City and rely more heavily on walking and public transit. Many of the City's initiatives strive to improve the pedestrian landscape of the City with a special focus on adjusting

existing processes and the direction of resources toward the more equitable provision of pedestrian and roadway safety improvements. Some recommendations would have a stronger impact than others. In the absence of additional staffing or technical consulting support, some recommendations would only be implementable in part or not at all, which diminishes their ability to reduce racial inequity.

**Attachments and Links**

Resolution 2022-41: Resolution on Pedestrian and Transportation Safety

Ordinance 2023-3: Installation of Traffic Calming on the 6500 Block of Second Avenue

Complete Safe Streets Committee Recommendations (2021)

Introduced by: Councilmember Kostiuk

**CITY OF TAKOMA PARK, MARYLAND**

**RESOLUTION 2022-41**

**RESOLUTION ON PEDESTRIAN AND TRANSPORTATION SAFETY**

WHEREAS, the City Council identified a goal of improving transportation planning and outreach to create a safer and more racially equitable community for all residents, including pedestrians, bicyclists, and vehicle occupants, in Resolution 2021-6; and

WHEREAS, Resolution 2021-6 also outlined strategies of exploring adopting a Vision Zero initiative, examining potential components such as education/outreach, policy, changes, and infrastructure improvements, and continuing to revise processes for traffic calming and sidewalk requests; and

WHEREAS, other goals outlined in Resolution 2021-6, such as climate change mitigation and improved city policies and processes to enhance resident interaction with the city, support this goal of improved transportation planning and outreach; and

WHEREAS, the City has identified inequities in the existing traffic calming and sidewalk request policies; and

WHEREAS, the Takoma Park Complete Safe Streets Committee developed a set of recommendations to improve decision-making and prioritization related to pedestrian safety initiatives in the City of Takoma Park and presented those recommendations to the City Council in March 2021; and

WHEREAS, those recommendations include, among other things: utilizing data-driven and evidence-based criteria as the basis for decisions; balancing the weight of “public input” by giving more weight to other criteria, including racial equity; proactively considering traffic data; considering a variety of traffic-calming measures as options in addition to speed humps; planning more holistically for traffic calming and pedestrian safety across larger geographic areas; utilizing a variety of methods for resident outreach and education; and creating criteria for prioritizing locations for new sidewalk installation; and

WHEREAS, Montgomery County is undertaking a number of initiatives to improve pedestrian safety, including the Action Plan for Vision Zero, the Pedestrian Master Plan, the Predictive Safety Analysis, the RideOn Reimagined Study, and the Bicycle Master Plan, that may inform and help support work on these issues in Takoma Park; and

WHEREAS, many of the most dangerous locations for traffic safety, as identified in the Montgomery County Predictive Safety Analysis and Takoma Park Police data, are located on State Highway Administration roads in the city; and

WHEREAS, State law now allows municipalities in Montgomery County to decrease speed limits down to 15 MPH after performing an investigation; and

WHEREAS, during an October 12, 2022, work session, City staff presented about ongoing work and progress on safety improvements for pedestrians, transit-users, and people riding bicycles in the City; and

WHEREAS, the City Council has held work sessions on development of a Public Space Management Plan that is anticipated to be adopted in the near future and will outline key recommendations related to use of public space and evaluation criteria that may further inform changes to pedestrian and transportation safety.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT the City Council directs City staff to develop and present revised traffic calming, sidewalk request, and street safety policies and prioritization procedures for City Council consideration that:

- Prioritize safety and equity in decision-making processes and planning;
- Emphasize the wellbeing and safety of the most vulnerable roadway users and prioritize the best use of the public space for the community as a whole;
- Consider holistic approaches addressing larger geographic areas, including investigation of reduced speed limits, and integration of other City plans and priorities such as sustainability efforts, public art initiatives, and other projects;
- Utilize data-driven criteria for evaluating and prioritizing sidewalk and traffic calming installations and other traffic calming approaches such as reduced speed limits (as allowed by state law), and for planning and identifying where safety measures are needed;
- Allow for multiple avenues for initiating consideration of locations that may need traffic calming or sidewalks, speed limit reductions, or other measures;
- Make progress toward a more comprehensive approach to transportation and public space planning that prioritizes pedestrian and non-vehicle safety.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the City Council supports continuing periodic meetings between State Highway Administration representatives and City staff and/or Councilmembers to further progress toward substantially improving pedestrian, bike, and automobile safety on State Highways, and directs City staff to work with SHA to ensure that such meetings take place quarterly or as frequently as practicable.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the City Council directs staff to report back on the status of implementing this resolution within six months from the date of adoption.

Adopted this 26th day of October, 2022.


AYES: Stewart, Kovar, Dyballa, Kostiuk, Seamens, Smith, Searcy

NAYS: None

ABSENT: None

ABSTAIN: None

Attest:

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Jessie Carpenter", is written over a horizontal line.

Jessie Carpenter, CMC  
City Clerk

Introduced by: Councilmember Small

First Reading: March 1, 2023  
Second Reading: March 8, 2023  
Effective Date: March 8, 2023

**CITY OF TAKOMA PARK, MARYLAND**

**ORDINANCE NO. 2023-3**

**APPROVING THE INSTALLATION OF TRAFFIC CALMING  
ON THE 6500 BLOCK OF SECOND AVENUE**

WHEREAS, in accordance with Takoma Park Code, Section 13.28.010, the Director of Public Works is authorized to place, erect, and maintain upon the public highways of the City such traffic calming devices as the Council may direct at locations designated by the Council or as determined by the City Manager or his or her designee; and

WHEREAS, residents of the 6500 Block of Second Avenue initiated a traffic calming request for the installation of traffic calming on the block in a process that included a petition, community meeting, and a public hearing; and

WHEREAS, the City Council has considered the request; and

WHEREAS, as outlined in Resolution 2022-41 (Resolution on Pedestrian and Transportation Safety), the City Council expects staff to report back on the status of implementing that resolution at an appropriate time later this spring.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED BY THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF TAKOMA PARK, MARYLAND THAT:

Section 1. Installation of a speed hump between 6521 and 6522 Second Avenue is authorized. The speed hump profile will be the County Standard.

Section 2: This ordinance shall become effective immediately.

Adopted this 8th day of March, 2023 by roll-call vote as follows:

AYE: Searcy, Dyballa, Gibson, Seamens, Honzak  
NAY: None  
ABSTAIN: Fulcher, Small  
ABSENT: None

# Recommendations of the Complete Safe Streets Committee to the City Council:

---

## HOW TO PRIORITIZE TRAFFIC CALMING AND SIDEWALK INSTALLATIONS

# Contents

|  |    |
|--|----|
| Summary .....  | 2  |
| Additional information and tools needed to provide data for an informed decision: .....          | 2  |
| Trigger consideration of installation:.....  | 2  |
| Spring 2020 Recommendations .....  | 2  |
| Procedural Consistency: .....  | 2  |
| Procedural simplification and equity:.....   | 2  |
| Transparent and evidence-based decision making to enhance equitable results: .....               | 3  |
| Traffic data proactively evaluated:.....   | 3  |
| Community engagement in decision and design: .....   | 3  |
| Creative Approach to achieving Enhanced Mobility:.....   | 3  |
| Be Proactive in Evaluating Measures Holistically: .....  | 3  |
| Be Innovative and Cost Conscious:.....   | 3  |
| Be specific and wise about the budget available for mobility measures and how it is spent: ..... | 3  |
| To set priorities: .....   | 4  |
| There is no substitute/shortcut for outreach and education .....                                 | 4  |
| Criteria for prioritizing sidewalks.....   | 4  |
| Stage 1 .....  | 5  |
| Stage 2 .....  | 6  |
| For Reference.....   | 7  |
| Sidewalk and Traffic Calming Criteria Development .....  | 7  |
| Sidewalks.....   | 7  |
| Traffic calming .....  | 8  |
| Appendix.....  | 9  |
| Appendix A.....  | 9  |
| Appendix B.....  | 10 |
| Appendix C.....  | 11 |
| Appendix D.....  | 12 |



## Summary

The Committee has developed a set of recommendations we believe are necessary for informed decision making and prioritization.

### Additional information and tools needed to provide data for an informed decision:

1. Creation of an inventory of City sidewalks in GIS starting with the 2009 GIS data from Toole Design Group. City staff currently use an excel spreadsheet. Updating the GIS file would take an estimated one week to complete by a skilled GIS staff person.
2. Creation of a GIS-based inventory of current traffic calming installations, including, but not limited to, stop signs, speed bumps, traffic circles, one-way streets, bike lanes, etc. Data appears difficult to access.
3. Creation of an overlay of the inventory of *community-requested* traffic calming and sidewalk installations.
4. Creation of an overlay of the inventory of *staff-recommended* traffic calming and sidewalk installations.
5. Publication of the maps on the city page.

Once you these tools are in place, the city will be better able to view pending projects and gain a better understanding of unmet needs and expenditures. The size/cost of the backlog will provide insight into the level of needed prioritizing – if everything can get done in a short time then prioritization is less important.

### Trigger consideration of installation:

The CSSC presented recommendations in the spring of 2020 to the Takoma Park City Council. The Council requested the committee to provide more detail regarding criteria and prioritization. The committee believes a request should simply trigger consideration, as a starting point for this process. Following are our recommendations for process, criteria, and prioritization.

### Spring 2020 Recommendations

#### Procedural Consistency:

Make the process the same for requesting traffic calming and sidewalk installation.

#### Procedural simplification and equity:

The process for requesting action should reduce the burden on residents seeking safer streets or improved mobility. To that end, consider (a) removing the requirement for a petition, or (b) the following reforms:

- Reduce the percentage of residents required for triggering consideration.
- Add new simplified options for triggering consideration, such as creating a simplified request form with which someone can:
  - Ask a council member, who would either give them the simplified request form or fill it out for them.
  - Ask a designated city staff member, who could either give them the simplified request form or fill it out for them.
  - Allow city staff on own initiative to complete a simplified request form.

- Appeal to city in case of denial (petition) with a small number of interested parties (not one single resident)

#### Transparent and evidence-based decision making to enhance equitable results:

To be equitable, make the criteria and basis for decision about where/whether to adopt traffic calming or sidewalk installation data-driven and evidence-based.

Spell out the criteria that will be applied to any request/proposal, so that people can see in advance what criteria will be applied and decisions can be transparently and readily explained/justified. They can then use the criteria to fill in the simplified request form.

Consider using a point / rating system based on appropriate factors such as volume of complaints; volume of pedestrians/cars/bikes usage; accident/near miss data; proximity to schools or school walking routes; inputs from relevant experts like crossing guards, police, and emergency services; PTA concerns.

#### Traffic data proactively evaluated:

Takoma Park Police's recorded accident data needs to be merged with County data so that the full scope of accidents can be considered in evaluating proposals. Additional consultation between Public Works and TP Police regarding observational accident and safety data should also be considered, as well as predictive models under development by Parks and Planning ([Vision Zero Predictive Planning Model](#)) or other data sources as available.

#### Community engagement in decision and design:

If a request or city-initiated proposal meets the criteria for action and scores high enough to merit action, the City should have a predictable process for *posted notification* at proposed site and for *community consultation* at or near the site so that neighbors can easily learn about and offer feedback on proposals.

#### Creative Approach to achieving Enhanced Mobility:

Change the current language for 'speed hump' policy to be 'traffic calming' or 'mobility/safety' measures; requesters should call for action using viable options, and not necessarily be asked to or encouraged to specify which measures to install/remove.

#### Be Proactive in Evaluating Measures Holistically:

Consideration of large area scope approach vs. individual measures for problem streets/neighborhoods offers opportunities to avoid pushing a problem from one street to another; act systematically to avoid ripple effects.

#### Be Innovative and Cost Conscious:

There is a broad array of low-cost options for traffic calming and mobility enhancement. Be more creative and inclusive in considering them to enable the City to satisfy more requests that meet the transparent criteria.

#### Be specific and wise about the budget available for mobility measures and how it is spent:

There should be an annual budget that can be seen by all. Where multiple less expensive actions have to be weighed against fewer more costly options, there should be an open and

transparent process for selecting among these options with extra consideration given to underserved populations and neighborhoods.

## To set priorities:

Priorities should be data-driven and have a racial equity lens. We therefore propose the city council:

- Use the overall criteria laid out in the Toole report (which was primarily focused on ADA compliance, but is generally applicable to traffic calming and sidewalk installation).
- Review and adjust the weighting of these criteria based on experiences of other jurisdictions and active city policy/guidelines.
- Reducing the weight of 'public input' and increasing the weight of other criteria, foremost 'racial equity'.

## No substitute or shortcut for outreach and education

- Affected residents need to be kept informed and be consulted, early on in the process.
- City staff and elected officials are responsible for initiating outreach to residents and businesses, as well as responding to requesters within a pre-determined reasonable period of time.
- A variety of methods should be used to reach affected residents, and to gather their input (e.g., posted signs, emails, virtual and in-person meetings, social media, local paper, and local communication platforms. All communications should be accessible and strive to be translated to meet resident communication needs.)

## Criteria for prioritizing sidewalks

Presented below are two tables outlining criteria for prioritization of sidewalk requests. Criteria are weighted to yield a score in which to rate the sidewalk requests. Two options are presented, a one-stage process and a two-stage process. In both processes, a high score equates to higher priority, greater need.

## Stage 1

| Criteria for Prioritizing Sidewalks - Single Stage Process |                  |                  |                     |                |  |
|--|------------------|------------------|---------------------|----------------|--|
| Criteria Number  | Criteria Name    | Weighting Factor | 0-10 (Max Score 70) | Weighted Score |  |
|  |                  |                  |                     |                | How to score. Each criteria is scored on a 1 to 10 scale, cost score is scored on a 0,5,10 scale.  |
| 1  | Safety           | 25%              | 10                  | 25             | Does the project mitigate the actual or potential risks of death or injury? Projects that mitigate in hot spot locations (i.e. sites with high incidence of speeding, aggressive driving violations, pedestrian and bike injuries), or road sections with speed limits above 35 MPH, or with prevailing speeds above limits, using advice from police as well as accident reports since incident reports are not filed for minor accidents) get a higher score.  |
| 2  | School Access    | 15%              | 10                  | 15             | Does the project mitigate a gap in the sidewalk network in a school walk zone, projects that address gaps in the direct path score higher than projects that are not in the direct path or provide redundancy.   |
| 3  | Transit Access   | 15%              | 10                  | 15             | Does the project provide access to a transit facility from the nearest intersection? New access scores higher than upgrades to existing facilities.  |
| 4  | Key Destinations | 10%              | 10                  | 10             | Does the project provide access to schools, parks, houses of worship, groceries, medical offices, commercial centers? The larger the user numbers for the facility served, the greater the score.  |
| 5  | Public Input     | 10%              | 10                  | 10             | Project with high number of requests/support would score higher.   |
| 6  | Equity           | 15%              | 10                  | 15             | Enhances mobility for lower income/ higher minority Takoma Park wards, and focusing on higher density/low auto access areas within those wards (This criterion may require refinement and should be refined so that it can use existing databases wherever feasible) Suggest using the concept of 'vulnerable populations index', as developed by regional planning agencies. This would need to be refined to be more granular for the city. See <a href="https://bmc.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=b1e22c0caa7644ccb58484b00610712f">https://bmc.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=b1e22c0caa7644ccb58484b00610712f</a> We recommend giving this criterion a significantly higher weight to redress existing/past inequities and serve underserved areas of the city better. |
| 7  | Cost             | 10%              | 10                  | 10             | Projects with low cost to implement get a higher score. Staff will need to asses the level of utility relocation, ROW and Environmental impacts and assign a combined score. None-10, Minor-5, Major-0.  |
|  | <b>Score</b>     | <b>100%</b>      | <b>70</b>           | <b>100</b>     |  |

## Stage 2

| Criteria for Prioritizing Sidewalks - Two Stage Process |                            |                                  |                     |                |  |
|---|----------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------|----------------|--|
| Stage 1   |                            |                                  |                     |                |  |
| Criteria Number   | Criteria Name              | Weighting Factor                 | 0-10 (Max Score 60) | Weighted Score | How to score: Each criteria is scored on a 1 to 10 scale, then weighted. Cost score is scored on a 0,5,10 scale.   |
| 1   | Safety                     | 25%                              | 10                  | 25             | spot locations (i.e. sites with high incidence of speeding, aggressive driving violations, pedestrian and bike injuries), or road sections with speed limits above 35 MPH, or with prevailing speeds above limits, using advice from police as well as accident reports since incident reports are not filed for minor accidents) get a higher score.  |
| 2   | School Access              | 20%                              | 10                  | 20             | Does the project mitigate a gap in the sidewalk network in a school walk zone? Projects that address gaps in the direct path score higher than projects that are not in the direct path or provide redundancy.   |
| 3   | Transit Access             | 15%                              | 10                  | 15             | Does the project provide access to a transit facility from the nearest intersection? New access scores higher than upgrades to existing facilities.  |
| 4   | Key Destinations           | 15%                              | 10                  | 15             | Does the project provide access to schools, parks, houses of worship, groceries, medical offices, commercial centers? The larger the user numbers for the facility served, the greater the score.  |
| 5   | Public Input               | 10%                              | 10                  | 10             | Project with high number of requests/support would score higher.   |
| 6   | Equity                     | 15%                              | 10                  | 15             | density/low auto access areas within those wards (This criterion may require refinement and should be refined so that it can use existing databases wherever feasible) Suggest using the concept of 'vulnerable populations index', as developed by regional planning agencies. This would need to be refined to be more granular for the city. See <a href="https://bmc.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=b1e22c0caa7644ccb58484b00610712f">https://bmc.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=b1e22c0caa7644ccb58484b00610712f</a> We recommend giving this criterion a significantly higher weight to redress existing/past inequities and |
|   | <b>Score</b>               | <b>100%</b>                      | <b>60</b>           | <b>100</b>     |  |
| Stage 2   |                            |                                  |                     |                |  |
|   | Utility Relocation         | None-10,<br>Minor-5,<br>Major-0. | 5                   |                | This allows a more refined approach to costs. Projects with low cost to implement get a higher score. Staff will need to assess the level of utility relocation, ROW and Environmental impacts and assign a score for each factor.   |
|   | ROW Need                   |                                  | 10                  |                |  |
|   | Environmental Impacts      |                                  | 10                  |                |  |
|   | <b>Total Project Score</b> |                                  | <b>125</b>          |                |  |

## For Reference

### Sidewalk and Traffic Calming Criteria Development

#### Summary

The Subgroup of the CSSC was tasked to develop initial criteria for review by the full CSSC on a data driven approach for both traffic calming and sidewalk improvements across the city. Based on the discussion with Jennifer Toole, whose company developed a sidewalk assessment and ADA compliance plan in 2009, it is clear that sidewalk development has been a priority in some areas, but it is not clear that the data from the Toole Design group is being used by city staff. The group finds the following:

#### Sidewalks

##### 1. Inventory of sidewalks across Takoma Park

The city has a GIS file, developed by Toole Design, that outlines the 2009 status of sidewalk inventory across the entire city. While the data set is 11 years old, it is fully editable and is available to city staff to be updated to reflect current inventory. See Appendix A.

##### 2. Development of criteria

A catalogue of 7 different criteria was developed by Toole Design, each of which follows a point system, which then is weighted on priorities, see Appendix B.

This template ought to be updated but can easily be used as a starting point. Transit access and cost could be elevated while public input could be reduced to reflect this committee's desire to be more metric driven and less "squeaky-wheel" driven.

The assignment of point values would have to be further developed, perhaps by City planning staff, to provide a specific set of criteria. Toole used a standard set of criteria; e.g., for equity factors the following were used: locations of minority population, locations of transit, 0-car households.

Toole conducted such an assessment for the city and identified three tiers based on priority for sidewalk and ADA installation. Appendix C shows that prioritization, but also includes the need for ADA improvements with need for sidewalks in general.

##### 3. Next Steps

The CSSC would be happy to assist city staff to:

- update this inventory,
- update the criteria for sidewalk installation, and
- reassess the prioritization of sidewalk installation across the city, especially in previously under-served neighborhoods, and recognizing the eventual arrival of the Purple Line and related changes in walking patterns in the city.


The committee recommends that the City make the sidewalk tool and the data inputs publicly available, so residents can see where their street resides in terms of priority (and why!).

A review these recommendations for sidewalk installation might be warranted in future, if it becomes evident that sidewalk installation has been completed on most streets already. Moving away from a petition-based process, or reducing its importance in decision-making, may improve the equity of sidewalk placement.

## Traffic calming

1. Inventory
  - a. There does not seem to be an inventory of traffic calming measures across the city, nor a study to determine traffic patterns, speed and volume. Only safety related information (accident data) is available.
2. Development of criteria
  - a. Similar to the sidewalk criteria, traffic calming criteria need to be developed. An example that might be adapted as a model is from Coral Gables, Florida (<https://www.coralgables.com/trafficcalming>). A score of 10 is their threshold for calming, see Appendix D.
  - b. City staff could amend this in light of local traffic volume and speed and their ability to measure it. Also, the CSSC and City staff might consider whether these criteria are sufficiently holistic, for example consideration of pedestrian volume, and are weighted appropriately to meet our goals.

Appendix  
Appendix A  
Inventory Map





## Appendix B



Figure 1 - Template for a Criteria-Scoring-Weighing Tool

# Appendix C




Figure 2 - 2009 Prioritization of Sidewalk Installation in the City

## Appendix D

|                                   | Narrow Residential Local Street   | Residential Local Street | Residential Local Collector Street | Points |
|-----------------------------------|---|--------------------------|------------------------------------|--------|
| Daily Volume                      | 0 to 500 VPD  | 0 to 1,000 VPD           | 0 to 2,000 VPD                     | 0      |
|                                   | 501 to 750 VPD  | 1,001 to 1,250 VPD       | 2,001 to 2,500 VPD                 | 1      |
|                                   | 751 to 1,100 VPD  | 1,251 to 1,750 VPD       | 2,501 to 3,000 VPD                 | 2      |
|                                   | 1,101 to 1,700 VPD  | 1,751 to 2,500 VPD       | 3,001 to 4,000 VPD                 | 3      |
|                                   | 1,701 to 2,300 VPD  | 2,501 to 3,000 VPD       | 4,001 to 5,000 VPD                 | 4      |
|                                   | > 2,300 VPD   | > 3,000 VPD              | 5,001 to 8,000 VPD                 | 5      |
| 85th Percentile Speed             | 0 to 1.0 MPH > speed limit  |                          |                                    | 0      |
|                                   | 1.1 to 2.0 MPH > speed limit  |                          |                                    | 1      |
|                                   | 2.1 to 3.0 MPH > speed limit  |                          |                                    | 2      |
|                                   | 3.1 to 4.0 MPH > speed limit  |                          |                                    | 3      |
|                                   | 4.1 to 5.0 MPH > speed limit  |                          |                                    | 4      |
|                                   | 5.1 to 6.0 MPH > speed limit  |                          |                                    | 5      |
|                                   | 6.1 to 7.0 MPH > speed limit  |                          |                                    | 6      |
|                                   | 7.1 to 8.0 MPH > speed limit  |                          |                                    | 7      |
|                                   | 8.1 to 9.0 MPH > speed limit  |                          |                                    | 8      |
|                                   | 9.1 to 10.0 MPH > speed limit   |                          |                                    | 9      |
|                                   | > 10.0 MPH > speed limit  |                          |                                    | 10     |
| Presence of Pedestrian Facilities | Both sides  |                          |                                    | 0      |
|                                   | One side  |                          |                                    | 1.5    |
|                                   | None  |                          |                                    | 3      |
| Pedestrian Generators             | Schools within 0.5 mile (each)  |                          |                                    | 1      |
|                                   | Parks within 0.5 mile (each)  |                          |                                    | 0.5    |
|                                   | Transit lines with stops within 0.5 mile (each)                                 |                          |                                    | 0.5    |
| Driveway Density                  | ≥ 10 Driveways per 500 feet<br>(Circular driveways should be considered as one) |                          |                                    | 1      |
| Number of correctable crashes     | ≥ 3 per year  |                          | ≥ 6 per year                       | 5      |