Location	Problem
Madison College Ped Crossing (Badger/Park)	Peds crossing midblock
W Lakeside St	Speeding
Wheeler Rd	Speeding
Post Rd & Todd Dr	Disregarding Stop signs / speeding
Barton Rd	Speeding
Segoe Rd & Richland Ln	Dangerous school crossing (did not qualify for crossing guard)
1810 S Park St ped crossing at bus stop	No existing ped crossing at bus stop
Forster Dr	Speeding
Maher Ave & Cottage Grove Rd	Difficult pedestrian crossing
Glenway St at Cross St	Difficult pedestrian crossing
Rusk Ave	Speeding
Troy Dr	Speeding
Dempsey Rd	Speeding/no bike facilities
Midvale Blvd at Southwest Path	Speeding/difficult bike crossing
Midvale Blvd at Southwest Path	Speeding/difficult bike crossing
Park St between olin and Fish Hatchery	Difficult Crossing

Status in Existing Programs	Number of Travel Lanes	Number of Parking Lanes
Approved by NTMP in 2020		
Approved by NTMP in 2021	2	2
Approved by NTMP in 2021		
Approved by NTMP in 2021		
Approved by NTMP in 2021		
Approved by Ped/Bike in 2020		
Approved by Ped/Bike in 2021		
Approved by NTMP in 2021		
Not ranked high enough in Ped/Bike in 2020		
Not ranked high enough in Ped/Bike in 2021	2	1
Not enough points in NTMP		
Enough points but no project		
Enough points but no project		
Approved by Ped/Bike in 2020		
Approved by Ped/Bike in 2020		
Custom	6	

Potential Infrastructure	
None	

Two Stripes	
Continental	Somev
RFRB	
Full Signal	

The following categori
well for both point (inte

Current Crossing and Pedestrian Infrastructure	Current Bicycle Accomodations	Daily Traffic Volume
Not Safe and/or Not Convienent	Very confident bikers only (LTS 4)	2500-5000
Not Safe and/or Not Convienent	Moderately Confident Bikers (LTS 3)	100-2500
Not Safe and/or Not Convienent	Very confident bikers only (LTS 4)	20000+

Ranking Criteria and Score

Max Points 52

Lanes	Score
Parking	0.5
1	1
2	2
3	3
4	4
5	5
6	6

Assigns points based
lanes that need to be
be a non-linear scale.

Current level of stress for biking	Score
Very confident bikers only (LTS 4)	10
Moderately Confident Bikers (LTS 3)	6
Mostly All Ages and Abilities (LTS 2)	3
All Ages and Abilities (LTS 1)	0

Assigns points based
biking stress at the loc
corridor.

Current crossing condition and pedestrian infrastructure	Score
Dangerous or Highly Inconvienent	10

Many of the discarded
consolidated into this
crossing or corridor co

Not Safe and/or Not Convienent	5	a whole. It was also de
what Safe and/or Somewhat Convienent	3	current ped infrastructu
Moderately Safe and/or Convenient	1	convienence scale rath
Safe and/or Convienent	0	infrastructure. A fully s

Daily Traffic Volume	Score	Average daily traffic vo
20000+	10	
10000-20000	7.5	
5000-10000	5	
2500-5000	3	
100-2500	1	

Posted Speed Limit	Score	Assigns points based
35+	5	limit. Should this be ba
25	3	data such as % over 3
<20	1	

Ped demand	Score	Assigns points based
High	5	potential future pedest
Med	3	
Low	1	

Transit Ridership	Score	Daily transit boardings
>500/day	5	single location or corri
250-500	4	
100-250	3	
50-100	2	
<50	1	

es were discussed and it was decided to remove them from the ranking criteria because the model was erstection) and line (block or corridor) problem types. There was also some redundancy occuring. They h

Ped Activator within quarter mile	Score	Is there a pedestrian a
School	1	certian distance of the
Library	1	corridor? Parks were g
Business Corridor	1	because it was though
Parks	0	park density are often
Medical Facilities	1	areas and this could b
Housing Density	1	
Equity Metric	1	

Number of Movements to Cross Street	Score	How many actuall cros
4	4	does it take to cross th
3	3	example, a slip lane cr
		one.

2	2
1	1

Multiplier for Number of Movements	
All Signalized	0.5
Some Signalized but not all	0.8
None Signalized	1

A multiplier for the nu
account for safer infra

Major Artery	1
Collector	0.5
Local Street	0.2

Another multiplier for t
movements to accoun

Cross Slip Lane?	Score
Yes, Unsignalized	2
Yes, Signalized	1
No	0

Slip lanes are often da
invonvienent. This sco
that.

Distance to nearest safe crossing (based on street)	Score
>300 m	5
200-300	4
100-200	3
50-100	2
0-50	0

Longer distances betw
it more likely that peop
block and are inconvie

Length of Missing Sidewalk or Bike Facility	Score
Entire Corridor	10
Many Blocks	7.5
Major Intersection/Multiple Crossings	5
Few Blocks	2.5
Single Block	1
Single Intersection	1

Accounts for length of
bicycle facility.

Can all potential crossings be completed in one movement?	Score
Yes	0
No	3

This is meant to accou
light cycles it takes to

Maximum distance to negotiate intersection	Score
<100 ft	1
100-200 ft	3
>200 ft	5

This is meant to assig
the worst case scenari
wishing to cross the st
an intersection has cr
four sides, a pedestria

Ped Issue	Score
Missing Sidewalk 2 sides	5
Missing Sidewalk 1 side	3

Posted Speed Limit	Ped Demand	Transit Ridership	Points in NTMP (30 pts needed)	Points in Ped/Bike (out of 100) No point threshold
				41
25	Med	<50	44	
			68	
			59	
			34	
				20
				38
			31	
				16
25	Low	<50		10
			22	
			42	
			42	
				18
				18
25	High	100-250		

on the number of
crossed. This could

on the current level of
cation or along the

metrics were
score so that the
uld be considered as

ecided to consider the
ure on a safety and
her than
ignalized crossing

olume.

on the posted speed
ased on speed study
5 mph?

on existing and
rian demand.

. Can be used for
dor projects.

becoming too inflexible and wasn't working
have been retained here as reference and

ctivator within a
problem location or
given a zero score
t that areas with high
alredy privelaged
e an equity issue.

ssing movements
he street. For
rossing counts as

nber of movements to
structure.

he number of
t for safer road types.

ngerous and
re would account for

veen crossings make
ole will cross mid-
enent.

missing pedestrian or

unt for the number of
complete a crossing.

n a score based on
io for a pedestrian
reet. For example, if
ossings on three of
n may need to cross

Points in SSM (Out of 52)	Documented safety issue (HIN) quantified (VZ Funding if Yes)	Ped Gap issue quantified - missing sidewalk, street crossings, volumes, proximity to transit	Importance of Ped Gap Isssue	Bike Gap issue quantified - level of stress, importance of route, alternatives
	Yes			
28	No			
	Yes			
	No			
	No			
	No			
	Yes			
	No			
	No			
19.5	No			
	No			
	Yes			
	No			
	Yes			
	Yes			
42	Maybe			

proposed solution(s)	Impact on safety (0-3)	Impact on ped gap (0-3)	Impact on bike gap (0-3)	EJ area / high social vulnerability index
Ped Ramps, Continental X-walk, & signs				
Speed Humps & Circle				
Islands				
Islands				
Speed Humps				
RRFB				
Ped Ramps, Continental X-walk, & signs				
Islands				
RRFB				
RRFB				
Speed Humps				
Speed Humps				
Bike lanes				
Upgrade lighting to LED				
Narrow Lanes				
At-Grade Crossing				
Full Signal				

can we assign points for slip lanes?

cost	timing	t/cost = (I + J + K + L)/N
$15,000		
$24,000		
$45,000		
$14,000		
$40,000		
$20,000		
$15,000		
$40,000		
$20,000		
$20,000		
$35,000		
$40,000		
$30,000		
$4,000		
$4,000		

Resources:
Traffic counts
Metro boardings
Speed limits and
Traffic level of str

Harald notes
- consider some k
- have a couple "e
- what to do about
-prioritizing equity

https://data-cityofmadison.opendata.arcgis.com/datasets/traffic-flow-map?geometry=-89.464%2C43.048%2C
https://haraldkliems.netlify.app/posts/bus-boardings-in-madison/
https://data-cityofmadison.opendata.arcgis.com/datasets/street-centerlines-and-pavement-data
https://cityofmadison.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=cb7a2e78477044c19bf6a5eaa182

ind of score for lack of accessibility?
ngineering judgment" points for special circumstances (context specific situations)
t the "let's fix a corridor" idea (corridor vs interstection project) - should this be on the solutions side?
issues

C-89.355%2C43.059

:0e38

Location	Problem
Madison College Ped Crossing (Badger/Park)	Peds crossing midblock
W Lakeside St	Speeding
Wheeler Rd	Speeding
Post Rd & Todd Dr	Disregarding Stop signs / speeding
Barton Rd	Speeding
Segoe Rd & Richland Ln	Dangerous school crossing (did not qualify for crossing guard)
1810 S Park St ped crossing at bus stop	No existing ped crossing at bus stop
Forster Dr	Speeding
Maher Ave & Cottage Grove Rd	Difficult pedestrian crossing
Glenway St at Cross St	Difficult pedestrian crossing
Rusk Ave	Speeding
Troy Dr	Speeding
Dempsey Rd	Speeding/no bike facilities
Midvale Blvd at Southwest Path	Speeding/difficult bike crossing
Midvale Blvd at Southwest Path	Speeding/difficult bike crossing
Park St between olin and Fish Hatchery	Difficult Crossing

Status in Existing Programs	Number of Travel Lanes	Number of Parking Lanes
Approved by NTMP in 2020		
Approved by NTMP in 2021	2	2
Approved by NTMP in 2021		
Approved by NTMP in 2021		
Approved by NTMP in 2021		
Approved by Ped/Bike in 2020		
Approved by Ped/Bike in 2021		
Approved by NTMP in 2021		
Not ranked high enough in Ped/Bike in 2020		
Not ranked high enough in Ped/Bike in 2021	2	1
Not enough points in NTMP		
Enough points but no project		
Enough points but no project		
Approved by Ped/Bike in 2020		
Approved by Ped/Bike in 2020		
Custom	6	

Potential Infrastructure	
None	D
Two Stripes	
Continental	Somewhat Sa
RFRB	Mo
Full Signal	

The following categori
inflexible and wasn't w

Current Crossing and Ped Infrastructure	Daily Traffic Volume	Posted Speed Limit	Ped Demand
Somewhat Safe and/or Somewhat Convienent	2500-5000	25	Med
Not Safe and/or Not Convienent	100-2500	25	Med
Not Safe and/or Not Convienent	20000+	25	High

Ranking Criteria and Score

Max Points 41

Lanes	Score
Parking	0.5
1	1
2	2
3	3
4	4
5	5
6	6

Assigns points based on the number of lanes that need to be crossed. This could be a non-linear scale

Current crossing condition and ped infrastructure	Score
)angerous or Highly Inconvienent	10
Not Safe and/or Not Convienent	5
afe and/or Somewhat Convienent	3
)derately Safe and/or Convenient	1
Safe and/or Convienent	0

Many of the discarded metrics were consolidated into this score so that the crossing or corridor could be considered as a whole. It was also decided to consider the current ped infrastructure on a safety and convienence scale rather than infrastructure. A fully signalized crossing

Average daily traffic volume.

Daily Traffic Volume	Score
20000+	10
10000-20000	7.5
5000-10000	5
2500-5000	3
100-2500	1

Posted Speed Limit	Score
35+	5
25	3
<20	1

Assigns points based on the posted speed limit. Should this be based on speed study data such as % over 35 mph?

Ped demand	Score
High	5
Med	3
Low	1

Assigns points based on existing and potential future pedestrian demand.

Transit Ridership	Score
>500/day	5
250-500	4
100-250	3
50-100	2
<50	1

Daily transit boardings. Can be used for single location or corridor projects.

es were discussed and it was decided to remove them from the ranking criteria because the model wa
orking well for both point (interstection) and line (block or corridor) problem types. There was also son

Ped Activator within quarter mile	Score
School	1
Library	1
Business Corridor	1
Parks	0
Medical Facilities	1
Housing Density	1
Equity Metric	1

Is there a pedestrian activator within a certian distance of the problem location or corridor? Parks were given a zero score because it was thought that areas with high park density are often alredy privelaged areas and this could be an equity issue.

Number of Movements to Cross Street	Score
4	4
3	3
2	2
1	1

How many actuall crossing movements does it take to cross the street. For example, a slip lane crossing counts as one.

Multiplier for Number of Movements	
All Signalized	0.5
Some Signalized but not all	0.8
None Signalized	1

A multiplier for the number of movements to account for safer infrastructure.

Major Artery	1
Collector	0.5
Local Street	0.2

Another multiplier for the number of movements to account for safer road types.

Cross Slip Lane?	Score
Yes, Unsignalized	2
Yes, Signalized	1
No	0

Slip lanes are often dangerous and invonvienent. This score would account for that.

Distance to nearest safe crossing (based on street)	Score
>300 m	5
200-300	4
100-200	3
50-100	2
0-50	0

Longer distances between crossings make it more likely that people will cross mid-block and are inconvienent.

Length of Missing Sidewalk	Score
Entire Corridor	10
Many Blocks	7.5
Major Intersection/Multiple Crossings	5
Few Blocks	2.5
Single Block	1
Single Intersection	1

Accounts for length of missing sidewalk.

Can all potential crossings be completed in one movement?	Score
Yes	0
No	3

This is meant to account for the number of light cycles it takes to complete a crossing.

Maximum distance to negotiate intersection	Score
<100 ft	1
100-200 ft	3
>200 ft	5

This is meant to assign a score based on the worst case scenario for a pedestrian wishing to cross the street. For example, if an intersection has crossings on three of four sides, a pedestrian may need to cross

Ped Issue	Score
Missing Sidewalk 2 sides	5
Missing Sidewalk 1 side	3

Transit Ridership	Points in NTMP (30 pts needed)	Points in Ped/Bike (out of 100) No point threshold	Points in SSM (Out of 41)	Documented safety issue (HIN) quantified (VZ Funding if Yes)
		41		Yes
<50	44		16	No
	68			Yes
	59			No
	34			No
		20		No
		38		Yes
	31			No
		16		No
<50		10	15.5	No
	22			No
	42			Yes
	42			No
		18		Yes
		18		Yes
100-250			32	Maybe

as becoming too
ne redundancy

Ped Gap issue quantified - missing sidewalk, street crossings, volumes, proximity to transit	Importance of Ped Gap Isssue	Bike Gap issue quantified - level of stress, importance of route, alternatives	proposed solution(s)	Impact on safety (0-3)
			Ped Ramps, Continental X-walk, & signs	
			Speed Humps & Circle	
			Islands	
			Islands	
			Speed Humps	
			RRFB	
			Ped Ramps, Continental X-walk, & signs	
			Islands	
			RRFB	
			RRFB	
			Speed Humps	
			Speed Humps	
			Bike lanes	
			Upgrade lighting to LED	
			Narrow Lanes	
			At-Grade Crossing	
			Full Signal	

Impact on ped gap (0-3)	Impact on bike gap (0-3)	EJ area / high social vulnerability index	cost	timing
			$15,000	
			$24,000	
			$45,000	
			$14,000	
			$40,000	
			$20,000	
			$15,000	
			$40,000	
			$20,000	
			$20,000	
			$35,000	
			$40,000	
			$30,000	
			$4,000	
			$4,000	

can we assign points for slip lanes?

efit/cost = (I + J + K + L)/N

Resources:

Traffic counts https://data-cityofmadison.opendata.arcgis.com/datase

Metro boardings https://haraldkliems.netlify.app/posts/bus-boardings-in

Speed limits and https://data-cityofmadison.opendata.arcgis.com/datase

Traffic level of str https://cityofmadison.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappvi

ets/traffic-flow-map?geometry=-89.464%2C43.048%2C-89.355%2C43.059

-madison/
ets/street-centerlines-and-pavement-data
ewer/index.html?id=cb7a2e78477044c19bf6a5eaa1820e38

Location	Problem
Madison College Ped Crossing (Badger/Park)	Peds crossing midblock
W Lakeside St	Speeding
Wheeler Rd	Speeding
Post Rd & Todd Dr	Disregarding Stop signs / speeding
Barton Rd	Speeding
Segoe Rd & Richland Ln	Dangerous school crossing (did not qualify for crossing guard)
1810 S Park St ped crossing at bus stop	No existing ped crossing at bus stop
Forster Dr	Speeding
Maher Ave & Cottage Grove Rd	Difficult pedestrian crossing
Glenway St at Cross St	Difficult pedestrian crossing
Rusk Ave	Speeding
Troy Dr	Speeding
Dempsey Rd	Speeding/no bike facilities
Midvale Blvd at Southwest Path	Speeding/difficult bike crossing
Midvale Blvd at Southwest Path	Speeding/difficult bike crossing
Park St between olin and Fish Hatchery	Difficult Crossing

Status in Existing Programs	Number of Travel Lanes	Number of Parking Lanes
Approved by NTMP in 2020		
Approved by NTMP in 2021	2	2
Approved by NTMP in 2021		
Approved by NTMP in 2021		
Approved by NTMP in 2021		
Approved by Ped/Bike in 2020		
Approved by Ped/Bike in 2021		
Approved by NTMP in 2021		
Not ranked high enough in Ped/Bike in 2020		
Not ranked high enough in Ped/Bike in 2021	2	1
Not enough points in NTMP		
Enough points but no project		
Enough points but no project		
Approved by Ped/Bike in 2020		
Approved by Ped/Bike in 2020		
Custom	6	

Current traffic level of stress	Score
Agressive bikers only (LTS 4)	10
Moderately Agressive Bikers (LTS 3)	6
Mostly All Ages and Abilities (LTS 2)	3
All Ages and Abilities (LTS 1)	0

Length of Gap	Score
Entire Corridor	10
Many Blocks	7.5
Major Intersection, Multiple crossings such as interstate overpass	5
Few Blocks	2.5
Single Block	1
Single Intersection	1

Current Crossing and Ped Infrastructure	Daily Traffic Volume	Posted Speed Limit	Ped Demand
Somewhat Safe and/or Somewhat Convienent	2500-5000	25	Med
Not Safe and/or Not Convienent	100-2500	25	Med
Not Safe and/or Not Convienent	20000+	25	High

Potential Infrastructure
None
Two Stripes
Continental
RFRB
Full Signal

Transit Ridership	Points in NTMP (30 pts needed)	Points in Ped/Bike (out of 100) No point threshold	Points in SSM (Out of 41)	Documented safety issue (HIN) quantified (VZ Funding if Yes)
		41		Yes
<50	44		16	No
	68			Yes
	59			No
	34			No
		20		No
		38		Yes
	31			No
		16		No
<50		10	15.5	No
	22			No
	42			Yes
	42			No
		18		Yes
		18		Yes
100-250			32	Maybe

Max Points 41

Lanes	Score
Parking	0.5
1	1
2	2
3	3
4	4
5	5
6	6

Assigns points based on the number of lanes that need to be crossed. This could be a non-linear scale

Current crossing condition and ped infrastructure	Score
Dangerous or Highly Inconvienent	10
Not Safe and/or Not Convienent	5
omewhat Safe and/or Somewhat Convienent	3
Moderately Safe and/or Convenient	1
Safe and/or Convienent	0

Many of the discarded metrics were consolidated into this score so that the crossing or corridor could be considered as a whole. It was also decided to consider the current ped infrastructure on a safety and convienence scale rather than infrastructure. A fully signalized crossing such as Fish Hatchery at S Park could score well based on infrastructure or safety, but it has a very long maximum crossing distance, a large number of movements to complete a crossing, slip lanes to negotiate, etc. and is highly inconvienent

Daily Traffic Volume	Score
20000+	10
10000-20000	7.5
5000-10000	5
2500-5000	3
100-2500	1

Average daily traffic volume.

Posted Speed Limit	Score
35+	5
25	3
<20	1

Assigns points based on the posted speed limit. Should this be based on speed study data such as % over 35 mph?

Ped demand	Score
High	5
Med	3
Low	1

Assigns points based on existing and potential future pedestrian demand.

Transit Ridership	Score
>500/day	5
250-500	4
100-250	3
50-100	2
<50	1

Daily transit boardings. Can be used for single location or corridor projects.

The following categories were discussed and it was decided to remove them from the ranking criteria because th becoming too inflexible and wasn't working well for both point (interstection) and line (block or corridor) problem t some redundancy occuring. They have been retained here as reference and the Subcommitted may wish to resu

Ped Activator within quarter mile	Score
School	1
Library	1
Business Corridor	1
Parks	0
Medical Facilities	1
Housing Density	1
Equity Metric	1

Is there a pedestrian activator within a certian distance of the problem location or corridor? Parks were given a zero score because it was thought that areas with high park density are often alredy privelaged areas and this could be an equity issue.

Number of Movements to Cross Street	Score
4	4
3	3
2	2
1	1

How many actuall crossing movements does it take to cross the street. For example, a slip lane crossing counts as one.

Multiplier for Number of Movements	
All Signalized	0.5
Some Signalized but not all	0.8
None Signalized	1

A multiplier for the number of movements to account for safer infrastructure.

Major Artery	1
Collector	0.5
Local Street	0.2

Another multiplier for the number of movements to account for safer road types.

Cross Slip Lane?	Score
Yes, Unsignalized	2
Yes, Signalized	1
No	0

Slip lanes are often dangerous and invonvienent. This score would account for that.

Distance to nearest safe crossing (based on street)	Score
>300 m	5
200-300	4
100-200	3
50-100	2
0-50	0

Longer distances between crossings make it more likely that people will cross mid-block and are inconvienent.

Length of Missing Sidewalk	Score
Entire Corridor	10
Many Blocks	7.5
Major Intersection/Multiple Crossings	5
Few Blocks	2.5
Single Block	1
Single Intersection	1

Accounts for length of missing sidewalk.

Can all potential crossings be completed in one movement?	Score
Yes	0
No	3

This is meant to account for the number of light cycles it takes to complete a crossing.

Maximum distance to negotiate intersection	Score
<100 ft	1

This is meant to assign a score based on the worst case scenario for a pedestrian wishing to cross the street. For example, if an intersection has crossings on three of

100-200 ft	3	four sides, a pedestrian may need to cross three streets to complete one desired crossing safely. Fish Hatchery at S Park St.
>200 ft	5	

Ped Gap issue quantified - missing sidewalk, street crossings, volumes, proximity to transit	Importance of Ped Gap Isssue	Bike Gap issue quantified - level of stress, importance of route, alternatives	proposed solution(s)	Impact on safety (0-3)
			Ped Ramps, Continental X-walk, & signs	
			Speed Humps & Circle	
			Islands	
			Islands	
			Speed Humps	
			RRFB	
			Ped Ramps, Continental X-walk, & signs	
			Islands	
			RRFB	
			RRFB	
			Speed Humps	
			Speed Humps	
			Bike lanes	
			Upgrade lighting to LED	
			Narrow Lanes	
			At-Grade Crossing	
			Full Signal	

e model was
ypes. There was also
rrect them.

Impact on ped gap (0-3)	Impact on bike gap (0-3)	EJ area / high social vulnerability index	cost	timing
			$15,000	
			$24,000	
			$45,000	
			$14,000	
			$40,000	
			$20,000	
			$15,000	
			$40,000	
			$20,000	
			$20,000	
			$35,000	
			$40,000	
			$30,000	
			$4,000	
			$4,000	

can we assign points for slip lanes?

efit/cost = (I + J + K + L)/N

Resources:

Traffic counts https://data-cityofmadison.opendata.arcgis.com/datase

Metro boardings https://haraldkliems.netlify.app/posts/bus-boardings-in

Speed limits and https://data-cityofmadison.opendata.arcgis.com/datase

Traffic level of str https://cityofmadison.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappvi

Harald notes

- consider some kind of score for lack of accessibility?
- have a couple "engineering judgment" points for special circumstances

- what to do about the "let's fix a corridor" idea (corridor vs interstection p
-prioritizing equity issues

ets/traffic-flow-map?geometry=-89.464%2C43.048%2C-89.355%2C43.059

-madison/
ets/street-centerlines-and-pavement-data
ewer/index.html?id=cb7a2e78477044c19bf6a5eaa1820e38

(context specific situations)

project) - should this be on the solutions side?