APPENDIX A

Pedestrian and Bicycle Report Card Assessments

BOSTON REGION METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

Pedestrian Report Card Assessment (PRCA):

Roadway Segment

Central Transportation Planning Staff (CTPS) to the Boston Region MPO:
www.ctps.org | 857.702.3700 | ctps@ctps.org

Ryan Hicks, Congestion Management Process Manager:
www.ctps.org/cmp | 857.702.3661 | rhicks@ctps.org

Casey Claude, Bicycle and Pedestrian Program Manager:
www.ctps.org/bicycle-pedestrian-activities | 857.702.3707 | cclaude@ctps.org

Roadway Segment Location
Route 28 in Milton (Brook Rd and Reesdale Rd)

Grading Categories[1]	Score	Rating
Safety	1.8	Fair
System Preservation	2.0	Fair
Capacity Management and Mobility	2.3	Good
Economic Vitality	2.0	Fair

Transportation Equity[2]	
High Priority Area	
Moderate Priority Area	√
Low Priority Area	

[1] Poor = 0 to 1.7; **Fair** = 1.8 to 2.2; **Good** = 2.3 to 3.0
[2] Low = 0 or 1 Factor; **Moderate** = 2 or 3 Factors; **High** = 4 or 5 Factors

Grading Categories: Scoring Breakdown **Roadway Segment**

Capacity Management and Mobility

Performance Measure[1]	Percentage	Score (out of 3.0)	Rating
Sidewalk Presence	50%	3	Good
Crosswalk Presence	33%	1	Poor
Walkway Width	17%	3	Good
GRADING CATEGORY TOTAL[2] (Sidewalk Presence Score * 0.5) + (Crosswalk Presence Score * 0.33) + (Walkway Width Score * 0.17)	**100%**	**2.3**	**Good**

Economic Vitality

Performance Measure[1]	Percentage	Score (out of 3.0)	Rating
Pedestrian Volumes	50%	2	Fair
Adjacent Bicycle Accommodations	50%	2	Fair
GRADING CATEGORY TOTAL[2] (Pedestrian Volumes Score * 0.5) + (Adjacent Bicycle Accommodations Score * 0.5)	**100%**	**2**	**Fair**

[1] **Poor** = 1.0; **Fair** = 2.0; **Good** = 3.0
[2] **Poor** = 0 to 1.7; **Fair** = 1.8 to 2.2; **Good** = 2.3 to 3.0
[3] Use these factors to determine Transportation Equity priority level (front)

Safety

Performance Measure[1]	Percentage	Score (out of 3.0)	Rating
Pedestrian Crashes	60%	2	Fair
Pedestrian-Vehicle Buffer	20%	2	Fair
Vehicle Travel Speed	20%	1	Poor
GRADING CATEGORY TOTAL[2] (Pedestrian Crashes Score * 0.6) + (Pedestrian-Vehicle Buffer Score * 0.2) + (Vehicle Travel Speed Score * 0.2)	**100%**	**1.8**	**Fair**

System Preservation

Performance Measure[1]	Percentage	Score (out of 3.0)	Rating
Sidewalk Condition	100%	2	Fair

Transportation Equity Factors[3]

Area Condition	Yes/No
Low-Income Population ≥ 32.32%	
Minority Population ≥ 28.19%	√
More than 6.69% of Population > 75 Years of Age	√
More than 16.15% of Households w/o Vehicle	
Within ¼ Mile of School/College	√

Roadway Segment Notes

Detailed Performance Measure Information

Grading Category	Performance Measure	Features of Analyzed Locations
Capacity Management and Mobility	Sidewalk Presence	Standard sidewalks on either side of the road
	Crosswalk Presence	7 crosswalks in 1.6 miles (4 crosswalks per mile)
	Walkway Width	Standard width (5.5 feet)
Economic Vitality	Pedestrian Volumes	5-60 pedestrians per hour
	Adjacent Bicycle Accommodations	Sharrows for the most part
Safety	Pedestrian Crashes	2 pedestrian and 2 bicycle crashes
	Pedestrian-Vehicle Buffer	7 feet (3 feet grass buffer and 4 feet shoulder)
	Vehicle Travel Speed	30 mph and 45 mph
System Preservation	Sidewalk Condition	Fair

BOSTON REGION METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

Pedestrian Report Card Assessment (PRCA):

Roadway Segment

Central Transportation Planning Staff (CTPS) to the Boston Region MPO:
www.ctps.org | 857.702.3700 | ctps@ctps.org

Ryan Hicks, Congestion Management Process Manager:
www.ctps.org/cmp | 857.702.3661 | rhicks@ctps.org

Casey Claude, Bicycle and Pedestrian Program Manager:
www.ctps.org/bicycle-pedestrian-activities | 857.702.3707 | cclaude@ctps.org

Roadway Segment Location
Route 28 in Milton (Randolph Ave)

Grading Categories[1]	Score	Rating
Safety	1.6	Poor
System Preservation	2.0	Fair
Capacity Management and Mobility	2.3	Good
Economic Vitality	1.5	Poor

Transportation Equity[2]	
High Priority Area	
Moderate Priority Area	√
Low Priority Area	

[1] Poor = 0 to 1.7; **Fair** = 1.8 to 2.2; **Good** = 2.3 to 3.0
[2] Low = 0 or 1 Factor; **Moderate** = 2 or 3 Factors; **High** = 4 or 5 Factors

Grading Categories: Scoring Breakdown **Roadway Segment**

Capacity Management and Mobility

Performance Measure[1]	Percentage	Score (out of 3.0)	Rating
Sidewalk Presence	50%	3	Good
Crosswalk Presence	33%	1	Fair
Walkway Width	17%	3	Good
GRADING CATEGORY TOTAL[2] (Sidewalk Presence Score * 0.5) + (Crosswalk Presence Score * 0.33) + (Walkway Width Score * 0.17)	**100%**	**2.3**	**Good**

Economic Vitality

Performance Measure[1]	Percentage	Score (out of 3.0)	Rating
Pedestrian Volumes	50%	2	Fair
Adjacent Bicycle Accommodations	50%	1	Poor
GRADING CATEGORY TOTAL[2] (Pedestrian Volumes Score * 0.5) + (Adjacent Bicycle Accommodations Score * 0.5)	**100%**	**1.5**	**Poor**

[1] **Poor** = 1.0; **Fair** = 2.0; **Good** = 3.0
[2] **Poor** = 0 to 1.7; **Fair** = 1.8 to 2.2; **Good** = 2.3 to 3.0
[3] Use these factors to determine Transportation Equity priority level (front)

Safety

Performance Measure[1]	Percentage	Score (out of 3.0)	Rating
Pedestrian Crashes	60%	2	Fair
Pedestrian-Vehicle Buffer	20%	1	Poor
Vehicle Travel Speed	20%	1	Poor
GRADING CATEGORY TOTAL[2] (Pedestrian Crashes Score * 0.6) + (Pedestrian-Vehicle Buffer Score * 0.2) + (Vehicle Travel Speed Score * 0.2)	**100%**	**1.6**	**Poor**

System Preservation

Performance Measure[1]	Percentage	Score (out of 3.0)	Rating
Sidewalk Condition	100%	2.0	Fair

Transportation Equity Factors[3]

Area Condition	Yes/No
Low-Income Population ≥ 32.32%	
Minority Population ≥ 28.19%	√
More than 6.69% of Population > 75 Years of Age	√
More than 16.15% of Households w/o Vehicle	
Within ¼ Mile of School/College	√

Roadway Segment Notes

Detailed Performance Measure Information

Grading Category	Performance Measure	Features of Analyzed Locations
Capacity Management and Mobility	Sidewalk Presence	Standard sidewalks on either side of the road
	Crosswalk Presence	4 crosswalks in 1.7 miles (2 crosswalks per mile)
	Walkway Width	Standard width (5.5 feet)
Economic Vitality	Pedestrian Volumes	5-60 pedestrians per hour
	Adjacent Bicycle Accommodations	None
Safety	Pedestrian Crashes	1 pedestrian and 2 bicycle crashes
	Pedestrian-Vehicle Buffer	None
	Vehicle Travel Speed	45 mph
System Preservation	Sidewalk Condition	Fair

BOSTON REGION METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

Bicycle Report Card

Roadway Segment Location
Route 28 in Milton (Brook Rd and Reedsdale Rd)

Grading Categories	Score	Grade
Safety	32	F
System Preservation	75	C
Capacity Management and Mobility	60	D
Economic Vitality	50	F

Transportation Equity	
High Priority Area	
Moderate Priority Area	√
Low Priority Area	

Grading
A: 90–100 *Excellent*
B: 80–89 *Satisfactory*
C: 70–79 *Acceptable*
D: 60–69 *Needs Improvement*
F: 59–0 *Not recommended for bicycle travel*

Transportation Equity Priority
High: Four (4) or Five (5) Factors
Moderate: Two (2) or Three (3) Factors
Low: Zero (0) or One (1) Factor

Central Transportation Planning Staff (CTPS) to the Boston Region MPO:
www.ctps.org | 857.702.3700 | ctps@ctps.org

Casey Claude, Bicycle and Pedestrian Program Manager:
www.ctps.org/bicycle-pedestrian-activities | 857.702.3707 | cclaude@ctps.org

Grading Categories: Scoring Breakdown

Capacity Management and Mobility

Performance Measure	Percentage	Points	Grade
Bicycle Facility Presence	50%	20	F
Proximity to Bike Network	33%	100	A
Proximity to Transit	17%	100	A
Total	**100%**	**60**	**D**

Economic Vitality

Performance Measure	Percentage	Points	Grade
Bike Rack Presence	50%	0	F
Land Use	50%	100	A
Total	**100%**	**50**	**F**

Grading
A: 90–100 *Excellent*
B: 80–89 *Satisfactory*
C: 70–79 *Acceptable*
D: 60–69 *Needs Improvement*
F: 59–0 *Not recommended for bicycle travel*

Transportation Equity Priority
High: Four (4) or Five (5) Factors
Moderate: Two (2) or Three (3) Factors
Low: Zero (0) or One (1) Factor

Safety

Performance Measure	Percentage	Points	Grade
Bicycle Facility Presence	33%	20	F
Absence of Bicycle Crashes	33%	40	F
Bicyclist Operating Space	17%	0	F
Number of Travel Lanes	17%	70	C
Total	**100%**	**32**	**F**

System Preservation

Performance Measure	Percentage	Points	Grade
Bicycle Facility Continuity	50%	100	F
Bicycle Facility Condition	50%	50	F
Total	**100%**	**75**	**C**

Transportation Equity Priority

Area Condition	Yes/No
Low Income Population =/> 32.32%	
Minority Population =/> 28.19%	√
18.2%+ of Population < 16 Years Old	√
16.15%+ of Households w/o Vehicle	
Within ¼ Mile of School/College	√

Notes

Detailed Performance Measure Information

Goal	Performance Measure	Features of Analyzed Locations
Capacity Management and Mobility	Bicycle Facility Presence	Sharrows/shared-use lane
	Proximity to Bike Network	Bicycle facility network within ¼ mile
	Proximity to Transit	Has a bus route on it and several stops in the corridor
Economic Vitality	Bike Rack Presence	No bicycle rack in the segment
	Land Use	Mixed use—educational, recreational, residential
Safety	Bicycle Facility Presence	Sharrows/shared-use lane
	Absence of Bicycle Crashes	2 bicycle crashes
	Bicyclist Operating Space	Bicycle operates in mixed traffic
	Number of Travel Lanes	Two travel lanes per direction
System Preservation	Bicycle Facility Continuity	Length of bicycle facility matches length of segment
	Bicycle Facility Condition	Bicycle facility in fair condition

BOSTON REGION METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

Central Transportation Planning Staff (CTPS) to the Boston Region MPO:
www.ctps.org | 857.702.3700 | ctps@ctps.org

Casey Claude, Bicycle and Pedestrian Program Manager:
www.ctps.org/bicycle-pedestrian-activities | 857.702.3707 | cclaude@ctps.org

Bicycle Report Card

Roadway Segment Location
Route 28 in Milton (Randolph Ave)

Grading Categories	Score	Grade
Safety	32	F
System Preservation	0	F
Capacity Management and Mobility	50	F
Economic Vitality	50	F

Transportation Equity	
High Priority Area	
Moderate Priority Area	√
Low Priority Area	

Grading
A: 90–100 *Excellent*
B: 80–89 *Satisfactory*
C: 70–79 *Acceptable*
D: 60–69 *Needs Improvement*
F: 59–0 *Not recommended for bicycle travel*

Transportation Equity Priority
High: Four (4) or Five (5) Factors
Moderate: Two (2) or Three (3) Factors
Low: Zero (0) or One (1) Factor

Grading Categories: Scoring Breakdown

Capacity Management and Mobility

Performance Measure	Percentage	Points	Grade
Bicycle Facility Presence	50%	0	F
Proximity to Bike Network	33%	100	A
Proximity to Transit	17%	100	A
Total	**100%**	**50**	**F**

Economic Vitality

Performance Measure	Percentage	Points	Grade
Bike Rack Presence	50%	0	F
Land Use	50%	100	A
Total	**100%**	**50**	**F**

Grading
A: 90–100 *Excellent*
B: 80–89 *Satisfactory*
C: 70–79 *Acceptable*
D: 60–69 *Needs Improvement*
F: 59–0 *Not recommended for bicycle travel*

Transportation Equity Priority
High: Four (4) or Five (5) Factors
Moderate: Two (2) or Three (3) Factors
Low: Zero (0) or One (1) Factor

Safety

Performance Measure	Percentage	Points	Grade
Bicycle Facility Presence	33%	0	F
Absence of Bicycle Crashes	33%	40	F
Bicyclist Operating Space	17%	0	F
Number of Travel Lanes	17%	70	C
Total	**100%**	**32**	**F**

System Preservation

Performance Measure	Percentage	Points	Grade
Bicycle Facility Continuity	50%	0	F
Bicycle Facility Condition	50%	0	F
Total	**100%**	**0**	**F**

Transportation Equity Priority

Area Condition	Yes/No
Low Income Population =/> 32.32%	
Minority Population =/> 28.19%	√
18.2%+ of Population < 16 Years Old	√
16.15%+ of Households w/o Vehicle	
Within ¼ Mile of School/College	√

Notes

Detailed Performance Measure Information

Goal	Performance Measure	Features of Analyzed Locations
Capacity Management and Mobility	Bicycle Facility Presence	Sharrows/shared-use lane
	Proximity to Bike Network	Bicycle facility network within ¼ mile
	Proximity to Transit	Has a bus route on it and several stops in the corridor
Economic Vitality	Bike Rack Presence	No bicycle rack in the segment
	Land Use	Mixed use—educational, recreational, residential
Safety	Bicycle Facility Presence	Sharrows/shared-use lane
	Absence of Bicycle Crashes	2 bicycle crashes
	Bicyclist Operating Space	Bicycle operates in mixed traffic
	Number of Travel Lanes	Two travel lanes per direction
System Preservation	Bicycle Facility Continuity	Length of bicycle facility matches length of segment
	Bicycle Facility Condition	Bicycle facility in fair condition

APPENDIX B

Support Letters

Seth Asante

From: John Thompson
Sent: Friday, October 11, 2019 10:54 AM
To: Vatan, Geraldine T. (DOT); Seth Asante; Dwyer, Courtney (DOT)
Cc: Mark Abbott; Michael D. Dennehy; Chase Berkeley
Subject: RE: Milton - Route 28 - Corridor Study

Good Morning Seth,

The Town of Milton still very much supports a corridor study for Route 28 as well. As you know, the Town sees a huge influx of cut through traffic in the peak hours along this corridor and safety and efficiency are of the utmost importance to the Town and residents.

Thank-you for the consideration.

Regards,

John P. Thompson, P.E.
Town Engineer

Town of Milton – Engineering Dept.
525 Canton Avenue
Milton, MA 02186

(617) 898-4869

From: Vatan, Geraldine T. (DOT) <geraldine.vatan@state.ma.us>
Sent: Friday, October 11, 2019 10:00 AM
To: Seth Asante <sasante@ctps.org>; Dwyer, Courtney (DOT) <courtney.dwyer@state.ma.us>
Cc: Mark Abbott <mabbott@ctps.org>; John Thompson <jthompson@townofmilton.org>
Subject: RE: Milton - Route 28 - Corridor Study

Hello Seth,
Yes, thank you for your consideration, D6 is still in support of a Route 28 corridor study in Milton.
Geri

Geraldine Vatan - District 6 Project Development Engineer
MassDOT Highway Division
185 Kneeland Street, Boston MA 02111
Office (857) 368-6115 Cell (508) 330-1078 geraldine.vatan@state.ma.us

---

From: Seth Asante <sasante@ctps.org>
Sent: Thursday, October 10, 2019 3:02 PM
To: Vatan, Geraldine T. (DOT) <Geraldine.Vatan@dot.state.ma.us>; Worhunsky, Courtney (DOT) <Courtney.Dwyer@dot.state.ma.us>
Cc: Mark Abbott <mabbott@ctps.org>
Subject: RE: Milton - Route 28 - Corridor Study

Good afternoon Geri and Courtney,

I am reviewing the arterial segments that were identified in the needs assessment of the MPO's Long-Range Transportation Plan to select a priority corridor for study this year.

Last April, you requested for a Route 28 corridor study in Milton with the support of the Town and Representative William Driscoll. This corridor ranks high on our list and so I wanted to confer with you if District 6 and Milton are still interested in pursuing the Route 28 study.

Please let me know as soon as possible.

Thank you,
Seth

Seth A. Asante, P.E. | Chief Transportation Planner
CENTRAL TRANSPORTATION PLANNING STAFF
857.702.3644 | sasante@ctps.org
www.ctps.org/bostonmpo
Ten Park Plaza, Suite 2150 | Boston, MA 02116-3968
Main 857.702.3700 | Fax 617.570.9192 | TTY 617.570.9193

From: Dwyer, Courtney (DOT) <courtney.dwyer@state.ma.us>
Sent: Monday, April 1, 2019 2:50 PM
To: Mark Abbott <mabbott@ctps.org>; sasante@ctps.org
Cc: Vatan, Geraldine T. (DOT) <geraldine.vatan@state.ma.us>
Subject: Milton - Route 28 - Corridor Study

Good Afternoon Mark & Seth,

The Town of Milton has requested for a corridor study to be conducted on Route 28. State Representative William Driscoll has been supportive of this request and has asked for an update regarding next steps and what, if anything, is required from Milton to get this study programmed. We have committed that the District will get back to the Town and Rep. Driscoll, after we hear back from you.

In March 2019, there was a Project (#609396) initiated for Resurfacing and Related Work on Route 28. The project is scheduled for advertisement in April 2024.

Please let us know if there is anything else you need from the District or Milton to help process this request.

Thank you,
Courtney

Courtney (Dwyer) Worhunsky, P.E.
District 6 Projects Engineer
MassDOT – Highway Division | 185 Kneeland Street, 9th Floor Boston, MA 02111
office (857)368-6165 | courtney.dwyer@state.ma.us