

Appendix B

Pedestrian and Bicycle Report Cards

- 1: Pedestrian Report Card Assessment
- 2: Bicycle Report Card Assessment

Part 1: Pedestrian Report Card Assessment



Appendix B Pedestrian Report Card Assessment (PRCA): Roadway Segment

Roadway Segment Location

Route 37 (Granite Street): Existing Conditions

Grading Categories ^[1]	Score	Rating
Safety	1.0	Poor
System Preservation	1.0	Poor
Capacity Management and Mobility	1.8	Fair
Economic Vitality	2.0	Fair

Transportation Equity ^[2]	
High Priority Area	
Moderate Priority Area	Yes
Low Priority Area	

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



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

Grading Categories: Scoring Breakdown Roadway Segment

Capacity Management and Mobility			
Performance Measure ^[1]	Percentage	Score (out of 3.0)	Rating
Sidewalk Presence	50%	1.0	Poor
Crosswalk Presence	33%	3.0	Good
Walkway Width	17%	2.0	Fair
GRADING CATEGORY TOTAL^[2] <small>(Sidewalk Presence Score * 0.5) + (Crosswalk Presence Score * 0.33) + (Walkway Width Score * 0.17)</small>	100%	1.8	Fair

Economic Vitality			
Performance Measure ^[1]	Percentage	Score (out of 3.0)	Rating
Pedestrian Volumes	50%	2.0	Fair
Adjacent Bicycle Accommodations	50%	2.0	Fair
GRADING CATEGORY TOTAL^[2] <small>(Pedestrian Volumes Score * 0.5) + (Adjacent Bicycle Accommodations Score * 0.5)</small>	100%	2.0	Fair

Safety			
Performance Measure ^[1]	Percentage	Score (out of 3.0)	Rating
Pedestrian Crashes	60%	1.0	Poor
Pedestrian-Vehicle Buffer	20%	0	Poor
Vehicle Travel Speed	20%	2.0	Fair
GRADING CATEGORY TOTAL^[2] <small>(Pedestrian Crashes Score * 0.6) + (Pedestrian-Vehicle Buffer Score * 0.2) + (Vehicle Travel Speed Score * 0.2)</small>	100%	1.0	Poor

System Preservation			
Performance Measure ^[1]	Percentage	Score (out of 3.0)	Rating
Sidewalk Condition	100%	1.0	Poor

Transportation Equity Factors ^[3]	
Area Condition	Yes/No
Low-income Population ≥ 32.32%	No
Minority Population ≥ 28.19%	No
More than 6.69% of Population > 75 Years of Age	Yes
More than 16.15% of Households w/o Vehicle	No
Within 1/4 Mile of School/College	Yes

[1] Poor = 1.0; Fair = 2.0; Good = 3.0

[2] Poor = 0 to 1.7; Fair = 1.7 < 2.3; Good = 2.3 to 3.0

[3] Use these factors to determine Transportation Equity priority level (front)

Roadway Segment Notes

Detailed Performance Measure Information

Grading Category	Performance Measure	Features of Analyzed Locations
Capacity Management and Mobility	Sidewalk Presence	Large gaps in sidewalk network(1)
	Crosswalk Presence	Seven crosswalk per mile (3)
	Walkway Width	Sidewalks measuring at least five feet wide on at least one side of the road (2)
Economic Vitality	Pedestrian Volumes	Roadway segment traversed by five to 60 pedestrians per hour (2)
	Adjacent Bicycle Accommodations	Roadway segments with between 5 and 60 bicycles per hour (2)
Safety	Pedestrian Crashes	Roadway segment with two pedestrian crashes (1)
	Pedestrian-Vehicle Buffer	Roadway segments without buffer (0)
	Vehicle Travel Speed	Roadway segments where average speeds between 25 and 35 mph (2)
System Preservation	Sidewalk Condition	Roadway segments with less than half of sidewalks in good condition (1)



Appendix B Pedestrian Report Card Assessment (PRCA): Roadway Segment

Roadway Segment Location

Route 37 (Franklin Street): Existing Conditions

Grading Categories ^[1]	Score	Rating
Safety	2.2	Fair
System Preservation	1.0	Poor
Capacity Management and Mobility	2.2	Fair
Economic Vitality	2.0	Fair

Transportation Equity ^[2]	
High Priority Area	
Moderate Priority Area	Yes
Low Priority Area	

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



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

Grading Categories: Scoring Breakdown Roadway Segment

Capacity Management and Mobility			
Performance Measure ^[1]	Percentage	Score (out of 3.0)	Rating
Sidewalk Presence	50%	3.0	Good
Crosswalk Presence	33%	1.0	Poor
Walkway Width	17%	2.0	Fair
GRADING CATEGORY TOTAL^[2] (Sidewalk Presence Score * 0.5) + (Crosswalk Presence Score * 0.33) + (Walkway Width Score * 0.17)	100%	2.2	Fair

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%	2.0	Fair

Safety			
Performance Measure ^[1]	Percentage	Score (out of 3.0)	Rating
Pedestrian Crashes	60%	3	Good
Pedestrian-Vehicle Buffer	20%	1	Poor
Vehicle Travel Speed	20%	1	Fair
GRADING CATEGORY TOTAL^[2] (Pedestrian Crashes Score * 0.6) + (Pedestrian-Vehicle Buffer Score * 0.2) + (Vehicle Travel Speed Score * 0.2)	100%	2.2	Fair

System Preservation			
Performance Measure ^[1]	Percentage	Score (out of 3.0)	Rating
Sidewalk Condition	100%	1.0	Poor

Transportation Equity Factors ^[3]	
Area Condition	Yes/No
Low-income Population ≥ 32.32%	No
Minority Population ≥ 28.19%	No
More than 6.69% of Population > 75 Years of Age	Yes
More than 16.15% of Households w/o Vehicle	No
Within 1/4 Mile of School/College	Yes

[1] Poor = 1.0; Fair = 2.0; Good = 3.0

[2] Poor = 0 to 1.7; Fair = 1.7 < 2.3; Good = 2.3 to 3.0

[3] Use these factors to determine Transportation Equity priority level (front)

Roadway Segment Notes

Detailed Performance Measure Information

Grading Category	Performance Measure	Features of Analyzed Locations
Capacity Management and Mobility	Sidewalk Presence	Large gaps in sidewalk network (2)
	Crosswalk Presence	Less than seven crosswalk per mile (1)
	Walkway Width	Sidewalks measuring at least five feet wide on at least one side of the road (3)
Economic Vitality	Pedestrian Volumes	Roadway segment traversed by five to 60 pedestrians per hour (2)
	Adjacent Bicycle Accommodations	Roadway segments with between 5 and 60 bicycles per hour (2)
Safety	Pedestrian Crashes	Roadway segment with no pedestrian crashes (2)
	Pedestrian-Vehicle Buffer	Roadway segments without buffer (1)
	Vehicle Travel Speed	Roadway segments where average speeds of 35 mph (1)
System Preservation	Sidewalk Condition	Roadway segments with less than half of sidewalks in good condition (1)



Appendix B Pedestrian Report Card Assessment (PRCA): Roadway Segment

Roadway Segment Location

Route 37 (Washington Street): Existing Conditions

Grading Categories ^[1]	Score	Rating
Safety	1.6	Poor
System Preservation	1.0	Poor
Capacity Management and Mobility	1.8	Fair
Economic Vitality	2.0	Fair

Transportation Equity ^[2]	
High Priority Area	
Moderate Priority Area	Yes
Low Priority Area	

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



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

Grading Categories: Scoring Breakdown Roadway Segment

Capacity Management and Mobility			
Performance Measure ^[1]	Percentage	Score (out of 3.0)	Rating
Sidewalk Presence	50%	2.0	Fair
Crosswalk Presence	33%	1.0	Poor
Walkway Width	17%	3.0	Good
GRADING CATEGORY TOTAL^[2] (Sidewalk Presence Score * 0.5) + (Crosswalk Presence Score * 0.33) + (Walkway Width Score * 0.17)	100%	1.8	Fair

Economic Vitality			
Performance Measure ^[1]	Percentage	Score (out of 3.0)	Rating
Pedestrian Volumes	50%	2.0	Fair
Adjacent Bicycle Accommodations	50%	2.0	Fair
GRADING CATEGORY TOTAL^[2] (Pedestrian Volumes Score * 0.5) + (Adjacent Bicycle Accommodations Score * 0.5)	100%	2.0	Fair

Safety			
Performance Measure ^[1]	Percentage	Score (out of 3.0)	Rating
Pedestrian Crashes	60%	2.0	Good
Pedestrian-Vehicle Buffer	20%	1.0	Poor
Vehicle Travel Speed	20%	1.0	Fair
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%	1.0	Poor

Transportation Equity Factors ^[3]	
Area Condition	Yes/No
Low-income Population ≥ 32.32%	No
Minority Population ≥ 28.19%	No
More than 6.69% of Population > 75 Years of Age	Yes
More than 16.15% of Households w/o Vehicle	No
Within 1/4 Mile of School/College	Yes

[1] Poor = 1.0; Fair = 2.0; Good = 3.0

[2] Poor = 0 to 1.7; Fair = 1.7 < 2.3; Good = 2.3 to 3.0

[3] Use these factors to determine Transportation Equity priority level (front)

Roadway Segment Notes

Detailed Performance Measure Information

Grading Category	Performance Measure	Features of Analyzed Locations
Capacity Management and Mobility	Sidewalk Presence	Large gaps in sidewalk network (2)
	Crosswalk Presence	Less than 7 crosswalk per mile (1)
	Walkway Width	Sidewalks measuring at least five feet wide on at least one side of the road (3)
Economic Vitality	Pedestrian Volumes	Roadway segment traversed by five to 60 pedestrians per hour (2)
	Adjacent Bicycle Accommodations	Roadway segments with between 5 and 60 bicycles per hour (2)
Safety	Pedestrian Crashes	Roadway segment with no pedestrian crashes (3)
	Pedestrian-Vehicle Buffer	Roadway segments without buffer (1)
	Vehicle Travel Speed	Roadway segments where average speeds between 25 and 35 mph (2)
System Preservation	Sidewalk Condition	Roadway segments with less than half of sidewalks in good condition (1)



Appendix B Pedestrian Report Card Assessment (PRCA): Roadway Segment

Roadway Segment Location

Route 37 (Granite Street): With Improvements

Grading Categories ^[1]	Score	Rating
Safety	2.2	Fair
System Preservation	3.0	Good
Capacity Management and Mobility	2.5	Good
Economic Vitality	2.0	Fair

Transportation Equity ^[2]	
High Priority Area	
Moderate Priority Area	Yes
Low Priority Area	

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



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

Grading Categories: Scoring Breakdown Roadway Segment

Capacity Management and Mobility			
Performance Measure ^[1]	Percentage	Score (out of 3.0)	Rating
Sidewalk Presence	50%	2.0	Good
Crosswalk Presence	33%	3.0	Good
Walkway Width	17%	3.0	Good
GRADING CATEGORY TOTAL^[2] (Sidewalk Presence Score * 0.5) + (Crosswalk Presence Score * 0.33) + (Walkway Width Score * 0.17)	100%	2.5	Good

Economic Vitality			
Performance Measure ^[1]	Percentage	Score (out of 3.0)	Rating
Pedestrian Volumes	50%	2.0	Fair
Adjacent Bicycle Accommodations	50%	2.0	Fair
GRADING CATEGORY TOTAL^[2] (Pedestrian Volumes Score * 0.5) + (Adjacent Bicycle Accommodations Score * 0.5)	100%	2.0	Fair

Safety			
Performance Measure ^[1]	Percentage	Score (out of 3.0)	Rating
Pedestrian Crashes	60%	3.0	Good
Pedestrian-Vehicle Buffer	20%	0	Poor
Vehicle Travel Speed	20%	2.0	Fair
GRADING CATEGORY TOTAL^[2] (Pedestrian Crashes Score * 0.6) + (Pedestrian-Vehicle Buffer Score * 0.2) + (Vehicle Travel Speed Score * 0.2)	100%	2.2	Fair

System Preservation			
Performance Measure ^[1]	Percentage	Score (out of 3.0)	Rating
Sidewalk Condition	100%	3.0	Good

Transportation Equity Factors ^[3]	
Area Condition	Yes/No
Low-income Population ≥ 32.32%	No
Minority Population ≥ 28.19%	No
More than 6.69% of Population > 75 Years of Age	Yes
More than 16.15% of Households w/o Vehicle	No
Within 1/4 Mile of School/College	Yes

[1] Poor = 1.0; Fair = 2.0; Good = 3.0

[2] Poor = 0 to 1.7; Fair = 1.7 < 2.3; Good = 2.3 to 3.0

[3] Use these factors to determine Transportation Equity priority level (front)

Roadway Segment Notes

Detailed Performance Measure Information

Grading Category	Performance Measure	Features of Analyzed Locations
Capacity Management and Mobility	Sidewalk Presence	Continuous sidewalk network (3)
	Crosswalk Presence	Seven crosswalk per mile (3)
	Walkway Width	Sidewalks measuring at least five feet wide on both sides of the road (3)
Economic Vitality	Pedestrian Volumes	Roadway segment traversed by five to 60 pedestrians per hour (2)
	Adjacent Bicycle Accommodations	Roadway segments with between five and 60 bicycles per hour (2)
Safety	Pedestrian Crashes	Roadway segment with no pedestrian crashes (3)
	Pedestrian-Vehicle Buffer	Roadway segments without buffer (0)
	Vehicle Travel Speed	Roadway segments where average speeds between 25 and 35 mph (2)
System Preservation	Sidewalk Condition	Roadway segments with sidewalks in good condition (3)



Appendix B Pedestrian Report Card Assessment (PRCA): Roadway Segment

Roadway Segment Location

Route 37 (Franklin Street): With Improvements

Grading Categories ^[1]	Score	Rating
Safety	2.4	Good
System Preservation	3.0	Good
Capacity Management and Mobility	2.3	Good
Economic Vitality	2.0	Fair

Transportation Equity ^[2]	
High Priority Area	
Moderate Priority Area	Yes
Low Priority Area	

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



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

Grading Categories: Scoring Breakdown Roadway Segment

Capacity Management and Mobility			
Performance Measure ^[1]	Percentage	Score (out of 3.0)	Rating
Sidewalk Presence	50%	3.0	Good
Crosswalk Presence	33%	1.0	Poor
Walkway Width	17%	3.0	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%	2.0	Fair
Adjacent Bicycle Accommodations	50%	2.0	Fair
GRADING CATEGORY TOTAL^[2] (Pedestrian Volumes Score * 0.5) + (Adjacent Bicycle Accommodations Score * 0.5)	100%	2.0	Fair

Safety			
Performance Measure ^[1]	Percentage	Score (out of 3.0)	Rating
Pedestrian Crashes	60%	3.0	Good
Pedestrian-Vehicle Buffer	20%	1.0	Poor
Vehicle Travel Speed	20%	2.0	Fair
GRADING CATEGORY TOTAL^[2] (Pedestrian Crashes Score * 0.6) + (Pedestrian-Vehicle Buffer Score * 0.2) + (Vehicle Travel Speed Score * 0.2)	100%	2.4	Good

System Preservation			
Performance Measure ^[1]	Percentage	Score (out of 3.0)	Rating
Sidewalk Condition	100%	3.0	Good

Transportation Equity Factors ^[3]	
Area Condition	Yes/No
Low-income Population ≥ 32.32%	No
Minority Population ≥ 28.19%	No
More than 6.69% of Population > 75 Years of Age	Yes
More than 16.15% of Households w/o Vehicle	No
Within 1/4 Mile of School/College	Yes

[1] Poor = 1.0; Fair = 2.0; Good = 3.0

[2] Poor = 0 to 1.7; Fair = 1.7 < 2.3; Good = 2.3 to 3.0

[3] Use these factors to determine Transportation Equity priority level (front)

Roadway Segment Notes

Detailed Performance Measure Information

Grading Category	Performance Measure	Features of Analyzed Locations
Capacity Management and Mobility	Sidewalk Presence	No gap in sidewalk network(3)
	Crosswalk Presence	Less than seven crosswalk per mile (1)
	Walkway Width	Sidewalks measuring at least five feet wide on both sides of the road (3)
Economic Vitality	Pedestrian Volumes	Roadway segment traversed by five to 60 pedestrians per hour (2)
	Adjacent Bicycle Accommodations	Roadway segment with between 5 and 60 bicycles per hour (2)
Safety	Pedestrian Crashes	Roadway segment with no pedestrian crashes (3)
	Pedestrian-Vehicle Buffer	Roadway segment without buffer (1)
	Vehicle Travel Speed	Roadway segment where average speeds between 25 and 35 mph (2)
System Preservation	Sidewalk Condition	Roadway segment with sidewalks in good condition (3)



Appendix B Pedestrian Report Card Assessment (PRCA): Roadway Segment

Roadway Segment Location

Route 37 (Washington Street): With Improvements

Grading Categories ^[1]	Score	Rating
Safety	2.6	Good
System Preservation	3.0	Good
Capacity Management and Mobility	2.3	Good
Economic Vitality	2.0	Fair

Transportation Equity ^[2]	
High Priority Area	
Moderate Priority Area	Yes
Low Priority Area	

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



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

Grading Categories: Scoring Breakdown Roadway Segment

Capacity Management and Mobility			
Performance Measure ^[1]	Percentage	Score (out of 3.0)	Rating
Sidewalk Presence	50%	3.0	Good
Crosswalk Presence	33%	1.0	Poor
Walkway Width	17%	3.0	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%	2.0	Fair
Adjacent Bicycle Accommodations	50%	2.0	Fair
GRADING CATEGORY TOTAL^[2] (Pedestrian Volumes Score * 0.5) + (Adjacent Bicycle Accommodations Score * 0.5)	100%	2.0	Fair

Safety			
Performance Measure ^[1]	Percentage	Score (out of 3.0)	Rating
Pedestrian Crashes	60%	3.0	Good
Pedestrian-Vehicle Buffer	20%	2.0	Fair
Vehicle Travel Speed	20%	2.0	Fair
GRADING CATEGORY TOTAL^[2] (Pedestrian Crashes Score * 0.6) + (Pedestrian-Vehicle Buffer Score * 0.2) + (Vehicle Travel Speed Score * 0.2)	100%	2.6	Good

System Preservation			
Performance Measure ^[1]	Percentage	Score (out of 3.0)	Rating
Sidewalk Condition	100%	3.0	Good

Transportation Equity Factors ^[3]	
Area Condition	Yes/No
Low-income Population ≥ 32.32%	No
Minority Population ≥ 28.19%	No
More than 6.69% of Population > 75 Years of Age	Yes
More than 16.15% of Households w/o Vehicle	No
Within 1/4 Mile of School/College	Yes

[1] Poor = 1.0; Fair = 2.0; Good = 3.0

[2] Poor = 0 to 1.7; Fair = 1.7 < 2.3; Good = 2.3 to 3.0

[3] Use these factors to determine Transportation Equity priority level (front)

Roadway Segment Notes

Detailed Performance Measure Information

Grading Category	Performance Measure	Features of Analyzed Locations
Capacity Management and Mobility	Sidewalk Presence	Small gap in sidewalk network (3)
	Crosswalk Presence	Less than 7 crosswalk per mile (1)
	Walkway Width	Sidewalks measuring at least five feet wide on both sides of the road (3)
Economic Vitality	Pedestrian Volumes	Roadway segment traversed by five to 60 pedestrians per hour (2)
	Adjacent Bicycle Accommodations	Roadway segment with between 5 and 60 bicycles per hour (2)
Safety	Pedestrian Crashes	Roadway segment with no pedestrian crashes (3)
	Pedestrian-Vehicle Buffer	Roadway segment with buffer (2)
	Vehicle Travel Speed	Roadway segment where average speeds between 25 and 35 mph (2)
System Preservation	Sidewalk Condition	Roadway segment with sidewalks in good condition (3)

Part 2: Bicycle Report Card Assessment



Appendix B Bicycle Report Card

Roadway Segment Location

Route 37 (Granite Street) : Existing Conditions

Grading Categories	Score	Grade
Safety	29	F
System Preservation	0	F
Capacity Management and Mobility	50	F
Economic Vitality	50	F

Transportation Equity	
High Priority Area	
Moderate Priority Area	Yes
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%	0	F
Proximity to Bike Network	33%	100	F
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%	50	F
Bicyclist Operating Space	17%	0	C
Number of Travel Lanes	17%	75	C
Total	100%	29	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%	No
Minority Population => 28.19%	No
18.2%+ of Population < 16 Years Old	Yes
16.15%+ of Households w/o Vehicle	No
Within 1/4 Mile of School/College	Yes

Notes

Detailed Performance Measure Information

Goal	Performance Measure	Features of Analyzed Locations
Capacity Management and Mobility	Bicycle Facility Presence	None in the corridor on Granite Street, people biking mostly share the road (0)
	Proximity to Bike Network	Yes, bicycle facility within one-quarter mile on West Street, which connects to Granite Street (100)
	Proximity to Transit	Yes, bus route 230, 236, and 238 operates on the corridor (100)
Economic Vitality	Bike Rack Presence	None in the corridor (0)
	Land Use	Land uses in the corridor, include commercial and retail, residential, and recreational, would support biking (100)
Safety	Bicycle Facility Presence	None in the corridor on Granite Street, people biking mostly share the road (0)
	Absence of Bicycle Crashes	Two bicycle crashes in five years (2016–20) (50%)
	Bicyclist Operating Space	People biking share lane with vehicles (0)
	Number of Travel Lanes	Two travel lanes each direction (75)
System Preservation	Bicycle Facility Continuity	No bicycle facility (0)
	Bicycle Facility Condition	No bicycle facility (0)



Appendix B Bicycle Report Card

Roadway Segment Location

Route 37 (Franklin Street) : Existing Conditions

Grading Categories	Score	Grade
Safety	40	F
System Preservation	0	F
Capacity Management and Mobility	50	F
Economic Vitality	50	F

Transportation Equity	
High Priority Area	
Moderate Priority Area	Yes
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%	0	F
Proximity to Bike Network	33%	100	F
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%	70	F
Bicyclist Operating Space	17%	0	C
Number of Travel Lanes	17%	100	C
Total	100%	40	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 \geq 32.32%	No
Minority Population \geq 28.19%	No
18.2%+ of Population < 16 Years Old	Yes
16.15%+ of Households w/o Vehicle	No
Within 1/4 Mile of School/College	Yes

Notes

Detailed Performance Measure Information

Goal	Performance Measure	Features of Analyzed Locations
Capacity Management and Mobility	Bicycle Facility Presence	None in the corridor on Granite Street, people biking mostly share the road (0)
	Proximity to Bike Network	Yes, bicycle facility within one-quarter mile on Hancock Street and West Street, which connects to Franklin Street (100)
	Proximity to Transit	Yes, bus route 230, 236, and 238 operates on the corridor (100)
Economic Vitality	Bike Rack Presence	None in the corridor (0)
	Land Use	Land uses in the corridor, include commercial and retail, residential, and recreational, would support biking (100)
Safety	Bicycle Facility Presence	None in the corridor on Granite Street, people biking mostly share the road (0)
	Absence of Bicycle Crashes	One bicycle crash in five years (2016–20) (70)
	Bicyclist Operating Space	People biking share lane with vehicles (0)
	Number of Travel Lanes	One travel lane each direction (100)
System Preservation	Bicycle Facility Continuity	No bicycle facility (0)
	Bicycle Facility Condition	No bicycle facility (0)



Appendix B Bicycle Report Card

Roadway Segment Location

Route 37 (Washington Street) : Existing Conditions

Grading Categories	Score	Grade
Safety	55	F
System Preservation	50	F
Capacity Management and Mobility	85	B
Economic Vitality	50	F

Transportation Equity	
High Priority Area	
Moderate Priority Area	Yes
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%	70	C
Proximity to Bike Network	33%	100	A
Proximity to Transit	17%	100	A
Total	100%	85	B

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%	75	C
Absence of Bicycle Crashes	33%	0	F
Bicyclist Operating Space	17%	80	B
Number of Travel Lanes	17%	100	A
Total	100%	55	F

System Preservation			
Performance Measure	Percentage	Points	Grade
Bicycle Facility Continuity	50%	50	F
Bicycle Facility Condition	50%	50	F
Total	100%	50	F

Transportation Equity Priority	
Area Condition	Yes/No
Low-income Population => 32.32%	No
Minority Population => 28.19%	No
18.2%+ of Population < 16 Years Old	Yes
16.15%+ of Households w/o Vehicle	No
Within 1/4 Mile of School/College	Yes

Notes

Detailed Performance Measure Information

Goal	Performance Measure	Features of Analyzed Locations
Capacity Management and Mobility	Bicycle Facility Presence	Yes, bike facility present in the corridor on Washington Street and shoulders in areas where there are no bike facilities. (70)
	Proximity to Bike Network	Yes, bicycle facility within the corridor south of South Street (100)
	Proximity to Transit	Yes, bus route 230, 236, and 238 operates on the corridor (100)
Economic Vitality	Bike Rack Presence	None in the corridor (0)
	Land Use	Land uses in the corridor, include commercial and retail, residential, and recreational, would support biking (100)
Safety	Bicycle Facility Presence	Yes, bike facility present in the corridor on Washington Street and shoulders in areas where there are no bike facilities (70)
	Absence of Bicycle Crashes	One bicycle crash in five years (2016–20) (70)
	Bicyclist Operating Space	Bicycle facility measures five feet wide for each direction of travel (70)
	Number of Travel Lanes	One travel lane each direction (100)
System Preservation	Bicycle Facility Continuity	Bicycle facility present on one-half of the corridor (50)
	Bicycle Facility Condition	Bicycle facility is new and in good condition (100)



Appendix B Bicycle Report Card

Roadway Segment Location

Route 37 (Granite Street) : With Improvements

Grading Categories	Score	Grade
Safety	96	A
System Preservation	100	A
Capacity Management and Mobility	500	A
Economic Vitality	88	B

Transportation Equity	
High Priority Area	
Moderate Priority Area	Yes
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%	100	A
Proximity to Bike Network	33%	100	A
Proximity to Transit	17%	100	A
Total	100%	100	A

Economic Vitality			
Performance Measure	Percentage	Points	Grade
Bike Rack Presence	50%	75	C
Land Use	50%	100	A
Total	100%	88	B

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%	100	A
Absence of Bicycle Crashes	33%	100	A
Bicyclist Operating Space	17%	100	A
Number of Travel Lanes	17%	75	C
Total	100%	96	A

System Preservation			
Performance Measure	Percentage	Points	Grade
Bicycle Facility Continuity	50%	100	A
Bicycle Facility Condition	50%	100	A
Total	100%	100	A

Transportation Equity Priority	
Area Condition	Yes/No
Low-income Population \geq 32.32%	No
Minority Population \geq 28.19%	No
18.2%+ of Population < 16 Years Old	Yes
16.15%+ of Households w/o Vehicle	No
Within 1/4 Mile of School/College	Yes

Notes

Detailed Performance Measure Information

Goal	Performance Measure	Features of Analyzed Locations
Capacity Management and Mobility	Bicycle Facility Presence	Proposed bike infrastructure in the corridor (100)
	Proximity to Bike Network	Yes, bicycle facility within one-quarter mile on West Street, which connects to Granite Street (100)
	Proximity to Transit	Yes, bus route 230, 236, and 238 operates on the corridor (100)
Economic Vitality	Bike Rack Presence	In the mall and businesses along the corridor (75)
	Land Use	Land uses in the corridor, include commercial and retail, residential, and recreational, would support biking (100)
Safety	Bicycle Facility Presence	Proposed bike infrastructure in the corridor (100)
	Absence of Bicycle Crashes	No bicycle crashes in five years (100%)
	Bicyclist Operating Space	People biking protected biking facilities (100)
	Number of Travel Lanes	Two travel lanes each direction (75)
System Preservation	Bicycle Facility Continuity	Length of bicycle facility match length of corridor (100)
	Bicycle Facility Condition	Segment include bicycle facility (100)



Appendix B Bicycle Report Card

Roadway Segment Location

Route 37 (Franklin Street) : With Improvements

Grading Categories	Score	Grade
Safety	40	F
System Preservation	0	F
Capacity Management and Mobility	50	F
Economic Vitality	50	F

Transportation Equity

High Priority Area	
Moderate Priority Area	Yes
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%	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%	70	C
Bicyclist Operating Space	17%	70	C
Number of Travel Lanes	17%	100	A
Total	100%	51	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 \geq 32.32%	No
Minority Population \geq 28.19%	No
18.2%+ of Population < 16 Years Old	Yes
16.15%+ of Households w/o Vehicle	No
Within 1/4 Mile of School/College	Yes

Notes

Detailed Performance Measure Information

Goal	Performance Measure	Features of Analyzed Locations
Capacity Management and Mobility	Bicycle Facility Presence	None in the corridor on Granite Street, people biking mostly share the road (0)
	Proximity to Bike Network	Yes, bicycle facility within one-quarter mile on Hancock Street and West Street, which connects to Franklin Street (100)
	Proximity to Transit	Yes, bus route 230, 236, and 238 operates on the corridor (100)
Economic Vitality	Bike Rack Presence	None in the corridor (0)
	Land Use	Land uses in the corridor, include commercial and retail, residential, and recreational, would support biking (100)
Safety	Bicycle Facility Presence	None in the corridor on Granite Street, people biking mostly share the road (0)
	Absence of Bicycle Crashes	No bicycle crash in five years (100)
	Bicyclist Operating Space	People biking share lane with vehicles (70)
	Number of Travel Lanes	One travel lane each direction (100)
System Preservation	Bicycle Facility Continuity	No bicycle facility (0)
	Bicycle Facility Condition	No bicycle facility (0)



Appendix B

Bicycle Report Card

Roadway Segment Location

Route 37 (Washington Street) With Improvements

Grading Categories	Score	Grade
Safety	98	A
System Preservation	100	A
Capacity Management and Mobility	100	A
Economic Vitality	95	A

Transportation Equity	
High Priority Area	
Moderate Priority Area	Yes
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%	100	A
Proximity to Bike Network	33%	100	A
Proximity to Transit	17%	100	A
Total	100%	100	A

Economic Vitality			
Performance Measure	Percentage	Points	Grade
Bike Rack Presence	50%	90	A
Land Use	50%	100	A
Total	100%	95	A

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%	100	A
Absence of Bicycle Crashes	33%	100	A
Bicyclist Operating Space	17%	90	A
Number of Travel Lanes	17%	100	A
Total	100%	98	A

System Preservation			
Performance Measure	Percentage	Points	Grade
Bicycle Facility Continuity	50%	100	A
Bicycle Facility Condition	50%	100	A
Total	100%	100	A

Transportation Equity Priority	
Area Condition	Yes/No
Low-income Population => 32.32%	No
Minority Population => 28.19%	No
18.2%+ of Population < 16 Years Old	Yes
16.15%+ of Households w/o Vehicle	No
Within 1/4 Mile of School/College	Yes

Notes

Detailed Performance Measure Information

Goal	Performance Measure	Features of Analyzed Locations
Capacity Management and Mobility	Bicycle Facility Presence	Yes, bike facility present in the corridor on Washington Street. (100)
	Proximity to Bike Network	Yes, bicycle facility within the corridor (100)
	Proximity to Transit	Yes, bus route 230, 236, and 238 operates on the corridor (100)
Economic Vitality	Bike Rack Presence	None in the corridor (0)
	Land Use	Land uses in the corridor, include commercial and retail, residential, and recreational, would support biking (100)
Safety	Bicycle Facility Presence	Yes, bike facility present in the corridor on Washington Street and shoulders in areas where there are no bike facilities (100)
	Absence of Bicycle Crashes	No bicycle crash in five years (100)
	Bicyclist Operating Space	Bicycle facility measures five feet wide for each direction of travel (100)
	Number of Travel Lanes	One travel lane each direction (100)
System Preservation	Bicycle Facility Continuity	Bicycle facility present entire the corridor (100)
	Bicycle Facility Condition	Bicycle facility is new and in good condition (100)