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A. OVERVIEW:

The Kensington Town Council established the Pedestrian and Bicycling Access & Safety Working Group (WG) in July 2020 to explore options for increasing pedestrian and bicycle access and safety in and around the Town of Kensington (ToK). The Mayor and Town Council solicited voluntary participation of interested residents for the WG through a notification in the July/August 2020 ‘Around the Town’ Journal and ‘Kensingtown’ listserv. Councilmember Engle and resident Anne-Marie Turner offered to co-chair the WG. The co-chairs wish to express their gratitude to all of those listed on the cover page of this report who have actively participated in the WG and encourage other interested residents to become involved in future efforts by contacting them (nateengletok@gmail.com; turner.landis@gmail.com).

This report captures the initial recommendations that the working WG has gathered over the past five months. It briefly describes the process that the WG embarked upon to develop these recommendations, lists key recommendations and actions for immediate consideration, and concludes with suggestions for future work of the WG. It also includes more detailed reporting and recommendations in the form of Annexes.

B. WORKING GROUP PROCESS:

The WG held its first meeting in September 2020 and then monthly meetings thereafter through January 2021. The agendas and notes from each meeting are available on the Town of Kensington’s website under ‘2020/2021 Committee Meeting Minutes’. Initial discussions aimed at deciding how to focus the WG’s work during this initial stage of its efforts. Subsequent meetings focused on achieving these goals through several means.

The first was to develop a system for tracking and then prioritizing the eventual recommendations of the WG (i.e., the "prioritization spreadsheet"). The second was to embark on a complete “walkability and bicycling audit” of the ToK to establish a baseline of the physical experience for walkers and bikers and to identify areas for improvement. After an October 31st in-person audit training by Anne-Marie Turner, the WG split the Town into sections to conduct the audits between November 1st and December 24th. The audit map and checklist created by the WG are attached as Annexes 1 and 2, respectively. To the best of the WG’s knowledge, the auditing process was conducted for the entire Town. Future iterations of this exercise will consider completing audits for these same stretches at different times of the day (e.g., evening, rush-hour, etc.), and on different days (e.g., weekends vs. weekdays), and will be added accordingly to the walk audit tracking spreadsheet created and maintained by the WG.

WG meetings also included briefings from the participants on various issues related to the WG’s goals, including, but not limited to, discussions on: linking the WG’s efforts to the ongoing development of Montgomery County’s Pedestrian Master Plan; State of Maryland ‘Walktober’ events and webinars; and relevant State and County processes and grant funding opportunities that could be of influence to pedestrian and bicycling issues in the ToK.

C. KEY RECOMMENDATIONS AND IMMEDIATE ACTIONS:

Councilmember Engle reported on the developments of the WG to the Mayor, Town Council, and Town Manager at each Town Council meeting between September and January. Early accomplishments of the WG included requesting the Town to remove signage at Town Hall that discouraged bicycle
parking, as well as helping to locate the installation of a recently purchased 2-bicycle bike rack at Town Hall.

The WG reserved most of its immediate recommendations, however, to be delivered through this report. These recommendations were gathered through several means, including the walkability and bicycling audit process, conversations with County and State officials, and independent research conducted by the various WG participants. The recommendations and immediate actions are also based on the professional/personal views of the participants. The WG identified 32 recommendations in total, comprised of 17 short-term, 11 mid-term, and 4 long-term actions. Some of the recommendations were deemed not an immediate priority for inclusion in the report, while others were combined to comprise the 13 recommendations detailed below. The complete ‘results’ of the prioritization process are depicted in Annex 3. Although this spreadsheet has not yet been utilized to its fullest extent as envisioned, it has served as an important mechanism for filtering out the key recommendations described below. Future efforts of the WG should focus on refining the prioritization tracking and ranking process.

The recommendations listed below are by order of immediacy, as several of these recommendations involve the need to initiate processes that have deadlines approaching in the next several weeks or months. Missing these deadlines will have a negative cascading effect on subsequent decisions the Town may pursue to improve pedestrian and bicycling access and safety. The combined 13 recommendations represent a combination of applying for grants or ‘designation’ processes, pursuing discussions with the County and/or State on planning or infrastructure, and/or Town planning, spending, or infrastructure decisions.

**Immediate Actions Recommended with Approaching Deadlines**

1. **Seek Bicycle & Pedestrian Priority Areas (BPPA) designation for the ToK.**

   The BPPA program is a mechanism of the State of Maryland designed to designate geographical areas where the enhancement of bicycle and pedestrian traffic is a priority. According to the information on the Maryland Department of Transportation State Highway Administration (MDOT SHA) website (https://roads.maryland.gov/mdotsha/pages/Index.aspx?PageId=693), “Once MDOT designates an area as a BPPA, drafting a Bicycle and Pedestrian Priority Area Plan (BPPAP) would be a next step [in partnership with the local governments...[MDOT SHA] leads the BPPAP development. MDOT SHA plans bicycle and pedestrian treatments that align State, local, and stakeholder goals to expand existing or planned bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure.”

   The ToK can apply for BPPA designation, but it requires a letter of support from municipal or county level public works or transportation departments, such as the Montgomery County Department of Transportation (MCDOT). The application process runs between early March to early May 2021. The application is comprehensive and would require the WG to shift its efforts in the next several months to complete this application, with the support of the Town Manager and Town where needed. It would also require the Town to secure the buy-in of MCDOT, and possibly County and State elected officials.

   Seeking the BPPA designation and embarking on the subsequent planning process with MDOT SHA should not discourage the Town from pursuing the remaining recommendations in this report. However,
if acquired, designation would help to facilitate a more comprehensive and coordinated effort to pursue many of the recommendations identified by the WG. It would also help with giving these issues visibility and additional technical support to the WG’s ongoing efforts. Finally, the WG’s functions and representation could transition to support the BPPA process as part of the BPPAP Working Group.

2. **Apply for Transportation Land Use Connections (TLC) program for consulting services support.**

   The Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments (COG) TLC program ([https://www.mwcog.org/transportation/planning-areas/land-use-coordination/tlc-program/](https://www.mwcog.org/transportation/planning-areas/land-use-coordination/tlc-program/)) provides focused consultant services to local jurisdictions working on creative, forward-thinking, and sustainable plans and projects. It provides consultant assistance of $30,000 to $60,000 for planning projects, and up to $80,000 for conceptual design or preliminary engineering projects, including (but not limited to): Corridor and transit station planning; Bicycle and pedestrian safety and access studies; Transit-oriented development studies; Streetscape improvement plans; Design guidelines and roadway standards; and Transit demand and feasibility analysis issues.

   Applications for FY22 open in early January 2021, with abstracts due mid-end January and full applications due March 2021. In coordination with MCDOT, the Town should submit a proposal to COG for assistance through the TLC program, which could be to support a range of pedestrian and bicycling priority issues for the ToK (such as those recommended in this report by the WG). The proposal could also be highly targeted to a specific issue, such as to study siting, costing, and financing for Capital Bike Share station(s) [see Recommendation 8, below.]

3. **Work with MCDOT on planned pedestrian and bicycling improvements to Summit Avenue.**

   Parkwood Residents Association Vice President, Jeffrey Griffith, informed the WG about a recent inquiry that he made on behalf of the Association to MCDOT regarding safety improvements along Summit Avenue from Prospect Street to Knowles Avenue. He subsequently informed the WG that he received a positive response from MCDOT, indicating that they are working to provide such improvements this upcoming spring. The improvements could include widening (and separating with a grass buffer) the sidewalk on the East side and also making bicycling enhancements according to the County’s Bicycling Master Plan. The Town should engage with MCDOT in these discussions as soon as possible, as it is in the interests of the Town for walkability and biking purposes, and the decisions may potentially impact several ToK homeowners on the East side of Summit Avenue. It is also important for the Town to ensure that the planned developments on the Southeast and Northeast corners of Summit and Knowles are involved in these discussions, to maximize opportunities and synergies in access and safety improvements along this stretch.
Immediate Actions Recommended without Clear Deadlines

4. *Invest in improvements, repairs, and enhancements identified in the “walkability and bicycling audit” process.*

The audits identified a host of recommendations for improving the infrastructure and ultimately enhancing the pedestrian and bicycling experience throughout the ToK. A map that captures most of these improvements is provided in Annex 4, and a full list is available upon request via the audit database created by the WG. The Town should review and consider these recommendations and incorporate them into its planned Capital Improvement Projects.

Many of these are relatively quick fixes that could be made almost immediately, while others would involve soliciting the feedback of residents in the affected neighborhoods and/or waiting for the right time to make the improvements (e.g., to add a sidewalk on the West side of Kensington Parkway between Kent Street and Washington Street).

5. *Prioritize pedestrian and cycling improvements along Connecticut Avenue and at major intersections in the Connecticut Avenue corridor.*

By far, Connecticut Avenue is the most frequently discussed area of concern for pedestrian and bicycling access and safety. The challenges with improving Connecticut Avenue have existed for decades, but these are only likely to be exacerbated with anticipated new developments along the corridor.

The WG recommends that the Town should strongly advocate for making improvements that will transform this stretch; improvements that are both bold and practical. One ‘low-hanging fruit’ would be for the Town to work with SHA to replace the narrow, substandard sidewalks on Connecticut Avenue south of Warner Street/Knowles Avenue with wider, ADA compliant sidewalks, as previously discussed with the State.

Beyond this, however, comprehensive pedestrian and bicycling enhancements in this stretch are not only possible, but they are also necessary if the County is to fully realize its vision for non-vehicle transit as a top priority for future planning (as made clear in its Thrive 2050 planning process). This will take comprehensive planning and unprecedented coordination between ToK, County, and State officials and technical staff to bring about this transformation. The BPPA designation process identified in Recommendation 1 could help serve as the catalyst and the glue that is needed to finally make a material difference. Similarly, the TLC grant mentioned in Recommendation 2 could also emphasize the Connecticut Avenue corridor for improvements.
6. **Pursue enhancements to Kensington Parkway to improve bicycling and pedestrian options and experience.**

Kensington Parkway is a priority for the Bicycling Master Plan. It is also a highly traversed stretch by foot. Its wide nature and newly paved surface make it a prime candidate for immediate improvements to increase pedestrian and bicycling access and safety. Improvements could include that the Town:

- Work with MCDOT along the unincorporated section to add a sidewalk with grass buffer.
- Add a bikeway (bike lane) as envisioned in the Bicycling Master Plan in the section under ToK ownership and work with MCDOT to add a bikeway to the unincorporated section (in conjunction with the sidewalk suggested immediately above).

These recommendations also involve taking advantage of WSSC’s work on Kensington Parkway for pedestrian and bicycling improvements, which are already being discussed with Delegate Al Carr, a participant of this WG.

7. **Enhance pedestrian safety at Metropolitan Avenue intersections.**

   **St. Paul Street/Metropolitan Avenue.** The St. Paul Street/Metropolitan Avenue intersection is popular with pedestrians and cyclists traveling to the train station or the southern side of the Town. Before the developer of the Modena Reserve development installed an all-way stop, it was difficult to cross the intersection, as drivers often travel on Metropolitan Avenue at a speed far greater than the 25 mph speed limit and many drivers do not stop to allow pedestrians to cross. The all-way stop has effectively calmed the street and improved safety at the intersection. SHA has indicated it plans to remove the all-way stop, despite the current improvements expressed repeatedly by Town officials and residents, and the likely increase in pedestrian use of the intersection once the development is complete and resident occupied.

   The WG recommends that the Town request for SHA to keep the all-way stop and engage the Modena Reserve developer for support on this matter. Keeping the all-way stop should not negate the installation of the Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacon (RRFB) already approved by SHA for the Wheatly Street/Metropolitan Avenue intersection.

   **Plyers Mill Road/Metropolitan Avenue.** The Plyers Mill Road/Metropolitan Avenue intersection presents challenges to both pedestrians and drivers. Pedestrians face the prospect of crossing wide streets with generally poor sight lines, given the geometry and size of the intersection and lack of pedestrian signals. Drivers unfamiliar with the area face confusing signage and signals. This intersection would be significantly improved through design interventions to reduce the size of the intersection and simplify traffic flow.

   The WG recommends that the Town encourage SHA to review the design of the intersection. In parallel, the Town should engage the Kensington Crossing developer early on in its effort to develop 10619 Connecticut Avenue (also known as the “Huggins Site”), as early plans call for an entrance to the development's surface lot at this intersection.
8. **Consider adding Capital Bikeshare (CaBi) station(s) in the ToK.**

Kensington represents a significant gap in the CaBi network. Adding a station or two would help to bring cyclists to and from Bethesda, North Bethesda, Rockville, Wheaton, and Silver Spring to Kensington businesses. It would also improve access to public transportation options (MARC and Metro) for current and incoming residents that will join the community with ongoing new development projects.

Indicative cost breakdowns have been provided to the WG by MCDOT. One-time capital costs are approximately $55,000 per station (15-dock and 19-dock), and annual operating costs are between $15,000 and $19,000. If the CaBi stations are installed, Lyft, the vendor operating the County's dockless e-bikes, might also consider adding them to the network for Kensington at little or no additional cost to the ToK.

A first step in this pursuit could be to apply for the TLC program grant to study where to site and how to finance the station(s), as noted in Recommendation 2.

---

9. **Improve crossings along Knowles Avenue.**

Knowles Avenue is the primary entry into the ToK from the west, bringing high volumes of traffic. It is also the main route through which pedestrians from adjacent neighborhoods, such as Parkwood and Kensington Estates, access the Town on foot or bicycle. The current design and infrastructure along Knowles Avenue are insufficient for ensuring pedestrian and bicycling comfort and safety, including narrow sidewalks directly adjacent to the road, an absence of designated bicycling pathways, and dangerous intersections. At present, all three options for crossing Knowles Avenue (west of Connecticut Avenue) are extremely uncomfortable or dangerous for pedestrians (i.e., Connecticut Avenue, Detrick Avenue, and Summit Avenue).

The ongoing and anticipated future large development projects along Knowles Avenue will bring much needed improvements through widened and separated sidewalks and bike lanes. Even with the new developments, challenges will remain with respect to safe and comfortable crossing options. Moreover, additional people walking and cycling along and across Knowles will increase with the added housing units from the developments, bringing more pressure to an already difficult corridor.

For immediate improvements, the WG recommends that the Town work with SHA to install crosswalks and other relevant street markings at Detrick Avenue at both the North and South sides of Knowles Avenue.

The WG also recommends that the Town work with SHA and the developers of the properties along Knowles Avenue to propose a safe solution, or set of solutions, for crossing Knowles Avenue between Connecticut Avenue and Summit Avenue; solutions that account for increased pedestrian and bicycling as an extension of the new development.
10. Improve options for pedestrian crossings of the railroad tracks.

The pedestrian crossing of the railroad tracks at the MARC station is the only opportunity to cross the tracks east of Connecticut Avenue and poses an inherent risk to pedestrian and bicyclist safety due to its poor design. Trains frequently operate at high rates of speed through the station and there are limited sight lines to the east, with no indications that a train is approaching (contrast with a vehicular crossing, which has gates, lights, and bells). There are many potential solutions to mitigate this risk, ranging from automated signage and announcements that indicate when a train is approaching, to the construction of a dedicated underpass or overpass for pedestrians/cyclists.

The WG recommends that the Town engage CSX and the Maryland Transit Administration to explore potential solutions to improve the safety of the crossing.

11. Pursue a ‘road diet’ on North-bound University Boulevard (North of split with Connecticut Avenue).

Three lanes are not necessary heading North on University Boulevard out of the ToK. At the same time, the fast movement of vehicles and narrow sidewalk without a buffer make this a prime location for a road diet. The Town should work with SHA to reduce this portion of University Boulevard to two lanes and add a protected bike lane and a widened sidewalk with a buffered grass strip separating the road from the sidewalk. A road diet also has the potential to reduce pedestrian crossing distances and increase pedestrian safety by reducing speeds on University Boulevard.

12. Assess opportunities and needs for pedestrian-scale street lighting.

Work with a street lighting consultant to review where gaps in street lighting exist and where appropriate opportunities may reside for adding pedestrian-scale street lighting, such as Kensington Parkway and Metropolitan, Connecticut, Knowles, and Summit Avenues (including estimating capital and operating costs). This could be done in conjunction with the hiring of a consultant to advise the Town on the PEPCO rate case.

13. Reduce speed limits.

High vehicle rates and speeds directly contribute to the likelihood of a crash, increase the severity of injuries to vehicle occupants, and reduce the survivability of any pedestrian or cyclist involved (see National Transportation Safety Board report: “Reducing Speeding-Related Crashes Involving Passenger Vehicles”). Jurisdictions across the country have recently lowered speed limits in recognition of this fact and in an effort to improve overall safety for pedestrians, cyclists, and drivers. In 2020, DC lowered speed limits on all streets from 25 mph to 20 mph. In addition, DC has implemented a “Slow Streets Initiative” that includes a 15 mph speed limit and limited vehicle traffic on select streets.
The Working Group recommends that Town reduce speed limits on its streets to 20 mph and request that SHA lower the speed limit on Connecticut Avenue through the Town of Kensington to 30 mph or lower.

D. SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE WG EFFORTS:

The immediate future efforts of the WG should focus on helping the Town with implementing Recommendations 1 and 2; mainly, helping to ensure that the necessary support is garnered in the various jurisdictions and agencies, as well as supporting with the designation/grant application submissions. Also, if BPPA status is successfully achieved, the WG should merge and help to constitute what would ultimately be the BPPAP Working Group.

Further efforts of the WG will focus on conducting follow up walkability and bicycling audits and linking these findings with the County’s Pedestrian Master Plan, as well as making improvements to the prioritization process and tracking system developed by the WG over the past few months.

The WG also welcomes additional suggestions by the Mayor, Town Council, Town Manager, and residents for future efforts that the WG should embark upon.
Annex 1. ToK Walkability and Bicycling Audit Map
Annex 2. ToK Walkability and Bicycling Audit Checklist

Walk and Bike Audit Checklist

Town of Kensington, Maryland
Streets/Intersection and Corridor: ________________________________
Date, Day of Week, and Time of Day: ___________________________
Audit Conducted by: __________________________________________

### SIDEWALKS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does the street have a sidewalk? Which side of the street or both sides? What is the sidewalk condition (broken, trip hazards, narrow, etc.)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the sidewalk a comfortable width? Can you walk side by side with your companion, push a stroller, operate a wheelchair, etc.?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are sidewalks separated from traffic by parking, trees, grass buffer, etc.? Are there barriers that make walking difficult (poles, signs, shrubs, trash cans, low-hanging trees, etc.)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the sidewalk often interrupted for cars (driveways, loading docks, etc.), and/or does it cease to exist at certain stretches?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are buildings easy to access from the sidewalk (e.g., facing the sidewalk, providing pathways or entrances near the sidewalk, etc.)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do intersections (and medians) have curb ramps for wheelchairs, strollers, and carts? Do the ramps have detectable warning strips?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do intersections have marked crosswalks? Does the intersection have approaches with sidewalks and curb ramps where a crosswalk could be marked?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OVERALL RATING:** Rate this stretch from 0-5 (0 being like Interstate 495, 1 being like Connecticut Ave, and so on, with 5 being a walker’s/cyclist’s paradise)

### STREETS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are there controlled places to cross the street (e.g., 4-way stops, signalized intersections)? How frequent are these crossings?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If no sidewalks are present, do you feel comfortable walking in the street?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there adequate, pedestrian scale lighting (e.g., like the lighting on Antique Row)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When traffic signals are present, is there a pedestrian signal? Is there enough time to cross for all users, including children and older adults? Is there a long wait for the signal to change? Can children and wheelchair users reach and hear pedestrian push buttons at crossings?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does vehicle traffic move at a speed that feels safe walking by or when crossing the street? Do drivers yield to people crossing the street? Do you feel safe from cars walking along this street?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Were vehicles, trees, or signs blocking the view of traffic for pedestrians?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Describe the general condition of the area (e.g., is trash or graffiti present, is there shade provided by trees or buildings, etc.)?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OVERALL RATING:</strong> Rate this stretch from 0-5 (0 being like Interstate 495, 1 being like Connecticut Ave, and so on, with 5 being a walker’s/cyclist’s paradise)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>BICYCLING</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What is the general experience for a bicyclist? Are there clearly marked bike lanes? Would children be safe biking? Are there opportunities here to achieve aspects of the County’s Bicycling Master Plan?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you see bicyclists in this area? Are they using the sidewalk or the road?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is bicycle parking available? Where is it located in this area?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OVERALL RATING:</strong> Rate this stretch from 0-5 (0 being like Interstate 495, 1 being like Connecticut Ave, and so on, with 5 being a walker’s/cyclist’s paradise)?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>TRANSIT</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do bus stops have sidewalk access? Is seating available and is it sheltered? Are bus stops separated from the road and do they have crossings nearby that are efficient and comfortable to use?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is this location near the Marc train? If so, is the train accessible to pedestrians/cyclists from this block? List any challenges.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OVERALL RATING:</strong> Rate this stretch from 0-5 (0 being like Interstate 495, 1 being like Connecticut Ave, and so on, with 5 being a walker’s/cyclist’s paradise)?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RECOMMENDATIONS** (Flag any major concerns, specific improvements, or other noteworthy highlights from this stretch).

**KEEP IN MIND**
- Plan for about 30 minutes for every half mile of walking plus time before and after the walk.
- Make sure the routes are safe enough to walk in groups. Note any issues for possible participants.
- Create maps of the area from Google maps to accompany this checklist and mark as you go.
- Try to think about all types of road users, children, bicyclists, people in wheelchairs, people with visual or hearing impairments, and transit riders.
- Take photos of the conditions and to document key ‘findings’!

**OTHER COMMENTS:** ________________________________ (continue to another page if needed)
## Annex 3. Prioritization Process Results

### Kensington Pedestrian and Bicycling Access and Safety Working Group - Evaluation Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improvement/Barrier/Problem</th>
<th>Interventions</th>
<th>Expected</th>
<th>Feasibility</th>
<th>Implementation</th>
<th>Maintenance</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
<th>High/Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian safety improvements</td>
<td>Pedestrian Infrastructure,  Location, Time, Speed</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle safety improvements</td>
<td>Bicycle Infrastructure,  Location, Time, Speed</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian and bicycle access improvements</td>
<td>Access Infrastructure,  Location, Time, Speed</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Potential Interventions

- Pedestrian Infrastructure
- Bicycle Infrastructure
- Access Infrastructure

### Evaluation Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improvement/Barrier/Problem</th>
<th>Interventions</th>
<th>Expected</th>
<th>Feasibility</th>
<th>Implementation</th>
<th>Maintenance</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
<th>High/Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian safety improvements</td>
<td>Pedestrian Infrastructure,  Location, Time, Speed</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle safety improvements</td>
<td>Bicycle Infrastructure,  Location, Time, Speed</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian and bicycle access improvements</td>
<td>Access Infrastructure,  Location, Time, Speed</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Recommended Interventions

- Pedestrian Infrastructure
- Bicycle Infrastructure
- Access Infrastructure

### Implementation Notes

- Medium: Indicates a moderate level of implementation effort.
- Low: Indicates a low level of implementation effort.

### Evaluation Notes

- High: Indicates a high level of evaluation.
- Low: Indicates a low level of evaluation.

---
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# Kensington Pedestrian and Bicycling Access and Safety Working Group - Evaluation Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Subcommittee</th>
<th>Pedestrian</th>
<th>Bicycling</th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>Access</th>
<th>Safety</th>
<th>Mobility</th>
<th>Environment</th>
<th>Feasibility</th>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>Implementation</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Curbside construction improvements</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic calming &amp; signal modifications</td>
<td>Traffic</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street lighting &amp; signage</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-motorized safety</td>
<td>Non-motorized</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian safety evaluations</td>
<td>Pedestrian</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle safety evaluations</td>
<td>Bicycle</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: The table above outlines the evaluation matrix for the Kensington Pedestrian and Bicycling Access and Safety Working Group. Each category is evaluated based on various criteria, including access, safety, mobility, environment, feasibility, funding, and implementation. Recommendations are made based on the evaluation results.*
Annex 4. Map of Fixes, Improvements, and Enhancements Identified in by Audit Process