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### 1.0 INTRODUCTION

Montgomery County's Vision Zero Plan established a goal to eliminate serious injury and fatal collisions on County roads by 2030. Prince George's County's Vision Zero Plan also established a similar goal of reaching zero fatal and serious injury crashes on roadways by the year 2040. In support of these Vision Zero Initiatives, Montgomery and Prince George's County have identified roadway segments where fatal and serious injury crashes were most frequent. These roadway segments are part of each county's High Injury Network (HIN).

The 1.2-mile segment of MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) between I-495 (Capital Beltway) and MD 320 (Piney Branch Road) was identified as part of Montgomery and Prince George's counties' HINs. The MD 650 HIN safety study project, funded by the Transportation Planning Board (TPB), was initiated as part of the counties' on-going support of Vision Zero Plan. The primary objective of this HIN safety study is to identify potential risks to road users and recommend safety improvements along MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) between I-495 (Capital Beltway) and MD 320 (Piney Branch Road). It is expected that the safety improvement alternatives recommended from this study will yield benefits to all users and residents along the corridor in the study area. This Road Safety Audit (RSA) report summarizes the findings of the safety study.

### 2.0 BACKGROUND

### 2.1 STUDY AREA

The study limits are defined by a 1.2-mile segment of MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) between l-495 (Capital Beltway) and MD 320 (Piney Branch Road), as seen in Figure 1. MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) is classified as a Principal Arterial within the study area and includes 11 intersections highlighted in Table 1.

Table 1: Study Intersections

| MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) from I-495 (Capital Beltway) to MD 320 (Piney Branch Road) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| County | Intersection | Traffic Control Type |
| Montgomery County | MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) Southbound at I-495 Eastbound OnRamp | Free-Flow |
|  | MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) Northbound at I-495 Eastbound OffRamp (28B) | Free-Flow |
|  | MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) Southbound at I-495 Eastbound OffRamp (28A) | Signalized |
|  | MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) Northbound at I-495 On-Ramp | Free-Flow |
|  | MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) at Oakview Drive | Signalized |
|  | MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) at Dilston Road / Adelphi Road | Signalized |
|  | MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) at Fox Street | Side-Street Stop Controlled |
|  | MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) at Northampton Drive | Signalized |
| Prince George's County | MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) at Metzerott Road | Signalized |
|  | MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) at Southampton Drive | Side-Street Stop Controlled |
|  | MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) at MD 320 (Piney Branch Road) | Signalized |



Figure 1: Study Area

### 2.2 Roadway Features

### 2.2.1 Vehicular Facilities

Lane configurations at all major intersections along the corridor can be seen below in Figure 2.


Figure 2: Lane Configurations

MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) is classified as a Major Highway and traverses both Montgomery County, to the north, and Prince George's County, to the south. This mainline roadway is assumed to have a northsouth orientation and consists of six through lanes (three in each direction). The posted speed limit along most of the study corridor is 35 mph . However, between MD 320 (Piney Branch Road) and Southampton Drive the posted speed limit for the northbound direction of MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) is 40 mph. In addition, there are mainline turning bays for left turns at all six signalized intersections within the study area. Parking is restricted along MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) within the study area. There is one driveway to a commercial property along the study corridor.

I-495 (Capital Beltway) is classified as an Interstate and is assumed to have an east-west orientation within the study area. It consists of nine through lanes. There are four through lanes in the eastbound direction and 5 through lanes in the westbound direction. The posted speed limit near the study area is 55 mph . There are four intersections with I-495 ramps within the study corridor.

Oakview Drive is classified as a Primary Residential roadway and is assumed to have an east-west orientation. To the west of MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue), Oakview Drive consists of two through lanes (one in each direction), on-street parking, and runs .7 miles into residential neighborhoods and ends at Roscoe Nix Elementary School and pedestrian access to the Anacostia Tributary Trail System. To the east, Oakview Drive runs approximately 200 feet to a partially stop-controlled intersection with Mt. Pisgah Road and access to several apartment buildings and religious establishments. The posted speed limit along Oakview Drive 25 mph.

Dilston Road is a local roadway and is assumed to have an east-west orientation. It consists of two through lanes (one in each direction), on-street parking, and a left turn bay at MD 650. It runs west of MD 650 approximately .9 miles into residential neighborhoods. The posted speed limit is 25 mph .

Adelphi Road is classified as a County Road and is assumed to have an east-west orientation. It consists of four through lanes (two in each direction) with a grass median. It runs east of MD 650 several miles towards The University of Maryland (UMD) and East-West Highway. Adelphi Road, near the study area, consists of driveways for single family homes. The posted speed limit is 35 mph .

Fox Street is a local roadway and is assumed to have an east-west orientation. It consists of two lanes (one in either direction) and on-street parking. Fox street runs .3 miles east of MD 650 and consists of driveways to parking lots for apartment buildings. The posted speed limit is 25 mph .

Northampton Drive is a local roadway and is assumed to have an east-west orientation. It consists of two lanes (one in each direction), which are divided by a grass median, and on-street parking. Northampton Drive runs .4 miles to Southampton Drive and provides access to several apartment buildings and condos. Avenal Road intersects with Northampton Drive immediately adjacent to MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue). The posted speed limit along the Northampton Drive is 25 mph .

Metzerott Road is classified as a County Road and is assumed to have an east-west orientation. It consists of two lanes (one in each direction) and on-street parking. Metzerott Road runs several miles east of MD 650 and has a few driveways to parking lots for apartment complexes and commercial properties.

Southampton Drive is a local roadway and is assumed to have an east-west orientation. It consists of two through lanes (one in either direction), separated by a grass median, and on-street parking. Southampton

Drive runs .5 miles to Northampton Drive and provides access to several apartment buildings and condos. The posted speed limit along the Southampton Drive is 25 mph .

MD 320 (Piney Branch Road) is classified as a State Highway and is assumed to have an east-west orientation. It consists of four through lanes (two in each direction) divided by a concrete median. MD 320 (Piney Branch Road) runs several miles towards Washington, D.C. Near the study area, MD 320 provides access to local roads serving commercial establishments and apartment buildings. Parking is restricted at all times near MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue). The posted speed limit is 40 mph .

### 2.2.2 Pedestrian Facilities

Overall, the pedestrian facilities along MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) within the limits of the study corridor are in poor to satisfactory condition and include the following:

- Concrete sidewalks of varying widths are present along both sides of MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) for most of the study area. However, there is no sidewalk along northbound MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) between Metzerott Road and Piney Brach Road (MD 320). There is also no sidewalk along MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) between Capital Beltway (I-495) and Oakview Drive. There is little to no buffer between the sidewalk and the edge of travel lanes along the study corridor and there appears to be very limited right of way to facilitate the addition of such buffers. While the sidewalks throughout the study corridor provide direct access to bus stops, the inadequacy or lack of buffer creates an uncomfortable walking experience for pedestrians traveling along the corridor.
- Concrete sidewalks are present along both sides of Oakview Drive to the east of MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) with widths of 5 feet or more. A strip of natural vegetation provides a buffer between the sidewalk and travel lanes along the north sidewalk on Oakview Drive. The adequate widths and buffer along the sidewalks on Oakview Drive to the east of MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) create a more comfortable walking experience for pedestrians. To the west of MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue), there is only a sidewalk along eastbound Oakview Drive. This sidewalk is approximately 5 feet and provides pedestrians with a comfortable walking experience.
- Concrete sidewalks that are approximately 5 feet wide are present along eastbound and westbound sides of Adelphi Road near its intersection with MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue). There is a strip of natural vegetation which serves as a buffer between the sidewalk and travel lanes along both sides of Adelphi Road. The adequate width and buffer along the sidewalks on Adelphi Road facilitate a comfortable walking experience for pedestrians who utilize these facilities.
- Concrete sidewalks are present along both the eastbound and westbound sides of Dilston Road near its intersection with MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue). These sidewalks are approximately 5 feet wide. There is a strip of natural vegetation which provides a buffer between the sidewalk and travel lanes along both sides of Dilston Road. The sidewalk width and buffer along the sidewalks on Dilston Road provides a comfortable walking experience for pedestrians.
- Concrete sidewalks are present along both the eastbound and westbound directions of Fox Street near its intersection with MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue). These sidewalks are approximately 5 feet wide and there is a strip of natural vegetation which provides a buffer between the sidewalk and travel lanes along both sides of Fox Street. Additionally, parking is permitted along both directions of
the roadway which provides a buffer between the sidewalk and travel lanes along the roadway. The adequate sidewalk width and buffer provides a comfortable experience for pedestrians walking along Fox Street.
- Concrete sidewalks of 5 feet or more are present along both the eastbound and westbound directions of Northampton Drive near its intersection with MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue). There is a strip of natural vegetation as well as resident parking which provides a spatial buffer between the sidewalk and travel lanes along both sides of Northampton Drive. The adequate sidewalk width and additional buffer along Northampton Drive provides a very comfortable experience for pedestrians walking along the roadway.
- Concrete sidewalks that are approximately 5 feet wide are present along both the eastbound and westbound directions of Metzerott Road near its intersection with MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue). However, there is no buffer between the sidewalk and travel lanes along directions on Metzerott Road. Despite the sidewalk widths being sufficient along Metzerott Road, the lack of a spatial buffer may cause a somewhat comfortable experience for pedestrians utilizing the facilities.
- Concrete sidewalks in excess are 5 feet are present along both the eastbound and westbound directions of Southampton Drive near its intersection with MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue). There is also a strip of natural vegetation which provides a buffer between the sidewalk and travel lanes along both sides of Southampton Drive. In addition, there is a spatial buffer in the form of resident parking along eastbound Southampton Drive. The adequate sidewalk width and buffer along Southampton Drive creates a very comfortable walking experience for pedestrians.
- Concrete sidewalks at MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) and MD 320 (Piney Branch Road) are less than 5 feet wide along the westbound direction. There is also no spatial buffer between the sidewalk and travel lane. This may create an uncomfortable walking experience for pedestrians. Along the east bound direction of Pine Branch Road (MD 320) sidewalks are approximately 5 feet wide. However, the lack of a spatial buffer may cause an uncomfortable walking experience for pedestrians.
- Marked crosswalks are provided on all mainline approaches of MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) at signalized intersections along the study corridor. However, there are a few locations within the study area where crosswalk markings are either completely missing or faded at pedestrian crossing facilities. These locations include:
- MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) at MD 320 (Piney Branch Road) auxiliary right turn lane
- Crosswalk markings missing due to patching road repair on utility cut
- MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) at Southampton Drive west crosswalk
- Missing crosswalk markings at pedestrian sidewalk ramps
- MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) at Northampton Drive west intersection leg
- Missing crosswalk markings across Northampton Drive and across Avenal Road
- MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) at Northampton Drive south intersection leg
- Faded crosswalk markings
- Fox Street
- Missing crosswalk markings at pedestrian sidewalk ramps at east leg of intersection
- Avenel Road at MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) and Capital Beltway (I-495)
- Missing crosswalk markings across Avenel Road at pedestrian ramp at existing pedestrian cut-through access 750 feet north of Oakview Drive
- Countdown Pedestrian Signals (CPS) are provided for all signalized intersection approaches that contain a marked crosswalk. Accessible Pedestrian Signals (APS) are also provided at all signalized intersections. However, the APS at MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) and Northampton Drive is not functioning and has outdated signage (based on observations from a field audit assessment on March 29, 2022).

Pedestrian Level of Comfort (PLOC) is a metric used to quantify how comfortable people feel when they walk under various existing conditions. The PLOC scores pedestrian facilities in Montgomery Country from 1 (best) to 4 (worst) based on pathway and crossing features such as land use, pathway width, posted speed limit, pathway buffer width, pathway condition, on-street separation, and traffic volume. The rating scale of the PLOC consists of four qualitative ratings which are associated with the each PLOC score. These ratings are very comfortable, somewhat comfortable, uncomfortable, and undesirable.

Figure 3 presents the PLOC ratings obtained from the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission's (M-NCPPC) MC Atlas online database for pedestrian facilities along the study corridor. Most of the pedestrian pathways along MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) are categorized as undesirable. However, the west sidewalk along the study corridor between Northampton Drive and Piney Branch Road is classified as uncomfortable and the east sidewalk along MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) between Fox Street and Oakview Drive is categorized as somewhat comfortable. The sidewalks along Oakview Drive, Dilston Road, and Adelphi Road near their intersection with MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) are classified as somewhat comfortable. The sidewalks along Northampton Drive and Southampton Drive near their respective intersections with MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) are classified as very comfortable. The sidewalks at MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) and MD 320 (Piney Branch Road) are rated as undesirable.


Figure 3: Pedestrian Level of Comfort

### 2.3 Traffic Data

The Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT) within the study limits on MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) is presented in Figure 1. The 1.2-mile study corridor is divided into three homogenous sections based on the AADT as presented in Table 2.

Table 2: Corridor Volume

| New Hampshire Avenue (MD 650) Section | AADT (2020) |
| :---: | :---: |
| Between Capital Beltway (1-495) and Adelphi Road/Dilston Road | 67,192 veh/day |
| Between Adelphi Road/Dilston Road and Northampton Drive | 32,911 veh/day |
| Between Northampton Drive and Piney Branch Road (MD 320) | 33,112 veh/day |

The AADT was obtained from Maryland's GIS Data Catalog. These counts are representative of 2020 traffic volumes; however, the actual count was performed between 2018-2019 and growth factors were applied by MDOT. These growth factors were determined based on previous yearly growth rates calculated from automatic traffic recorders (ATRs). These volumes are not representative of the effects the COVID-19
pandemic had on traffic volumes in 2020. Pre-COVID 19 traffic volumes were used for the purposes of this study, as volumes are expected to recover from peak pandemic levels.

The AADT in both directions was generally steady at the intersection of MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) and MD 320 (Piney Branch Road) to the intersection of MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) and Adelphi Road/Dilston Road.

There is a significant change in AADT at the intersection of MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) and Adelphi Road/Dilston Road. This is due to Adelphi Road serving as a minor arterial roadway that provides a major connection between MD 650 and I-495 with MD 193 and The University of Maryland. As a result, AADT volumes are significantly higher on MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) north of Adelphi Road, as compared to MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) south of Adelphi Road.

Turning movement count data was obtained in 2021. Counts were taken from 6 AM - 9 AM during the AM peak period and 4 PM - 7 PM during the PM peak period. AM peak hours varied slightly between intersections, but generally started between 7:00 and 7:15 AM. PM peak hours varied more and started between 4:45 and 5:45 PM. The intersection with the highest volumes was MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) at Oakview Drive.

Summaries of vehicular Turning Movement Counts (TMCs) and pedestrian counts during AM and PM peak hours are shown in Figure 4, below.


Figure 4: Peak Hour Volumes and AADT

### 2.4 Speed Data

PSI received speed data from MCDOT which was collected on MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue), south of Oakview Drive on Wednesday, January 12, 2022, by pneumatic tubes. A summary of the results from analysis of the speed survey data is presented in Table 3.

Table 3: Summary of Vehicle Speed Survey

|  | North Bound | South Bound |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Total days | 1 | 1 |
| Speed Limit | 40 | 40 |
| Average Speed $(\mathrm{mph})$ | 29 | 28 |
| 50th Percentile $(\mathrm{mph})$ | 30 | 29 |
| 85th Percentile $(\mathrm{mph})$ | 40 | 35 |
| Pace Speed Range | $26-35$ | $26-35$ |
| 1 day sample volume (vehicles | 18779 | 24028 |

The posted speed limit within this segment of MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) study corridor is 40 mph . From the analysis of the BRT speed data, $99 \%$ of the southbound traffic are traveling below 40 mph while $86.5 \%$ of the northbound traffic are traveling below 40 mph . It should be noted that this speed data was collected along a segment of MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) that experiences significant levels of congestion for several hours of the day, at least in part due to the relative proximity of the I-495 (Capital Beltway) interchange and congestion associated with it.

In addition, PSI received speed sentry data from MCPD which was collected along northbound and southbound MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue), near the intersection of Fox Street. This speed survey of the northbound traffic was done from February $7^{\text {th }}, 2022$, until February $14^{\text {th }}, 2022$. The survey for the southbound traffic was done from February $14^{\text {th }}, 2022$, until February $21^{\text {st }}, 2022$. Both surveys were conducted for 24 hours each day. Totals of 46,431 and 88,691 vehicles were sampled in the northbound and southbound directions, respectively. A summary of the speed survey results is presented in Table 4.

Table 4: Speed Sentry Data

| Data Category | Northbound | Southbound |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Total Days | 8 | 8 |
| Posted Speed Limit (mph) | 40 | 40 |
| Average Speed (mph) | 34 | 38 |
| $50^{\text {th }}$ Percentile Speed (mph) | 35 | 40 |
| $85^{\text {th }}$ Percentile Speed (mph) | 42 | 48 |
| Pace Speed Range | $30-40$ | $36-46$ |
| 8 -Day Sample Volume (Vehicles) | 46,431 | 88,691 |

The results of the speed sentry data collection shows that the average vehicular speed in both northbound and southbound MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) is below 40 mph . However, the $85^{\text {th }}$ percentile speed exceeded the posted speed limit by approximately 2 mph in the northbound direction of MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) and 7.5 mph in the southbound direction. The negative gradient along southbound MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) was a likely factor for the increased vehicular speeds in the southbound
direction of the roadway segment. Another likely factor for the discrepancy between the northbound and southbound $85^{\text {th }}$ percentile speeds is the fact that queuing regular occurs near Capital Beltway (I-495) in the northbound direction which, possibly lowers the $85^{\text {th }}$ percentile speeds in that direction. The maximum vehicular speed on the northbound and southbound directions of MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) were 81 mph and 102 mph respectively. The number of vehicles that violated the posted speed limit in the northbound and southbound directions were 1105 out of 46431 and 7921 out of 88691 respectively.

Detailed speed reports can be found in Appendix B.

### 2.5 LAND UsE

The MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) HIN falls within an area that is classified as a Suburban Activity Center (Zone C) context zone according to MDOT SHA's 2019 Context Driven Guide (MDOT SHA Context Zone Interactive Map; MDOT SHA Context Driven Guide). A Suburban Activity Center is defined in the Context Driven guide as an area found along a major arterial which typically has less development than an urban center. It is characterized by several medium density land use features which include multi-family and single family residential as well as commercial and office facilities. In this type of context zone, development primarily consists of detached low-rise structures that are setback from the roadway. Another key feature of a Suburban Activity center is off-street parking which is typical located between structures and the roadway. It should be noted that Suburban Activity centers serve a wide range of travel modes and trip types which demand a balance approach between accessibility and mobility.

The type of land use along the study corridor primarily consists of Medium to High Density Residential, however, there are pockets of Institutional land use as well. Several schools are located near the study area which include: Brookview School, Roscoe Nix Elementary School, St. Francis International School, Kids Kave Learning Center, and JoAnn Leleck Elementary School. There are also several parks located near the study area: George Washington/ Mt. Lebanon Cemetery, Broadacres Local Park, and Anacostia Tributary Trail System.

### 2.6 Other Corridor Studies, Plans and Redevelopment

### 2.6.1 Montgomery County Bicycle Master Plan

Montgomery County Bicycle Masterplan (Figure 5) presents the County's vision to deliver a world class, wellconnected, bicycle network that provides safety, accessibility, and comfort to bicyclists and offers a viable transportation alternative for all persons throughout the county. This Bicycle Master Plan is a vital component of Montgomery County's Vision Zero efforts to eradicate traffic-related fatalities and serious injuries. It was adopted by was adopted by the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission in 2018. The Master Plan has four main goals: (1) increase bicycling rates in Montgomery County, (2) create a highly connected, convenient, and low stress bicycle network, (3) provide equal access to low-stress bicycling facilities for all community members of Montgomery County, and (4) improve the safety of bicycling. The Bicycle Master Plan proposed 1,150 miles of bikeways of which 279.2 miles existed as of December 2020. These bikeways consisted of 603 miles of sidewalks, 174 miles of off-street trails, 98 miles of separated bike lanes, and 51 miles of neighborhood greenways. Figure 5 shows the existing and proposed bikeways along the HIN on MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue). It can be observed from this figure $t$
hat the Bicycle Master Plan proposes sidepaths for both the northbound and southbound directions of the study corridor between the intersections of MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) \& Capital Beltway (I-495) and MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) \& Northampton Drive, respectively.


Figure 5: Bicycle Masterplan within Study Corridor

### 2.6.2 MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) Bus Rapid Transit

The MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) corridor was conceptualized in the Countywide Transit Corridors Functional Master Plan that was adopted by the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission in 2013. The main aim of the Master Plan was to recommend measures that would significantly enhance the quality and level of transit service offerings to Montgomery County's developed areas and regions earmarked for new or redevelopment. The Master Plan proposed the implementation of a 102-mile, BRT network to meet current and future mobility needs of Montgomery County and identified 11 suitable transportation corridors to implement such a system. The 8.5 -mile corridor along MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) between Colesville Park \& Ride and the District of Columbia Line was identified as a prime BRT route (Figure 6). This is because it traverses the emerging mixed-use center at White Oak and the activity centers of Langley Park and Takoma Park. In addition, MD 650
(New Hampshire Avenue) experiences high traffic volumes in the southbound direction during morning peak and high traffic volumes in the northbound direction during evening time peak. It can be observed from Figure 6 that a portion of the proposed BRT route on MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) runs along the 1.2mile study corridor under consideration in this Road Safety Audit. Two proposed BRT stops also lie within the RSA study area. These stops are located at the intersections of MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) \& Capital Beltway (I-495) and MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) \& Northampton Drive, respectively. The Master Plan also recommended the repurposing of an existing lane within the study limits of the RSA to accommodate a dedicated BRT lane on MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue).


Figure 6: Proposed BRT Section within the Study Corridor

### 2.6.3 Prince George's County Pedestrian Safety Improvements on Metzerott Road

Under the Pedestrian Safety CIP Improvement program, Prince George's County Department of Public Works and Transportation has approved the following improvement works along Metzerott Road from New Hampshire Avenue to the intersection with Adelphi Road, a 0.87-mile segment:

- Provision of concrete sidewalk as a shared use path on the westbound and eastbound directions
- Fine Milling and Resurfacing along Metzerott Road
- Roadway Lighting
- New RRFB signal (approximately 1900 feet from MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue))
- New Bus Stops (approximately 1300 feet from MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) in westbound direction and approximately 1450 feet from MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) in eastbound direction

It should be noted that the five pedestrian safety improvements mentioned above is likely to impact the study corridor in ways which include but is not limited to:

- Increased pedestrian volume at the junction with MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) due to NEW bus stops on the eastbound and westbound directions of Metzerott Road near the MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue)/ Metzerott Road intersection

As a result, there is an additional need to consider further pedestrian infrastructure/facilities at the intersection of Metzerott Road and MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue). Figure 7 shows the extent of the proposed CIP pedestrian safety improvement.


Figure 7: Metzerott Road: Extent of CIP Safety Improvement Works

### 2.6.4 Maryland Department of Transportation Purple Line

The Maryland Department of Transportation Maryland Transit Administration (MDOT MTA) Purple Line is a 16-mile light rail that spans from Bethesda in Montgomery County to New Carrollton in Prince George's County. After construction, the Purple Line will offer a direct connection to the Red, Green and Orange Lines of the Metrorail at Bethesda, Silver Spring, College Park and New Carrolton. The Purple Line will also connect to the MARC, Amtrak, and local bus services. An overview of the general alignment of the Purple Line is shown in Figure 8. As seen, the Purple Line will have 21 stations upon completion. Two of these stations will be approximately 1 mile south of the HIN study corridor along MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue). Additionally, one station would be located across from the Takoma-Langley Transit Center in the center of University Boulevard East while the other will be in the center of University Boulevard East near the intersection of University Boulevard East \& MD 320 (Piney Branch Road). Proximity of these stations to the MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) corridor could lead to an increase in multimodal traffic in the study area.


Figure 8: MDOT Purple Line Route Alignment

### 2.7 Public Transit and Ridership

There are three transit services available to commuters within the study limits. These services include Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (WMATA) routes C8 and K6, Montgomery County Ride On (Ride On) routes 20 and 24, and University of Maryland (UMD) Shuttle-UM route 108.

WMATA bus route C8 runs east-west along Adelphi Road and north-south along the MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) (from Adelphi Road, northward). This route begins at Fort Totten Station in Washington DC and ends at White Oak in Silver Spring, MD. WMATA bus route C8 has stops along the northern portion of study corridor and Adelphi Road. WMATA bus route K6 runs north-south throughout the entirety of the study corridor along MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) and east-west along Northampton Drive and Southampton Drive. This route begins at Marinelli Road/Rockville Pike and ends at College Park Station. WMATA bus route K6 has bus stops along the study corridor; north of Northampton Drive, and bus stops very close to the study corridor on Northampton Drive and Southampton Drive respectively. Ride On bus routes 20 and 24 run east-west along MD 320 (Piney Branch Road) and north-south along MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue); throughout the entire study corridor. These two bus routes have several stops directly on the MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) HIN, Northampton Drive, and Southampton Drive. Shuttle-UM bus route 108 run east-west along Metzerott Road and north-south along (from Metzerott Road to Oakview Drive). Ride On route 20 runs from Silver Spring, MD to Powder Mill Road while Ride On route 24 runs from Takoma Station/Bay H to Powder Mill Road. Shuttle-UM bus route 108 has stops along MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue), Metzerott Road, and Mt. Pisgah Road. The bus route runs from Regent Drive Garage to Mt Pisgah Road at Chateau Apartment.

Bus stops are identified along MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) by WMATA, Ride On, and Shuttle-UM signage which contain details regarding route information. Bus stop shelters are provided at the following locations:

- MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) southbound at Oakview Drive
- Location: Near side of intersection
- WMATA Stop ID: 2000321
- Ride On Stop ID: 24492
- MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) northbound at Oakview Drive
- Location: Near side of intersection
- WMATA Stop ID: 2000319
- Ride On Stop ID: 24462

Figure 9 show the locations of WMATA, Ride On, and UMD Shuttle-UM stops bus routes and bus stops within the study corridor.


Figure 9: WMATA, RideOn, and UMD Transit Routes
Table 5 presents data regarding WMATA, Ride On, and UMD Shuttle-UM bus stop ID numbers at each stop and the level of utilization at each stop (i.e., daily boarding and alighting) respectively. Approximately 1533
passengers on average use transit services along the study corridor daily. There are 5 bus stop locations in the southbound direction and 6 bus stop locations in the northbound direction. The northbound and southbound stop locations at Oakview Drive have the highest level of utilization serving almost 49\% of all passengers. The locations with the second and third highest level of utilization is northbound MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) at Adelphi Road and at Fox Street which serves approximately $13 \%$ and $15 \%$ of all passengers, respectively. The average daily WMATA ridership was 808 passengers in total in 2019. More than half of these passengers (i.e., 53\%) used the northbound and southbound Oakview stop locations. The Adelphi and Dilston stop location was also heavily utilized, serving $20 \%$ of daily passengers. With respect to Ride On average daily ridership, the two Ride On bus routes (i.e., 20 and 24) which run along the study corridor combined to serve a total of 340 passengers in 2019. Riders predominantly utilized the near side intersection bus stops at MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) and Oakview Drive along these routes. The far side intersection bus stops at Dilston Road and MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) SB, Fox Street and MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) NB had very low ridership. The midblock bus stop along northbound MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) near Madre Street also had very low ridership utilization. Shuttle-UM route 108 served a total of 385 passengers between January and February 2022. Approximately $28 \%$ of daily passengers utilized the bus stop location at MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) and Metzerott Road while $22 \%$ of riders used the bus stop at MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) and Adelphi Road. The bus stops at MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) and Fox Street and MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) and Oakview Drive served approximately $27 \%$ and $22 \%$ respectively.

Table 5: Average Ridership on the Transit Routes

| Location | Direction | Transit Agency | Stop ID |  |  | Alighting(Passengers) | Onboarding <br> (Passengers) | Percentage of Transit Users Served |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | WMATA | Ride On | UMD |  |  |  |
| New Hampshire Avenue (MD 650) at Oakview Drive | Southbound | WMATA / Ride On | 2000321 | 24492 | - | 233 | 87 | 21\% |
| New Hampshire Avenue (MD 650) at Dilston Road |  | WMATA / Ride On / UMD | 2000305 | 24488 | SB | 76 | 24 | 7\% |
| New Hampshire Avenue (MD 650) at Fox Street |  | WMATA / Ride On | 2000279 | 28886 | - | 9 | 6 | 1\% |
| New Hampshire Avenue (MD 650) at Northampton Drive |  | WMATA | 3004275 | - | - | 61 | 3 | 4\% |
| New Hampshire Avenue (MD 650) at Metzerott Road |  | UMD | - | - | SB | 64 | 7 | 5\% |
| New Hampshire Avenue (MD 650) at Oakview Drive | Northbound | WMATA / Ride On / UMD | 2000319 | 24462 | NB | 104 | 327 | 28\% |
| New Hampshire Avenue (MD 650) at Madre Street |  | WMATA / Ride On | 24460 | 24460 | - | 0 | 3 | < 1\% |
| New Hampshire Avenue (MD 650) at Adelphi Road |  | WMATA / Ride On / UMD | 2000302 | 24458 | NB | 65 | 140 | 13\% |
| New Hampshire Avenue (MD 650) at Fox Street |  | WMATA / Ride On / UMD | 2000283 | 24456 | NB | 77 | 149 | 15\% |
| New Hampshire Avenue (MD 650) at Northampton Drive |  | WMATA | 3004276 | - | - | 3 | 56 | 4\% |
| New Hampshire Avenue (MD 650) at Metzerott Road |  | UMD | - | - | NB | 9 | 30 | 2\% |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  | 701 | 832 | 100\% |

### 3.0 CRASH DATA SUMMARY

This section summarizes the crash history received from Maryland Department of Transportation (MDOT) for the period from January 1, 2015, to December 31, 2019, for the study corridor - MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) from MD 320 (Piney Branch Road) junction to I-495 (Capital Beltway) interchange. Total crash history included 625 crashes, involving 1,378 vehicles and 1,814 people. The data has been reviewed and summarized in the following section.

### 3.1 Crash Severtit

Crash severities analyzed and discussed in this section of the Road Safety Audit (RSA) Report include fatal, serious, and minor injury crashes. These crash severities are translated from MDOT injury descriptions, summarized below in Table 6:

Table 6: Crash Descriptions

| No | MDOT SHA Description | MCDOT Description |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Fatal crashes | Fatal crashes |
| 2 | Incapacitating/disabling injury crashes | Serious injury crashes |
| 3 | Non incapacitating injury crashes | Minor injury crashes |

The crash severities discussed in subsequent sections uses the MCDOT descriptions presented in Table 6. It should be noted that possible incapacitating injury crashes and Property Damage Only (PDO) crashes are omitted in this analysis. This is to be consistent with Vision Zero Plan to eliminate fatalities and serious injuries crashes.

Figure 10 presents the overall crash frequency grouped by pedestrian/bicycle crashes and vehicular crashes along the study corridor between 2015 and 2019. There were 175 vehicular crashes including 17 that involved pedestrians or bicyclists.


Figure 10: Overall Crash Frequency by Year (2015-2019)

Out of the 175 crashes, there were 3 fatal crashes, 19 serious injury crashes, and 153 minor injury crashes along the study corridor from 2015 to 2019.

### 3.1.1 Fatal Crashes

Figure 11, shows fatal crashes from 2015 to 2019 by road user type.


Figure 11: Fatal Crash Frequency by Year (2015-2019)
The 3 fatal crashes occurred at the following locations:

1. Intersection of MD 650 (New Hampshire Drive) at Oakview Drive
2. Intersection of MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) at Northampton Drive
3. Intersection of MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) at Metzerott Road

From available data, the fatal crashes affected vehicle occupants (1 driver and 1 passenger) and 2 pedestrians. The crash locations involving pedestrians occurred at the intersection of MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) at Oakview Drive and the intersection of MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) at Metzerott Road. The crash at Metzerott Road occurred during daylight, under dry surface condition and was attributed to a same movement angle collision. The crash at Oakview Drive occurred under dark condition (lights on) and dry surface condition. Figure 12 presents the geospatial distribution and the attributes of the crashes. 2 out of the 3 fatal crashes were as a result of same movement angle collision under dry surface conditions.


Figure 12: Geospatial Distribution of Fatal Crashes
3.1.2 Serious Injury Crash Frequency by Year

Figure 13 shows the number of serious injury crashes between 2015 and 2019.


Figure 13: Crash Frequency for Serious Injuries by Year (2015-2019)
There were 19 serious injury crashes between 2015 and 2019 within the study corridor. These included 1 crash involving a bicyclist and 9 crashes involving pedestrians.

Figure 14 shows the spatial distribution and other attributes of the serious injury crashes.


Figure 14: Serious Injury Crash Sites (2015-2019)

From Figure 15, out of the 153 minor injury crashes, there were 5 crashes that affected pedestrians. Figure 16 shows the general locations of the minor injury crashes within the study corridor and period. Some of the dots in Figure 16 represents multiple crashes.


Figure 15: Crash Frequency for Minor Injuries by Year (2015-2019)


Figure 16: Minor Injury Crash Locations (2015-2019)

### 3.2 Crash/Collision Type

Figure 17 and Table $\mathbf{7}$ summarize the crash collision type by severity along the study corridor between 2015 and 2019. There are 3 fatal crashes that affected a vehicle occupant, a driver and 2 pedestrians. 2 of the 3 fatal crashes were attributed to same movement angle collision. From Table 7, same direction rear end collisions contributed $54 \%$ of the crashes. Same movement angle and same direction right turn contributed $16 \%$ and $4 \%$ respectively. Both head on left turn and single vehicle contributed $3 \%$ of the crashes. Same direction sideswipe collisions contributed $2 \%$ of the crashes.


Figure 17: Crash Collision Type by Severity

Table 7: Crash Collision Type by Severity

| Collision type/Crash Type | Fatal Crash | Serious Injury Crash | Minor Injury Crash | Sub Total <br> (Number) | Sub Total <br> (Percentage) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Same Direction Rear End | 0 | 5 | 89 | 94 | $54 \%$ |
| Same Movement Angle | 2 | 5 | 21 | 28 | $16 \%$ |
| Same Direction Right Turn | 0 | 0 | 7 | 7 | $4 \%$ |
| Head On Left Turn | 0 | 0 | 6 | 6 |  |
| Single Vehicle | 0 | 3 | 2 | $5 \%$ |  |
| Same Direction Sideswipe | 0 | 0 | 4 | $3 \%$ |  |
| Unknown/NA/Other | 1 | 6 | 24 | $2 \%$ |  |
|  | 19 | 153 | 31 | $18 \%$ |  |

### 3.3 Crash by Time of Day

Figure 18 and Table 8 summarize the peak hour crashes by severity. $37 \%$ of the total crashes occurred during the midday (9AM - 4PM). The 3 fatal crashes occurred during the PM peak (4PM - 7PM), midday (9AM 4PM) Peak and pre-AM Peak (12AM - 6AM) times respectively. The lowest number of crashes were during the AM peak (6AM - 9AM) time totaling $10 \%$.


Figure 18: Crashes by Time of Day by Severity

Table 8: Crashes by Time of Day by Severity

| Time | Fatal Crash | Serious Injury Crash | Minor Injury Crash | Sub Total <br> (Number) | Sub Total <br> (Percentage) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pre-AM Peak (12-6AM) | 1 | 5 | 18 | 24 |  |
| AM Peak (6-9AM) | 0 | 1 | 17 | $14 \%$ |  |
| Midday (9AM -4PM) | 1 | 7 | 56 | 64 |  |
| PM Peak (4-7PM) | 1 | 2 | 30 | $37 \%$ |  |
| Post-PM Peak (7PM -12AM) | 0 | 4 | 32 | 33 | $19 \%$ |
| Total | 3 | 19 | 153 | 36 | $21 \%$ |

### 3.4 Crash by Lighting Condition

Table 9 and Figure 19 present a summary of the crash severity by lighting conditions. $54 \%$ and $37 \%$ of the crashes occurred during daylight and dark (with lights on) conditions respectively. $2 \%$ of the crashes occurred under dark (with lights off). 1\% of crashes occurred at Dusk and 4\% occurred at dawn.

The fatal crash involving a pedestrian at MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) and Oakview Drive occurred while the pedestrian was crossing MD 650, in a crosswalk, during dark conditions (with lights on). The fatal crash at Northampton Drive also occurred during dark conditions, however the overhead lighting conditions were recorded as unknown.


Figure 19: Crashes by Lighting Condition by Severity

Table 9: Crashes by Lighting Condition by Severity

| Lighting Condition | Fatal <br> Crash | Serious Injury Crash | Minor Injury Crash | Sub Total <br> (Number) | Sub Total <br> (Percentage) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Daylight | 1 | 6 | 87 | 94 | $54 \%$ |
| Dusk | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | $1 \%$ |
| Dawn | 0 | 2 | 5 | 7 | $4 \%$ |
| Dark (Lights on) | 1 | 8 | 55 | 64 | $37 \%$ |
| Dark (Lights off) | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | $2 \%$ |
| Not Applicable/Unknown | 1 | 2 | 3 | 6 | $3 \%$ |
| Total | 3 | 19 | 153 | 175 | $100 \%$ |

### 3.5 Crash by Weather and Surface Conditions

Table 10 presents a summary of the crash severity by weather condition at the time of the crash. $48 \%$ of the crashes occur during clear weather while $10 \%$ of the crashes occurred under rainy condition. All the fatal crashes occurred under clear weather conditions. In addition, 8 out of the 19 serious injury crashes occurred under clear weather conditions.

Table 10: Crashes by Weather Condition by Severity

| Weather Conditon | Fatal Crash | Serious Injury Crash | Minor Injury Crash | Sub Total <br> (Number) | Sub Total <br> (Percentage) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Clear | 3 | 8 | 73 | 84 |  |
| Cloudy | 0 | 2 | 4 | $68 \%$ |  |
| Raining | 0 | 1 | 16 | 17 |  |
| Wintry Mix | 0 | 0 | 1 | 17 | $10 \%$ |
| N/A/Other | 0 | 8 | 59 | 1 | $1 \%$ |
| Total | 3 | 19 | 153 | 67 | $38 \%$ |

Looking at Table 11 and Figure 20, the 3 fatal crashes occurred under dry surface condition. Overall, most crashes occurred under dry surface conditions (128 crashes/73\% of total crashes), while much of the remainder occurred under wet surface conditions ( 24 crashes $/ 14 \%$ of total crashes). 1 crashes occurred under snowy/icy surface conditions.

Table 11: Crashes by Surface Condition by Severity

| Surface Conditon | Fatal Crash | Serious Injury Crash | Minor Injury Crash | Sub Total <br> (Number) | Sub Total <br> (Percentage) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Wet | 0 | 2 | 22 | 24 |  |
| Dry | 3 | 15 | 110 | $14 \%$ |  |
| Ice/Snow | 0 | 1 | 0 | 128 |  |
| Unknown/NA | 0 | 1 | 21 | 1 |  |
| Total | 3 | 19 | 153 | 22 | $1 \%$ |

Surface Condition during Crash (2015-2019)


Figure 20: Crashes by Surface Condition

### 3.6 Pedestrians and Bicyclists involved in Crashes by Severity

Table 12 presents a summary of crashes that involved pedestrians and bicyclist by injury severity. It shows that 2 out of the 3 fatal crashes involved pedestrians, 10 out of the 19 serious injury crashes involved 1 bicyclist and 9 pedestrians while 5 out of 153 minor injury crashes involved pedestrian.

Table 12: Pedestrian and Bicyclists involved in Crashes by Severity

|  | Fatal Crash | Serious Injury Crash | Minor Injury Crash | Sub Total <br> (Number) | Sub Total <br> (Percentage) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bicyclist | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | $6 \%$ |
| Pedestrian | 2 | 9 | 5 | 16 | $94 \%$ |
| Total | 2 | 10 | 5 | 17 | $100 \%$ |

### 4.0 FIELD REVIEW AND OBSERVATIONS

A field walk assessment was conducted by the RSA team on March 29, 2022, along MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) between Piney Brach Road (MD 320) and Capital Beltway (l-495). The field assessment reviewed several categories of pedestrians, bicyclists, and motorists' safety concerns within the study limits. These issues related to pedestrian, bicyclist, and motorist safety within the study limits. The safety concerns identified during the field walk assessment are highlighted and summarized in the following sections. The photographs which correspond to these field observations are illustrated in Appendix C.

### 4.1 PaVement Conditions and Markings

The condition of thermoplastic pavement markings along the MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) was visually evaluated. The thermoplastic pavement markings within the study area were in good condition. However, there were several intersection locations with pedestrian sidewalk ramps present but no crosswalk markings, deteriorated (i.e., faded) crosswalk markings, or crosswalks with limited visibility to approaching drivers. These locations include:

- MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) at MD 320 (Piney Branch Road)
- Missing crosswalk markings due to patching road repair on utility cut - southwest crosswalk crossing the channelized right turn lane
- MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) at Southampton Drive
- Missing crosswalk markings and stop lines at pedestrian sidewalk ramps - west leg crossing Southampton Drive
- MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) at Northampton Drive
- Missing crosswalk markings and stop line along - west leg crossing Northampton Drive
- Faded crosswalk markings - south intersection leg crossing MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue)
- Avenel Road at MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) and Northampton Drive intersection
- Missing crosswalk markings and stop lines at pedestrian sidewalk ramps - crossing Avenel Road
- Fox Street
- Missing crosswalk markings and stop lines at pedestrian sidewalk ramps - east leg crossing Fox Street
- 9810 New Hampshire Avenue (service road) at sidewalk connection to mainline MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) at I-495 (Capital Beltway) eastbound off-ramp (28B) signalized intersection.
- Missing crosswalk markings across New Hampshire Avenue service road that connects the existing pedestrian ramp to the existing sidewalk. A pedestrian ramp on the west side of New Hampshire Avenue service road is also not present.


### 4.2 Sidewalk Condition

Sidewalk and trailhead conditions were assessed based on the overall state of the sidewalk or trailhead surface and the adequacy of the effective width for pedestrians. There were numerous sidewalk locations the MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) within the limits of the study corridor which were in a general state
of disrepair. The sidewalk facilities at the following locations require reconstruction due to poor surface conditions:

- Pedestrian Refuge Island at west intersection leg of MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) at MD 320 (Piney Branch Road)
- There is no concrete surface on some sections of the sidewalk.
- MD 320 (Piney Branch Road) north sidewalk
- Entrance to Anacostia River trail system is unpaved and obstructed with foliage.
- MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) west sidewalk between Piney Branch (MD 320) and Southampton Drive
- Sidewalk surface is spalled.
- No buffer between roadway and sidewalk.
- Curb height was estimated to be less than 4 inches.
- MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) west sidewalk at MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) and Capital Beltway (I-495)
- Buildup of debris on sidewalk ramp at Capital Beltway (I-495) Ramp 6 merge could be attributed to flooding or poor drainage.

There were several areas within the study limits where sidewalk facilities either presented pedestrian trip hazards or provided insufficient horizontal or vertical clearance for pedestrians. Some of these areas include:

- MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) West sidewalk between Piney Branch (MD 320) and Southampton Drive
- Utility pole and vegetation along sidewalk limit effective sidewalk width for pedestrians.
- Low-hanging speed limit sign limits vertical height clearance for pedestrians.
- Foliage along sidewalk limits effective sidewalk width for pedestrians.
- MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) west sidewalk between Southampton Drive and Metzerott Road
- Sidewalk is cracked and uneven.
- "Traffic Signal at Piney Branch Road" sign limits vertical height clearance for pedestrians.
- MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) west sidewalk between Metzerott Road and Northampton Drive
- Sidewalk is cracked and uneven.
- MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) west sidewalk between Northampton Drive and Dilston/Adelphi Road
- Overgrown trees cause pedestrians to utilize roadway to avoid obstruction on sidewalk.
- Foliage reduces effective sidewalk width for pedestrians.
- MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) west and east sidewalk at MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) and Capital Beltway (I-495)
- Metal storm drain covers on east and west sidewalks (approximately 500 feet and 250 feet from Capital Beltway (I-495) Ramps 28A and 28B, respectively) are not secured which creates a trip hazard.


### 4.3 ADA COMPLIANCE

The ADA compliance of sidewalk facilities throughout the study corridor was visually evaluated based on the presence of sidewalk ramps at crosswalks, overall characteristics of sidewalk ramps, effective sidewalk width for pedestrians at ramp landings, presence of detectable warning surfaces (DWS), availability of accessible pedestrian signals (APS) and position of pedestrian push buttons. There were various locations along MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) where pedestrian sidewalk and ramp facilities did not appear to be ADA compliant based on visual inspection. These locations include:

- MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) west sidewalk between Metzerott Road and Northampton Drive
- Insufficient pedestrian landing area on midblock pedestrian refuge island and corresponding sidewalk ramps at pedestrian crossing facility at 7-Eleven access driveway.
- No DWS at midblock pedestrian refuge island and sidewalk ramps at 7-Eleven access driveway.
- Northampton Drive median at MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) and Northampton Drive
- There are no pedestrian ramps in the southwest corner of the intersection to cross the channelized eastbound right turn lane, or to access the channelization island from any direction
- There is no sidewalk on the eastbound right turn channelization island in the southwest corner to facilitate pedestrian movement.
- There are no pedestrian ramps in the northeast, southeast, and northwest corners of the intersection to facilitate pedestrian crossings of MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue).
- There are no pedestrian ramps or curb cuts in the narrow concrete median along the eastbound Northampton Drive approach to allow pedestrians to safely cross Northampton Drive.
- There is no APS located on any pedestrian movement except for the southwest channelization island, which appears to be broken as it gave no audible feedback when pushed.
- MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) at Fox Street
- No detectable warning surface (DWS) on sidewalk ramps at Fox Street
- MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) at Dilston/Adelphi Road
- Insufficient pedestrian landing area on median between MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) and Fox Street. Adjacent DWSs on the east leg Adelphi Road median cut-through are not a minimum of 2 feet away from each other.
- Insufficient pedestrian landing area on median at Adelphi Road.
- MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) east sidewalk between Dilston/Adelphi Road and Oakview Drive
- Traveling northbound, the only sidewalk present is along the east side of the service road. This sidewalk ends approximately halfway between Adelphi Road and Oakview Drive, and with no ADA connection to the sidewalk along the east side of New Hampshire Avenue, which continues north to Oakview Drive.
- MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) at Oakview Drive
- APS push button in the northwest corner of the intersection (to facilitate crossing MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue)) was estimated to be greater than the 4 feet maximum distance from ramp landing.
- APS push button in northwest corner of intersection does not operate as designed or intended (does not vibrate).
- Redundant pedestrian push button (i.e., two push buttons) at northeast corner of intersection.
- Mt. Pisgah Road east Sidewalk
- Surface is unpaved and concrete sidewalk is completely missing. It should be noted however, that this sidewalk fell outside the scope of this study.
- 9801 MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) (service road) east Sidewalk between Oakview Drive and Capital Beltway (I-495) Ramp 28A merge lane
- Surface is unpaved and concrete sidewalk is completely missing along west and east sides of 9801 MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) (service road).
- There is no sidewalk ramp along the west side of New Hampshire Avenue (service road) near 9801 MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) (service road), despite there being a connection to the sidewalk along southbound mainline New Hampshire Avenue across the street.
- New Hampshire Avenue (west) sidewalk at MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) and Capital Beltway (I-495) southbound Off-ramp
- Slope of pedestrian access ramp to 9801 MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) (service road) is estimated to be greater than $8 \%$.

It should be noted that a detailed ADA study was not completed as part of this study.

### 4.4 LIGHTING CONDItIons

Existing lighting infrastructure along the MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) study corridor appeared to be adequate (based on field observations) in the southern sections of the study limits. However, the absence of lighting in portions of the northern part of the study corridor was of particular concern because it also limited the ability of motorists to safely detect the presence of crossing pedestrians at nightfall. There is a lack lighting infrastructure at the following locations along MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue):

- MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) east and west sides between Oakview Drive and Capital Beltway (I-495)
- MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) east and west sides under Capital Beltway (I-495) overpass bridge
- Crosswalk at MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) northbound and the ramp to Capital Beltway (I495) Inner and Outer Loops.
- Crosswalk at MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) northbound and the ramp from Capital Beltway (I495) Inner loop. However, it should be noted that lighting is provided in advance of the crosswalk on the ramp.
- Crosswalk at MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) southbound and the ramp from Capital Beltway (I495) Inner loop.
- MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) west side between Northampton Drive and Oakview Drive (corridor lighting).
- Crosswalk at MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) channelized southbound right turn at MD 320 (Piney Branch Road).
- Crosswalk at MD 320 (Piney Branch Road) eastbound right turn at MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue)
- Pedestrian refuge island at the northwest corner of MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) at MD 320 (Piney Branch Road)


### 4.5 ROADWAY SIGNING

Signing along MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) within the study corridor limits was visually assessed for visibility, clarity, appropriateness, and orientation relative to approaching traffic. Most of the signing throughout the study area was in a good overall condition but there were a few road signs that required replacement, relocation, or removal. These signs were located at:

- MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) Median between MD 320 (Piney Branch Road) and Southampton Drive
- Posted speed limit for MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) northbound was not reduced from 40 mph to 35 mph even though the posted speed limit on the other segments of the study area was recently reduced to 35 mph . Additionally, this roadway segment is on a steep incline and potentially slow down a vehicle unless the driver accelerates.
- MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) at Metzerott Road
- Metzerott Road street sign attached to traffic signal pole is faded and barely visible to drivers along MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) due to its location - at west sidewalk. Additionally, there is an overhead Metzerott Road street sign on the traffic signal mast arm at the intersection which makes the signing on the sidewalk redundant.
- MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) at Dilston Road / Adelphi Road
- The standalone signpost should be removed - WMATA Bus Stop 2000305 on MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) west sidewalk.
- The stop sign on the Fox Road (service road) northbound approach to Adelphi Road does not align with the stop line, potentially creating confusion as to where motorists should stop.
- Service Road along northbound MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) between Dilston Road / Adelphi Road and Oakview Drive
- Madre Street sign is not secured and hanging off of utility pole number 805428.


### 4.6 Signalization

Issues related to signal operations at signalized intersections along the study corridor were identified through visual analysis. No obvious or apparent concerns were observed with respect to the signal operations at three of the five signalized intersections within the study limits. However, potential signalization issues are detected at two intersections. They are as follows:

- MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) at Metzerott Road
- A pedestrian was left stranded at the north leg MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) median while completing a crossing indicating a need to review pedestrian crossing times and clearance intervals at intersection.
- MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) at Dilston Road / Adelphi Road
- Signal phasing serving eastbound (i.e., Dilston Road) and westbound (i.e., Adelphi Road) intersection approaches is concurrent. That is, all eastbound and westbound movements share the same green time as well as the same crossing time with the crosswalk along the south intersection leg. There are conflicts between westbound vehicles turning left, eastbound through traffic, eastbound vehicles turning right, and pedestrians crossing the south leg of the intersection.


### 4.7 Sight Distance

It should be noted that a formal sight distance evaluation/measurement was not completed as part of this study. Sight lines between pedestrians crossing the channelized southbound right turn lane at MD 320 (Piney Branch Road) and oncoming southbound right turning vehicles appear to be limited by the retaining wall on the west side of MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) southbound approach.

### 4.8 ROADWAY Operations

### 4.8.1 Driver Behavior

Between 33,000 and 67,00 vehicles are estimated to travel along the MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) corridor daily. The following observations made by the field audit team relating to driver behavior include the following:

- During the AM and PM peaks, there is significant queuing along northbound MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue), which extend from the on-ramp to Capital Beltway (l-495) Inner and Outer Loops, back through Oakview Drive, and toward Adelphi Road. This traffic congestion appears to be influenced by heavy congestion on Capital Beltway (l-495), heavy volumes of northbound MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) traffic seeking to access Capital Beltway (I-495) via the on-ramp, and last-minute lane changes along northbound Capital Beltway (I-495) by motorists attempted to "cutin" to the outermost northbound lane to access the on-ramps.
- Vehicles were observed not coming to a full and complete stop on the Fox Road (service road) stopcontrolled approach at Adelphi Road, immediately parallel to MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue). This is concerning due to the mix of signalized and stop-controlled approaches in immediate proximity to one another, especially considering the dual left turn lanes from southbound MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) that can conflict with northbound right turning lanes from Fox Road (service road).
- Vehicles were observed taking several turns at high speeds to/from MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) which is a potential safety issue because of potential conflicts with pedestrians:
- Northbound ramp to Capital Beltway (I-495) eastbound/westbound Inner and Outer loops
- Northbound ramp from Capital Beltway (I-495) eastbound Inner loop
- Southbound ramp to Capital Beltway (I-495) eastbound Inner loop
- Eastbound right at Northampton Drive
- Southbound right at Southampton Drive
- Northbound left at Southampton Drive
- Southbound right at MD 320 (Piney Branch Road)


### 4.8.2 Pedestrian Behavior

During the field audit assessment, pedestrians were observed crossing MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) at unmarked and midblock crosswalks throughout the study corridor. In addition, there were a few areas within the study limits where the location of crossing facilities placed pedestrian safety at risk due to limited motorist sight distance, motorist behavior, and/or miscellaneous hazards. These areas included:

- MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) at MD 320 (Piney Branch Road) Northwest crosswalk
- Limited pedestrian visibility at crosswalk for southbound approach vehicles turning right (i.e., westbound) onto MD 320 (Piney Branch Road).
- MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) at MD 320 (Piney Branch Road) Southwest crosswalk
- Limited pedestrian visibility at crosswalk for eastbound approach vehicles turning right (i.e., southbound) onto MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue).
- MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) at Southampton Drive west intersection leg crossing
- Limited visibility for southbound New Hampshire Avenue right turning vehicles seeing pedestrians crossing Southampton Drive from north to south, due to an existing berm and landscaping. A larger curb radius in the northwest corner of the intersection, and existing downward slope along southbound New Hampshire Avenue, allow for vehicle to make right turns at higher speeds. This increases the risk potential when turning vehicles conflict with crossing pedestrians.


### 4.8.3 Bicyclist Behavior

Under the existing conditions along MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue), bicyclists are permitted to share the full lane with motorists in both directions based on posted signs. However, many bicyclists using the corridor appeared to prefer using the sidewalks, likely due to the heavy traffic volumes and higher speeds in New Hampshire Avenue travel lanes.

### 4.9 Utility Poles and Signpost Conditions

The condition of utility poles and signposts were visually inspected throughout the study corridor to determine whether they were structurally sound or required urgent replacement. The structural integrity of most utility poles and signposts along MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) was satisfactory but there were a few utility poles and signposts that appeared to be in critical condition. These utility poles were located at:

- MD 320 (Piney Branch Road) north sidewalk near MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) and MD 320 (Piney Branch Road) eastbound.
- Wooden utility pole located approximately 150 feet from intersection is eroded at base.
- MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) Median at Southampton Drive
- Wooden signpost for "Metzerott Road / University of Maryland Next Signal" sign is not anchored to ground on one side and sways in the wind.
- MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) Median between Metzerott Road and Northampton Drive
- Wooden signpost is not anchored to ground on one side and sways in the wind.
- Service Road along northbound MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) between Dilston Road / Adelphi Road and Oakview Drive
- Wooden utility pole on west sidewalk (approximately 250 feet from Adelphi Road) is broken at the mid-section of pole and leaning east towards Madre Street


### 4.10 Other Observations

There were several miscellaneous hazards along MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) which could not be clearly categorized but posed safety risks to pedestrians, bicyclists, and motorists. These hazards included:

- MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) at MD 320 (Piney Branch Road) Pedestrian Refuge Island
- Old Detour sign is lying near curbside in rightmost lane on MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) southbound.
- MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) west sidewalk at MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) and Metzerott Road
- Cables exposed at the base of traffic signal pole at southwest intersection corner
- MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) east sidewalk between Metzerott Road and Northampton Drive.
- Old utility pole lying along sidewalk (approximately 300 feet from MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) at Northampton Drive.
- Old road sign lying on sidewalk (approximately 75 feet from MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) at Northampton Drive.
- Northampton Drive north sidewalk at MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) and Northampton Drive
- Bus shelter missing at WMATA bus stop 2000269
- MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) Median between Northampton Drive and Fox Street
- Traffic drum randomly placed near curb edge along leftmost lane on MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) southbound approximately 120 feet from MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) at Fox Street intersection.
- New Hampshire Avenue east sidewalk between MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) northbound at Capital Beltway (I-495) eastbound/westbound On-ramp and MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) at Capital Beltway (I-495)
- Tree growing from storm drain near road edge along rightmost lane on MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) northbound


### 5.0 SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDED IMPROVEMENTS

Based on field review, observations and analysis of available data, potential improvements were identified that could address safety issues identified within the New Hampshire Avenue study corridor. These recommendations are compiled by timeframe (expected time to completed from point of project initiation), including Short-Term (0-12 months) and Long-Term (12+ months), as well as by relative cost, including low (< \$100k), medium (\$100k - \$250k) and high (>\$250k).

Recommendations are presented in Table 13 though Table 28. Each table represents a major intersection or road segment along MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue), beginning with the MD 320 (Piney Branch Road) and ending with the l-495 interchange at the north end of the study area.

Appendix C summarizes the observations made during the safety field walk audit completed on March 29, 2022.

Table 13: Recommendations for MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) at MD 320 (Piney Branch Road)

| Location 1: MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) at MD 320 (Piney Branch Road) - Signalized Intersection |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Issue <br> No. | Safety Issue/Observations | Recommendation (Responsible Agency) | Timeframe | Relative Cost |
| 1.1 | The pavement at the entrance to the Northwest Branch Trail of the Anacostia Tributary Trail System is damaged and covered in foliage along the north side of Piney Branch Road, west of New Hampshire Avenue. | Clear foliage and consider repaving the entrance to the Northwest Branch Trail, located along the north side of Piney Branch Road, west of New Hampshire Avenue. (MDOT/PGCDPW\&T) | Short-Term | Low |
| 1.2 | Missing sidewalk section within the pedestrian refuge island at northwest corner of the intersection of MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) at MD 320 (Piney Branch Road). | Repair or reconstruct the sidewalk at the northwest corner of the intersection of MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) at MD 320 (Piney Branch Road). (MDOT/PGCDPW\&T) | Short-Term | Low |
| 1.3 | There is a damaged utility pole located 25 feet west of the northwest crosswalk at MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) and MD 320 (Piney Branch Road). | Contact PEPCO to perform structural analysis and replace/reinforce wood utility pole at northwest, as necessary. Add reflective warning marker (OM-3L) to the utility pole. (PSI has notified PEPCO) | Short-Term | Low |
| 1.4 | Pedestrian crosswalk has poor visibility between motorists and pedestrians at northwest and southwest corners of MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) at MD 320 (Piney Branch Road), crossing the southbound right and eastbound right vehicle movements, respectively. | Along the southbound MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) and the eastbound MD 320 (Piney Branch Road) approaches, replace the existing advance pedestrian warning sign configurations by removing the existing "AHEAD" (W16-9P) plaque and replaced with "ACROSS RAMP" plaque to warn incoming turning vehicles of the pedestrian crossing across channelized turn. (MDOT/PGCDPW\&T) | Short-Term | Low |
| 1.5 | Pedestrian crosswalk has poor visibility between motorists and pedestrians at northwest and southwest corners of MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) at MD 320 (Piney Branch Road), crossing the southbound right and eastbound right vehicle movements, respectively. | If feasible, install flex posts or quick curb to effectively narrow and/or tighten the channelized right turn lanes from southbound MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) and eastbound MD 320 (Piney Branch Road) to slow incoming vehicles and reduce pedestrian crossing distance. This could also include relocation of crosswalk and pedestrian ramps to shorten crossing distance and improve sight distance. (MDOT/PGCDPW\&T) | Short-Term | Medium |


| 1.6 | Pedestrian crosswalk has poor visibility between motorists and pedestrians at northwest and southwest corners of MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) at MD 320 (Piney Branch Road), crossing the southbound right and eastbound right vehicle movements, respectively. | If feasible, remove/reconstruct channelized right turn lanes in the northwest and southwest corners of the intersection to improve sight distance, such that right turning vehicles must come to the signal to complete their turns. Design should also include improved lighting of pedestrian crossings and refuge islands. (MDOT/PGCDPW\&T) | Long-Term | High |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1.7 | Fallen streetlight pole lying on the ground on the northwest channelizing island along MD 320 (Piney Branch Road) needs to be removed | Contact PEPCO to remove streetlight pole lying on the ground on the northwest channelizing island along MD 320 (Piney Branch Road). (PSI has notified PEPCO) | Short-Term | Low |
| 1.8 | Fallen detour sign (W20-2) located at the northwest channelizing island at MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) at MD 320 (Piney Branch Road). | Remove detour sign (W20-2) located at the northwest channelizing island at MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) at MD 320 (Piney Branch Road). (MDOT/PGCDPW\&T) | Short-Term | Low |
| 1.9 | Pedestrian APS push button located at the southwest pedestrian refuge island of MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) at MD 320 (Piney Branch Road) is not operating as designed (it does not produce sound nor vibrate). | Repair or replace APS push button located at the southwest pedestrian refuge island of MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) at MD 320 (Piney Branch Road). (PGCDPW\&T) | Short-Term | Low |
| 1.10 | Crosswalk markings for pedestrians crossing the eastbound right movement are partially faded or missing at the southwest corner of MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) and MD 320 (Piney Branch Road) intersection. All crosswalks also lack high visibility continental crosswalk markings. | Repaint all crosswalks with high visibility continental style crosswalks markings at the intersection of MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) at MD 320 (Piney Branch Road). (MDOT/PGCDPW\&T) | Short-Term | Low |
| 1.11 | Pothole on southbound approach of MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) at Piney Branch Road poses a safety risk to motorists. | Fill pothole on southbound MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue). (MDOT/PGCDPW\&T) | Short-Term | Low |
| 1.12 | Every approach's existing red clearance time (2 seconds) does not meet the red clearance interval time calculated for the respective approach of MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) at MD 320 (Piney Branch Road). This was calculated using the NCHRP Traffic Signal Timing Manual, adopted by FHWA. | Perform a full yellow change and red clearance interval analysis, and if feasible, change the timing to reflect timings calculated using NCHRP Traffic Signal Timing Manual. (MDOT/PGCDPW\&T) | Short-Term | Low |

Table 14: Recommendations for MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) between Piney Branch Road and Southampton Drive

| $\begin{gathered} \text { Issue } \\ \text { No. } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Safety Issue/Observations | Recommendation (Responsible Agency) | Timeframe | Relative Cost |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2.1 | Spalling on sidewalk surface, abundance of foliage and dead plant material, and noncompliant curb height along MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) west sidewalk between MD 320 (Piney Branch Road) and Southampton Drive. | Repair or reconstruct the sidewalk, grass, and curb on the west side of MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) between MD 320 (Piney Branch Road) and Southampton Drive. (MDOT/PGCDPW\&T) | Long-Term | Medium |
| 2.2 | Sidewalk is missing on east side of MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) between MD 320 (Piney Branch Road) and Southampton Drive. | Evaluate the feasibility of installing new sidewalk along the east side of MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) between Ruatan Street and Metzerott Road to provide connectivity to the existing sidewalks at these locations. Install sidewalk if feasible. Evaluate feasibility of installing marked pedestrian crosswalks on the north and south legs of New Hampshire Avenue at Piney Branch Road, associated pedestrian ramps, and Accessible Pedestrian Signals/Countdown Pedestrian Signals (APS/CPS) in conjunction with sidewalk installation. (MDOT/PGCDPW\&T) | Long-Term | High |
| 2.3 | Obstructed sidewalk on west side of MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) between MD 320 (Piney Branch Road) and Southampton Drive. Obstructions include debris, vegetation, and dead plant material. | Begin monthly mowing, trimming, and clearing, especially during spring and summer months, to ensure unobstructed pedestrian travel way over the sidewalk on the west side of New Hampshire Avenue between Piney Branch Road and Southampton Drive. (MDOT/PGCDPW\&T) | Short-Term | Low |
| 2.4 | Obstructed sidewalk on west side of MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) between MD 320 (Piney Branch Road) and Southampton Drive. Obstructions include retaining wall, utility poles, and sign posts. | Investigate redesign alternatives of 5' or wider sidewalk on west side of MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) between MD 320 (Piney Branch Road) and Southampton Drive. Alternative analysis could consider relocation of the adjacent retaining wall, MD 650 lane width and/or median width reductions, or removal of a travel lane to allow for wider, ADA-compliant sidewalks and grass buffer. (MDOT/PGCDPW\&T) | Long-Term | High |


| 2.5 | There is a 40-mph posted speed limit sign <br> (R2-1) on northbound MD 650 (New <br> Hampshire Avenue), approximately 300 feet <br> north of the intersection at MD 320 (Piney <br> Branch Road). This is not uniform with the <br> 35-mph posted speed limit throughout the <br> study corridor. | Verify that the speed limit is 35 mph along MD 650 (New <br> Hampshire Avenue) northbound of MD 320 (Piney Branch Road). <br> If not, reduce speed limit to 35mph. (MDOT/PGCDPW\&T) | Short-Term | Low |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| 2.6 | Artwork is in need of rehabilitation on <br> retaining wall on west side of MD 650 (New <br> Hampshire Avenue) between MD 320 (Piney <br> Branch Road) and Southampton Drive. | Reach out to art group to repair artwork at this location. <br> (MDOT/PGCDPW\&T) | Short-Term | Low |
| 2.7 | Noncompliant mounted height of speed limit <br> sign (R2-1) along the west sidewalk of MD <br> 650 (New Hampshire Avenue), approximately <br> 250 feet north of the intersection of MD 650 <br> (New Hampshire Avenue) at MD 320 (Piney <br> Branch Road). This sign is low hanging and <br> limits pedestrian vertical clearance under the <br> sign. | Raise the speed limit sign (R2-1) along the west side of MD 650 <br> (New Hampshire Avenue) approximately 250 feet north of the <br> intersection of MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) at MD 320 <br> (Piney Branch Road) to provide sufficient vertical clearance for <br> pedestrians on sidewalk per MUTCD, Maryland, and Prince <br> George's County Standards. (MDOT/PGCDPW\&T) | Short-Term | Low |

Table 15: Recommendations for MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) at Southampton Drive

| oca | 3: MD 650 (New H | Side Street Stop-Controlled Intersection |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Issue } \\ & \text { No. } \end{aligned}$ | Safety Issue/Observations | Recommendation (Responsible Agency) | Timeframe | Relative Cost |
| 3.1 | Crosswalk pavement markings and stop bar are missing at the eastbound approach of MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) and Southampton Drive. | Paint high visibility continental crosswalk markings and stop bar between existing curb ramps at the eastbound approach of MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) at Southampton Drive. (MDOT/PGCDPW\&T) | Short-Term | Low |
| 3.2 | Vehicles make right turns onto Southampton Drive from southbound MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) at high speeds. | If feasible, install gore pavement markings and flexible posts to tighten right turning radius and decrease speed of vehicles turning right from southbound MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) at Southampton Drive. (MDOT/PGCDPW\&T) | Short-Term | Low |
| 3.3 | Vehicles make right turn onto Southampton Drive from southbound MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) at high speeds. | If feasible, install permanent curb bulb out to tighten right turning radius and decrease speed of vehicles turning right from southbound MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) at Southampton Drive. (MDOT/PGCDPW\&T) | Long-Term | Medium |
| 3.4 | Vehicles turning left onto northbound MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) from eastbound Southampton Drive experience difficulty finding gaps in traffic to complete their turns, especially during peak periods at MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue), Southampton Drive west leg. | Evaluate intersection crosshatch pavement markings within intersection and "Do Not Block Intersection" signs (R10-7) for southbound and northbound approaches at MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) at Southampton Drive. (MDOT/PGCDPW\&T) | Long-Term | Low |
| 3.5 | Vehicles turning left onto northbound MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) from eastbound Southampton Drive experience difficulty finding gaps in traffic to complete their turns, especially during peak periods at MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue), Southampton Drive west leg. | Perform full signal warrant analysis at MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) at Southampton Drive and install signal if warranted. If signal not warranted, develop other access management practices such as a "Maryland T" type intersection. (MDOT/PGCDPW\&T) | Long-Term | High |

Table 16: Recommendations for MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) between Southampton Drive and Metzerott Road

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Issue } \\ & \text { No. } \end{aligned}$ | Safety Issue/Observations | Recommendation (Responsible Agency) | Timeframe | Relative Cost |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4.1 | Sidewalk is cracked and uneven along the west side of MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) between Southampton Drive and Metzerott Road. | Repair/reconstruct sidewalk along the west side MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) between Southampton Drive and Metzerott Road. (MDOT/PGCDPW\&T) | Long-Term | Medium |
| 4.2 | There is missing sidewalk on the east side of MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) between Southampton Drive and Metzerott Road | Evaluate the feasibility of installing new sidewalk along the east side of MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) between Ruatan Street and Metzerott Road to provide connectivity to the existing sidewalks at these locations. Install sidewalk if feasible. Evaluate feasibility to install pedestrian crossing at Southampton Drive in conjunction with sidewalk installation. (MDOT/PGCDPW\&T) | Long-Term | High |

Table 17: Recommendations for MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) at Metzerott Road

| Issue <br> No. | Safety Issue/Observations | Recommendation (Responsible Agency) | Time frame | Relative Cost |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5.1 | Street name is not visible on sign located on utility pole on MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) at Metzerott Road | Remove street name sign located on utility pole on MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) at Metzerott Road. There are existing street name signs on the mast arms that are sufficient. (MDOT/PGCDPW\&T) | Short-Term | Low |
| 5.2 | Cables are exposed at transformer base of traffic signal at the northwest corner of MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) and Metzerott Road. | Fix the exposed traffic signal cables at the transformer base of the traffic signal pole at the northwest corner of MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) and Metzerott Road. (MDOT/PGCDPW\&T) | Short-Term | Low |
| 5.3 | Existing crosswalks are missing high visibility continental style pavement markings on the east and north legs of the intersection | Restripe crosswalks on the east and north legs of the intersection with high visibility continental style crosswalk markings. <br> (MDOT/PGCDPW\&T) | Short-Term | Low |
| 5.4 | The existing red clearance time of the westbound approach ( 3 seconds) does not meet the red clearance interval time calculated for this approach. This was calculated using the NCHRP Traffic Signal Timing Manual, adopted by FHWA. | Perform a full yellow change and red clearance interval analysis, and if feasible, change the timing to reflect timings calculated using NCHRP Traffic Signal Timing Manual. <br> (MDOT/PGCDPW\&T) | Short-Term | Low |
| 5.5 | The southwest corner near the pedestrian ramp and push button is missing lighting. | Install a light pole at the southwest corner of MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) at Metzerott Road. (MDOT/PGCDPW\&T) | Long-Term | Medium |
| 5.6 | Object marker sign (OM1-3) missing from north side median. | Install object marker sign and small post on the north side median, in from the of the existing keep right sign (R4-7). (MDOT/PGCDPW\&T) | Long-Term | Low |
| 5.7 | There is a conflict between southbound vehicles take a permissive left turn over three lanes of traffic and an active pedestrian crossing. There was at least one fatal collision at this intersection. | If feasible, modify the signal phasing for the southbound left turn from permissive/protected to protected only. (MDOT/PGCDPW\&T) | Long-Term | Medium |

Table 18: Recommendations for MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) between Metzerott Road and Northampton Drive

| Issue <br> No. | Safety Issue/Observations | Recommendation (Responsible Agency) | Timeframe | Relative Cost |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 6.1 | Sidewalk is cracked and uneven along MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) west side between Metzerott Road and Northampton Drive. | Reconstruct/repair sidewalk on west side of MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) between Metzerott Road and Northampton Drive. (MDOT/PGCDPW\&T) | Long-Term | Medium to High |
| 6.2 | Sidewalk is cracked and uneven along MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) east side between Metzerott Road and Northampton Drive. | Reconstruct/repair sidewalk on east side of MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) between Metzerott Road and Northampton Street (MDOT/PGCDPW\&T) | Long-Term | Medium to High |
| 6.3 | Fallen sign (R4-7) on the east side of MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) approximately 750 feet north of Metzerott Road. | Remove sign (R4-7) fallen on the ground on the east side of MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) approximately 750 feet north of Metzerott Road. (MDOT/PGCDPW\&T) | Short-Term | Low |
| 6.4 | Driveway to access 7-Eleven is cracked and ramps currently non-ADA compliant and are diagonally directed on the west side of MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue), approximately 150 feet south of Northampton Drive. | Reconstruct driveway apron to include ADA compliant pedestrian crossing. Evaluate feasibility of raised pedestrian crossing. (MDOT/PGCDPW\&T/Property Owner) | Long-Term | Medium |

Table 19: Recommendations for MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) at Northampton Drive

| Location 7: MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) at Northampton Drive - Signalized Intersection |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { Issue } \\ \text { No. } \end{gathered}$ | Safety Issue/Observations | Recommendation (Responsible Agency) | Timeframe | Relative Cost |
| 7.1 | All pedestrian crossings are missing ADAcompliant curb ramps and have missing or faded crosswalk and stop line pavement markings at MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) at Northampton Drive. | Install ADA-compliant ramps, high visibility continental crosswalk markings for all pedestrian crossings, and stop lines at MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) at Northampton Drive. Incorporate these improvements into the existing MDOT/MCDOT joint intersection improvement plan at MD 650 and Northampton Drive. (MDOT/MCDOT) | Long-Term | Medium |
| 7.2 | Pedestrian crossing is missing an ADA-compliant pedestrian ramp or crossing at median island on the west leg of MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) at Northampton Drive. There is also a storm drain on the west leg median within the existing signalized pedestrian crossing. | Evaluate feasibility of ramp and crosswalk improvement on the west leg of MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) and Northampton Drive. This design must evaluate the conflict of pedestrian crossing with the storm drains located in the median on the west leg, between the existing north-south pedestrian crossing signals. Incorporate these improvements into the existing MDOT/MCDOT joint intersection improvement plan at MD 650 and Northampton Drive. (MDOT/MCDOT) | Long-Term | Medium |
| 7.3 | All pedestrian crossings are missing ADAcompliant APS push buttons at MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) at Northampton Drive. | Install pedestrian bush buttons (APS) at all pedestrian crossings of MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) at Northampton Drive. Incorporate these improvements into the existing MDOT/MCDOT joint intersection improvement plan at MD 650 and Northampton Drive. (MDOT/MCDOT) | Long-Term | Medium |
| 7.4 | Crosswalks are not sufficiently lit on the south and west legs of MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) at Northampton Drive. | Evaluate lighting and, if necessary, add lighting for the south and west leg crosswalks at MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) at Northampton Drive. Incorporate these improvements into the existing MDOT/MCDOT joint intersection improvement plan at MD 650 and Northampton Drive. (MDOT/MCDOT) | Long-Term | Medium |


| 7.5 | Pedestrian crossing is missing high visibility <br> continental crosswalk markings and stop line at the <br> intersection of Northampton Drive at Avenel Road. | Install continental style crosswalk markings and a stop line at <br> the intersection of Northampton Drive at Avenel Road. <br> Incorporate these improvements into the existing <br> MDOT/MCDOT joint intersection improvement plan at MD <br> 650 and Northampton Drive. (MDOT/MCDOT) | Short-Term | Low |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 7.6 | Several potholes in roadway pose safety risk on <br> Northampton Drive eastbound approach | Fill pothole on Northampton Drive eastbound approach. <br> (MDOT/MCDOT) | Short-Term | Low |
| 7.7 | Steel plate poses safety risk to motorist along MD <br> 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) northbound <br> approach. | Replace steel plate with pavement surfacing along MD 650 <br> (New Hampshire Avenue) northbound approach. <br> (MDOT/MCDOT) | Short-Term | Low |
| 7.8 | Missing bus shelter at bus stop on the north side of <br> Northampton Drive, west of Avenel Road. | Add/Replace bus shelter on the north side of Northampton <br> Drive, west of Avenel Road. Consider County policy on <br> placement of shelter. (MDOT/MCDOT/WMATA) | Short-Term | Low to <br> Medium <br> 7.9 <br> Every approach's existing red clearance time (2 <br> seconds) does not meet the red clearance interval <br> time calculated for the respective approach. This <br> was calculated using the NCHRP Traffic Signal <br> Timing Manual, adopted by FHWA.Perform a full yellow change and red clearance interval <br> analysis, and if feasible, change the timing to reflect timings <br> calculated using NCHRP Traffic Signal Timing Manual. <br> (MDOT/MCDOT) |
| There were multiple observations made of <br> pedestrians crossing at unsignalized or unmarked <br> areas near the intersection along MD 650 (New <br> Hampshire Avenue). There are also a high number <br> of crashes involving serious injuries at this <br> intersection, some of which included pedestrians. | If feasible, redesign of entire intersection with the above <br> recommendations. Also included should be the evaluation of <br> a signalized crosswalk across the north leg of New <br> Hampshire Avenue (with associated pedestrian ramps, <br> CPS/APS, and pedestrian refuge island), along with the <br> removal of the channelized right turn lane in the southwest <br> corner, or the addition of a truck apron in the channelized <br> right turn lane in the southwest corner to slow down turning <br> vhicles. Coordinate improvements with those involved with <br> the MD 650 BRT study, and the existing MDOT/MCDOT <br> joint intersection improvement plan at MD 650 and <br> Northampton Drive.. (MDOT/MCDOT) | Low | Long-Term | High |

Table 20: Recommendations for MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) between Northampton Drive and Fox Street

| Location 8: MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) between Northampton Drive and Fox Street - Road Segment |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Issue <br> No. | Safety Issue/Observations | Recommendation (Responsible Agency) | Timeframe | Relative Cost |
| 8.1 | Sidewalk is narrow (4' average width) and often obstructed by overgrown bushes and trees on east and west sides of MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) between Northampton Drive and Fox Street. | Begin monthly trimming during spring and summer months to ensure unobstructed pedestrian travel way over the sidewalk on the east and west side of New Hampshire Avenue between Northampton Drive and Fox Street. (MDOT/MCDOT) | Short-Term | Low |
| 8.2 | Sidewalk is narrow (4' average width) and often obstructed by overgrown bushes and trees on west side of MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) between Northampton Drive and Fox Street. | Evaluate design for improved pedestrian walkway on west side, including moving the guardrail either back away from the roadway or between the sidewalk and vehicle lanes to accommodate added sidewalk width, between Northampton Drive and Fox Street. Implement design if feasible. (MDOT/MCDOT) | Long-Term | High |
| 8.3 | Sidewalk is narrow (4' average width) and often obstructed by overgrown bushes and trees on east side of MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) between Northampton Drive and Fox Street. | Evaluate design for improved pedestrian walkway on east side, including moving the guardrail either back away from the roadway or between the sidewalk and vehicle lanes to accommodate added sidewalk width, between Northampton Drive and Fox Street. Implement design if feasible. (MDOT/MCDOT) | Long-Term | High |

Table 21: Recommendations for MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) at Fox Street

| Location 9: MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) at Fox Street - Side Street Stop-Controlled Intersection |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Issue } \\ & \text { No. } \end{aligned}$ | Safety Issue/Observations | Recommendation (Responsible Agency) | Timeframe | Relative Cost |
| 9.1 | Pedestrian ramp is not ADA-compliant at southeast corner of MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) at Fox Street. | Install ADA-compliant pedestrian ramp at southeast corner of MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) at Fox Street. <br> (MDOT/MCDOT) | Short-Term | Low |
| 9.2 | Pedestrian ramp is missing $4^{\prime} \times 4^{\prime}$ turning space behind the ramp per ADA-guidelines at northeast corner of MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) at Fox Street. | Install ADA-compliant transition ramp at the northeast corner of MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) at Fox Street. (MDOT/MCDOT) | Short-Term | Low |
| 9.3 | The existing pedestrian crossing is missing high visibility continental crosswalk markings at the east leg of MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) at Fox Street. | Install high visibility continental crosswalk markings at the east leg of MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) at Fox Street. (MDOT/MCDOT) | Short-Term | Low |
| 9.4 | Pedestrians observed repeatedly crossing at unmarked and unsignalized locations across MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) at Fox Street. | Perform signal and HAWK signal warrant analysis with protected signalized pedestrian crossing across MD 650 at Fox Street. If warranted, design signalized crossing. If not, develop safe pedestrian crossing alternatives for pedestrians. (MDOT/MCDOT) | Long-Term | High |

Table 22: Recommendations for MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) between Fox Street and Dilston Road / Delphi Road

| Location 10: MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) between Fox Street and Dilston Road / Adelphi Road - Road Segment |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Issue | Safety Issue/Observations | Recommendation (Responsible Agency) | Timeframe | Relative <br> Cost |  |  |
| No. | Sidewalk is narrow (4' average width) and <br> often obstructed by overgrown bushes and <br> trees on east and west sides of MD 650 (New <br> Hampshire Avenue) between Fox Street and <br> Dilston Road / Adelphi Road. | Begin monthly trimming during spring and summer months to <br> ensure unobstructed pedestrian travel way over the sidewalk on the <br> east and west side of New Hampshire Avenue between Fox Street <br> and Dilston Road / Adelphi Road. (MDOT/MCDOT) | Short-Term | Low |  |  |
| 10.2 | Sidewalk is narrow (4' average width) and <br> often obstructed by overgrown bushes and <br> trees on west side of MD 650 (New <br> Hampshire Avenue) between Fox Street and <br> Dilston Road / Adelphi Road. | Evaluate design for improved pedestrian walkway on west side, <br> including moving the guardrail either back away from the roadway <br> or between the sidewalk and vehicle lanes to accommodate added <br> sidewalk width, between Fox Street and Dilston Road / Adelphi <br> Road. Implement design if feasible. (MDOT/MCDOT) | Long-Term | High |  |  |

Table 23: Recommendations for MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) at Dilston Road / Adelphi Road

| Location 11: MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) at Dilston Road / Adelphi Road - Signalized Intersection |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Issue <br> No. | Safety Issue/Observations | Recommendation (Responsible Agency) | Timeframe | Relative Cost |
| 11.1 | There is insufficient landing space for meeting ADA compliance for pedestrian ramps and the definition of pedestrian refuge on the median island nose between MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) and Fox Road approaches in the southeast corner of MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) at Dilston Road / Adelphi Road. | Evaluate widening the median island nose between Fox Road and MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) approaches to create more space for pedestrian refuge. (MDOT/MCDOT) | Long-Term | Medium |
| 11.2 | There is uneven pavement surface and potholes pose a risk to motorists at high speed along MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) northbound approach. | Repair potholes and broken pavement along MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) northbound approach. (MDOT/MCDOT) | Short-Term | Low |
| 11.3 | There is a signpost with no sign panel adjacent to the southbound bus stop on the west side of MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue), approximately 40 feet south of the intersection of MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) at Dilston Road / Adelphi Road. | Evaluate the previous sign located on the post and verify that it is no longer needed. If not needed, remove signpost located adjacent to the southbound bus stop west side of MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue), approximately 40 feet south of the intersection of MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) at Dilston Road / Adelphi Road. (MDOT/MCDOT) | Short-Term | Low |
| 11.4 | Stop sign does not align with stop line on Fox Road approach at the intersection of MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) at Dilston Road / Adelphi Road. | Move stop sign next to stop bar on Adelphi Road (MDOT/MCDOT) | Short-Term | Low |
| 11.5 | Observations made at this intersection suggested a conflict between side street left turning vehicles and pedestrians, especially during congested peak hours. Due to the permissive left turn, westbound vehicles must find a gap in eastbound vehicular traffic and south side pedestrian crossing in order to complete the left turn. Many times, drivers will stop abruptly for pedestrians crossing or create a near-miss incident with either pedestrians or other vehicles as they attempt to rush through a gap in traffic. There is at least one | Add Right/Left turn yield to Pedestrian sign (R10-15) for Dilston Road and Adelphi Road approaches at the signalized intersection at MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue). (MDOT/MCDOT) | Short-Term | Low |


|  | serious injury crash involving a crossing pedestrian being hit <br> by a westbound left turning vehicle. |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 11.6 | Observations made at this intersection suggested a conflict <br> between side street left turning vehicles and pedestrians, <br> especially during congested peak hours. Due to the <br> permissive left turn, vehicles must find a gap in vehicular <br> traffic and pedestrian crossing in order to complete the left <br> turn. Many times, drivers will stop abruptly for pedestrians <br> crossing or create a near-miss incident as they attempt to rush <br> through a gap in traffic. There is at least one serious injury <br> crash involving a crossing pedestrian being hit by a <br> westbound left turning vehicle | Perform a signal phasing and timing analysis at this <br> intersection. Evaluate the feasibility of changing the <br> Adelphi Road/Dilston Road approach left turn <br> phasing, and if feasible, change to split phasing or <br> protected leff turn phasing. This would reduce the <br> number of conflicts with left turning vehicles. Would <br> likely require further improvements to mitigate <br> congestion such as lane configuration, signal timing, <br> and signal phasing analyses. Evaluate feasibility and <br> coordinate with recommended improvements <br> included in the MD 650 BRT/RideOn study. <br> (MDOT/MCDOT) | Long-Term | Medium |
| 11.7 | Observations made at this intersection suggested a conflict <br> between northbound right turning vehicles from the Fox Road <br> stop-controlled approach at Dilston Road / Adelphi Road and <br> northbound right and southbound left turning vehicles from <br> MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) at Dilston Road / Adelphi <br> Road. The stop-controlled approach so close to the signalized <br> approaches creates the potential for unexpected conflicts for <br> roadway users at this intersection. | Evaluate feasibility of alternative intersection/signal <br> design, including the removal or signalization of Fox <br> road approach at the intersection of MD 650 (New <br> Hampshire Avenue) at Dilston Road / Adelphi Road. <br> Pursue feasible alternatives. (MDOT/MCDOT) | Long-Term | High |

Table 24: Recommendations for MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) between Dilston Road / Adelphi Road and Oakview Drive

| Issue No. | Safety Issue/Observations | Recommendation (Responsible Agency) | Timeframe | Relative Cost |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 12.1 | There is discontinuation of sidewalk between the service road and mainline along MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) east side approximately 850 feet north of the intersection of MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) at Dilston Road / Adelphi Road. | Add sidewalk connection between the service road and mainline along MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) east side approximately 850 feet north of the intersection of MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) at Dilston Road / Adelphi Road. (MDOT/MCDOT). | Short-Term | Low to Medium |
| 12.2 | There is buildup of debris and dead plant material on the sidewalk along the east side of New Hampshire Avenue approximately 900 feet north of the intersection of MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) and Dilston Road / Adelphi Road. | Regularly cleanup sidewalk along MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) east sidewalk (MDOT/MCDOT) | Short-Term | Low |
| 12.3 | "Madre St" Street sign (D3-1) is not adequately secured to utility pole on MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) east side approximately 250 feet north of the intersection of MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) at Dilston Road / Adelphi Road. | Replace broken and falling signs on the utility pole on MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) east side approximately 250 feet north of the intersection of MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) at Dilston Road / Adelphi Road. (MDOT/MCDOT) | Short-Term | Low |

Table 25: Recommendations for MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) at Oakview Drive

| Location 13: MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) at Oakview Drive - Signalized Intersection |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Issue No. | Safety Issue/Observations | Recommendation (Responsible Agency) | Timeframe | Relative Cost |
| 13.1 | Pedestrian APS push button is not operating as designed (it does not produce sound nor vibrate) located at the northwest corner of MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) at Oakview Drive. | Install ADA-compliant pedestrian APS Push button at the northwest corner of MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) at Oakview Drive. (MDOT/MCDOT) | Short-Term | Low |
| 13.2 | There is a redundant pedestrian push button on the northeast corner of MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) at Oakview Drive. | Remove redundant pedestrian push button on the northeast corner of MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) at Oakview Drive. (MDOT/MCDOT) | Short-Term | Low |
| 13.3 | Existing crosswalk markings are parallel lines on all legs of the intersection | Restripe all crosswalk on all legs with high visibility continental style crosswalk markings. (MDOT/MCDOT) | Short-Term | Low |
| 13.4 | The existing crosswalk on the west leg is 75 feet with at MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) and Oakview Drive, which is significantly longer than the crosswalk on the east leg ( 50 feet). | Evaluate the feasibility of extending the sidewalk at the northwest corner of MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) at Oakview Drive to reduce the crosswalk distance on the west leg. If feasible, extend the sidewalk with ADA compliant ramps. The evaluation should include an Auto Turn analysis for southbound right and evaluation of a NTOR restriction for southbound right turning vehicles. (MDOT/MCDOT) | Long-Term | Medium |
| 13.5 | The bus stops at the northwest and southeast corners of MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) at Oakview Drive have the highest ridership numbers in the corridor. From AADT and turning movement count data, the intersection at Oakview Drive has the highest volume of traffic in the study corridor. In addition, there was one fatal crash involving a pedestrian at this intersection in 2018. | Evaluate existing signal timings and phasing at the New Hampshire Avenue/Oakview Drive intersection to determine the feasibility of implementing exclusive leftturn phasing (or split phasing) and shorter cycle lengths to reduce vehicle and pedestrian conflicts while not significantly degrading overall intersection traffic operations. If feasible, implement timing and phasing improvements. Coordinate analysis and recommendations with the MD 650 BRT Study team. (MDOT/MCDOT) | Long-Term | Medium |

Table 26: Recommendations for MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) between Oakview Drive and I-495 Overpass

| Location 14: MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) between Oakview Drive and I-495 Overpass - Road Segment |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Issue No. | Safety Issue/Observations | Recommendation (Responsible Agency) | Timeframe | Relative Cost |
| 14.1 | Lighting is not working under the I-495 overpass over MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) for travel ways or sidewalks. | Repair underpass lighting under the I-495 overpass over MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) for travel ways or sidewalks. (MDOT) | Long-Term | Medium |
| 14.2 | Streetlighting is missing along the east and west sides of MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) between Oakview and Capital Beltway (I495) | Perform lighting analysis and, if feasible, install lighting infrastructure along MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) north of Oakview Drive between Oakview and Capital Beltway (I-495). Evaluate feasibility with Montgomery County Lighting Plans. (MCDOT/MDOT) | Long-Term | High |
| 14.3 | There is a small tree in the storm drain on the east side of MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue), approximately 250 feet north of the I-495 on-ramp from northbound MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue). | Remove small tree in storm drain approximately 250 feet north of the I-495 on-ramp from northbound MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue). (MDOT) | Short-Term | Low |
| 14.4 | There is missing sidewalk on Mt. Pisgah Road immediately south of the intersection of Oakview Drive and Mt. Pisgah Road. | Evaluate feasibility of sidewalk on Mt. Pisgah Road from Oakview Drive to Madre Street. Install sidewalk if feasible. It should be noted that while observations were made at this intersection, it was just outside of the official study corridor limits. (MDOT/MCDOT) | Long-Term | High |
| 14.5 | There is missing sidewalk on New Hampshire Avenue (service road) between Oakview Drive and Cottrell Terrace, west of MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue). MD 650 currently does not have a sidewalk on the west side between Oakview Drive and the I-495 EB offramp, and New Hampshire Avenue (service road) is used as a parallel pedestrian travel way instead for the west side. | Evaluate feasibility of sidewalk on New Hampshire Avenue (service road) between Oakview Drive and Cottrell Terrace. (MDOT/MCDOT) | Long-Term | High |


| 14.6 | Pedestrian crossing is missing one ADA- <br> compliant ramp on the west side and <br> crosswalk markings across New Hampshire <br> Avenue (service road), 40 feet south of <br> Cottrell Terrace. | Provide ADA-compliant pedestrian ramp on west side and high <br> visibility continental crosswalk markings on New Hampshire <br> Avenue (service road), 40 feet south of Cottrell Terrace, to align <br> with existing pedestrian ramp on east side. (MDOT/MCDOT) | Short-Term | Low |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 14.7 | Pedestrian access has high slope and is not <br> ADA-compliant between MD 650 (New <br> Hampshire Avenue) and New Hampshire <br> Avenue (service road), approximately 40 feet <br> south of Cottrell Terrace. | If feasible, redesign and install pedestrian access with reduced <br> slope onto New Hampshire Avenue (service road). <br> (MDOT/MCDOT) | Short-Term | Medium |
| 14.8 | There is an unrepaired utility patch along <br> Avenel Road on the east side in front of the <br> storm drain 30 feet north of Moffett Road <br> which poses a safety risk/hazard to motorist. | Repair the utility patch on Avenel Road on the east side in front of <br> the storm drain 30 feet north of Moffett Road which poses a safety <br> risk/hazard to motorist. (MDOT/MCDOT) | Short-Term | Low |

Table 27: Recommendations for MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) at Capital Beltway (I-495) Ramps

| $\begin{gathered} \text { Issue } \\ \text { No. } \end{gathered}$ | Safety Issue/Observations | Recommendation (Responsible Agency) | Timeframe | Relative Cost |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 15.1 | There is buildup of dirt and debris which may be a result of flooding on the pedestrian ramp on the east side of the I-495 EB off-ramp to northbound MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue). | Perform drainage analysis on this area. If necessary, add catch basin near pedestrian ramp on the east side of the I-495 EB off-ramp to northbound MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue). (MDOT) | Long-Term | Medium |
| 15.2 | Posted speed limit (R2-1) signage missing from Capital Beltway (I-495) EB off-ramp (28B) to SB MD 650. | Evaluate ramp design speed based on stopping sight distance for crosswalks and roadway curvature. Post speed limit on Capital Beltway (I-495) EB off-ramp (28B) to SB MD 650 based on evaluation. (MDOT) | Short-Term | Low |
| 15.3 | Posted speed limit (R2-1) signage missing from Capital Beltway (I-495) EB off-ramp (28A) to NB MD 650. | Evaluate ramp design speed based on stopping sight distance for crosswalks and roadway curvature. Post speed limit on Capital Beltway (I-495) EB off-ramp (28A) to NB MD 650 based on evaluation. (MDOT) | Short-Term | Low |
| 15.4 | Streetlight missing from unsignalized pedestrian crossings on Capital Beltway (I-495) ramps (3) with MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue), south of the I-495 overpass: I-495 EB on-ramp from SB MD 650, I-495 EB off-ramp to NB MD 650 (28A), and I-495 EB/WB on-ramp from MD 650 NB. | Install lighting for unsignalized pedestrian crossings on Capital Beltway (I-495) ramps (3) with MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue), south of the I-495 overpass: I-495 EB on-ramp from SB MD 650, I-495 EB off-ramp to NB MD 650 (28A), and I-495 EB/WB on-ramp from MD 650 NB. (MDOT/MCDOT) | Long-Term | Medium |
| 15.5 | Vehicles travel at high speeds along on- and offramps for I-495, near unsignalized pedestrian crossings. | Install flashing pedestrian warning signs (W11-2) to give emphasis to warning signs when pedestrians are present at the pedestrian crossings for I-495 ramps. (MDOT/MCDOT) | Long-Term | Medium |

Table 28: Recommendations for MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) Corridor

| Issue <br> No. | Safety Issue/Observations | Recommendation (Responsible Agency) | Timeframe | Relative Cost |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 16.1 | During field visits, pedestrians observed crossing MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) at unmarked locations numerous times between Southampton Drive and Oakview Drive. There are also 8 crashes involving pedestrians resulting in serious injuries or fatalities in the most recent available 5-year crash data. | Improve existing pedestrian facilities with high visibility crosswalk markings, ADA-compliant ramps, and APS at all signalized intersections. (MDOT/MCDOT/PGCDPW\&T) <br> Consider implementing context sensitive median barriers throughout the corridor. (MDOT/MCDOT/PGCDPW\&T) <br> Conduct a signal warrant analysis and consider adding further protected pedestrian crossing in order to provide further pedestrian crossing options, such as at Fox Street. <br> (MDOT/MCDOT/PGCDPW\&T) <br> Consider providing pedestrian travel way along both sides of MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) along the entire study corridor in order to improve pedestrian accessibility and comfort. <br> (MDOT/MCDOT/PGCDPW\&T) | Long-Term | High |
| 16.2 | There are currently "Bikes may use full lane" signs (R4-11) along MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) within the project area. The few bicyclists that use this roadway are often seen using the sidewalk instead, and community input suggests bicyclists do not feel safe traveling on the roadway. | Evaluate the feasibility of adding dedicated bicycle infrastructure. Off-street bike lanes may be preferred to separate bicycles from high-speed vehicles or peak hour congestion. Implement if feasible. Coordinate with recommended improvements included in the MD 650 BRT study. (MDOT/MCDOT/PGCDPW\&T) | Long-Term | High |
| 16.3 | Several intersections along the MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) corridor are in need of signal phasing or timing analysis. | It is recommended to perform a complete signal phasing and timing study along the corridor in order to increase safety of all road users while not significantly exacerbating existing congestion and queueing. Consider use of shorter cycle lengths to decrease pedestrian delay. (MDOT/MCDOT/PGCDPW\&T) | Long-Term | High |

## Appendix A: Turning Movement Counts


Peak-Hour: 7:15 AM -- 8:15 AM
Peak 15-Min: 7:30 AM -- 7:45 AM


| 15-Min Count Period Beginning At | 17 - New Hampshire Ave (Northbound) |  |  |  | 17 - New Hampshire Ave (Southbound) |  |  |  | Oakview Dr (Eastbound) |  |  |  | Oakview Dr (Westbound) |  |  |  | Total | Hourly Totals |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Left | Thru | Right | U | Left | Thru | Right | U | Left | Thru | Right | U | Left | Thru | Right | U |  |  |
| 6:00 AM | 5 | 463 | 3 | 0 | 11 | 336 | 6 | 0 | 30 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 100 | 0 | 977 |  |
| 6:15 AM | 2 | 519 | 3 | 1 | 12 | 469 | 17 | 1 | 42 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 73 | 0 | 1165 |  |
| 6:30 AM | 0 | 479 | 2 | 0 | 13 | 458 | 9 | 2 | 41 | 3 | 12 | 0 | 11 | 1 | 69 | 0 | 1100 |  |
| 6:45 AM | 1 | 435 | 2 | 0 | 19 | 592 | 19 | 1 | 43 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 27 | 0 | 58 | 0 | 1208 | 4450 |
| 7:00 AM | 6 | 463 | 2 | 0 | 20 | 608 | 22 | 0 | 41 | 2 | 9 | 0 | 16 | 1 | 82 | 0 | 1272 | 4745 |
| 7:15 AM | 4 | 531 | 2 | 0 | 24 | 629 | 18 | 1 | 50 | 2 | 11 | 0 | 20 | 2 | 80 | 0 | 1374 | 4954 |
| 7:30 AM | 4 | 586 | 3 | 1 | 31 | 689 | 24 | 1 | 46 | 1 | 12 | 0 | 19 | 1 | 75 | 0 | 1493 | 5347 |
| 7:45 AM | 2 | 515 | 2 | 0 | 19 | 641 | 35 | 2 | 52 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 27 | 1 | 81 | 0 | 1391 | 5530 |
| 8:00 AM | 3 | 470 | 4 | 1 | 17 | 645 | 49 | 2 | 46 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 44 | 0 | 1305 | 5563 |
| 8:15 AM | 8 | 488 | 4 | 0 | 9 | 596 | 44 | 3 | 22 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 10 | 2 | 41 | 0 | 1235 | 5424 |
| 8:30 AM | 4 | 400 | 4 | 0 | 19 | 403 | 32 | 2 | 31 | 6 | 11 | 0 | 22 | 7 | 48 | 0 | 989 | 4920 |
| 8:45 AM | 4 | 393 | 5 | 0 | 21 | 497 | 50 | 3 | 52 | 7 | 8 | 0 | 14 | 11 | 51 | 0 | 1116 | 4645 |
| Peak 15-Min Flowrates | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Total |  |
|  | Left | Thru | Right | U | Left | Thru | Right | U | Left | Thru | Right | U | Left | Thru | Right | U |  |  |  |
| All Vehicles | 16 | 2344 | 12 | 4 | 124 | 2756 | 96 | 4 | 184 | 4 | 48 | 0 | 76 | 4 | 300 | 0 |  | 72 |
| Heavy Trucks Buses | 0 | 48 | 0 |  | 4 | 84 | 12 |  | 4 | 0 | 0 |  | 4 | 0 | 16 |  |  | 72 |
| Pedestrians |  | 8 |  |  |  | 8 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 16 |  |  |  | 2 |
| Bicycles Scooters | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 |

Comments:

Peak-Hour: 4:15 PM -- 5:15 PM
Peak 15-Min: 5:00 PM -- 5:15 PM


| 15-Min Count Period Beginning At | 17 - New Hampshire Ave (Northbound) |  |  |  | 17 - New Hampshire Ave (Southbound) |  |  |  | Oakview Dr (Eastbound) |  |  |  | Oakview Dr (Westbound) |  |  |  | Total | Hourly Totals |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Left | Thru | Right | U | Left | Thru | Right | U | Left | Thru | Right | U | Left | Thru | Right | U |  |  |
| 4:00 PM | 7 | 552 | 5 | 2 | 38 | 419 | 47 | 1 | 45 | 3 | 12 | 0 | 11 | 2 | 86 | 0 | 1230 |  |
| 4:15 PM | 4 | 558 | 7 | 0 | 53 | 629 | 80 | 2 | 24 | 1 | 13 | 0 | 10 | 1 | 84 | 0 | 1466 |  |
| 4:30 PM | 8 | 540 | 4 | 0 | 51 | 643 | 54 | 2 | 41 | 1 | 8 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 77 | 0 | 1438 |  |
| 4:45 PM | 7 | 554 | 7 | 0 | 48 | 622 | 59 | 4 | 33 | 1 | 8 | 0 | 17 | 2 | 75 | 0 | 1437 | 5571 |
| 5:00 PM | 4 | 566 | 3 | 0 | 54 | 660 | 60 | 4 | 47 | 3 | 8 | 0 | 15 | 2 | 86 | 0 | 1512 | 5853 |
| 5:15 PM | 3 | 572 | 3 | 2 | 43 | 642 | 41 | 3 | 36 | 1 | 10 | 0 | 11 | 1 | 73 | 0 | 1441 | 5828 |
| 5:30 PM | 5 | 568 | 5 | 0 | 45 | 607 | 47 | 2 | 33 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 13 | 3 | 78 | 0 | 1415 | 5805 |
| 5:45 PM | 9 | 558 | 7 | 0 | 42 | 588 | 63 | 3 | 57 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 64 | 0 | 1410 | 5778 |
| 6:00 PM | 11 | 544 | 6 | 0 | 50 | 611 | 55 | 4 | 52 | 2 | 9 | 0 | 18 | 0 | 66 | 0 | 1428 | 5694 |
| 6:15 PM | 10 | 564 | 2 | 0 | 53 | 618 | 44 | 3 | 30 | 1 | 8 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 72 | 0 | 1418 | 5671 |
| 6:30 PM | 10 | 551 | 7 | 1 | 51 | 625 | 42 | 4 | 27 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 10 | 1 | 60 | 0 | 1397 | 5653 |
| 6:45 PM | 7 | 550 | 10 | 2 | 53 | 560 | 43 | 5 | 24 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 13 | 1 | 74 | 0 | 1346 | 5589 |
| Peak 15-Min Flowrates | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Total |  |
|  | Left | Thru | Right | U | Left | Thru | Right | U | Left | Thru | Right | U | Left | Thru | Right | U |  |  |  |
| All Vehicles | 16 | 2264 | 12 | 0 | 216 | 2640 | 240 | 16 | 188 | 12 | 32 | 0 | 60 | 8 | 344 | 0 |  | 48 |
| Heavy Trucks Buses | 4 | 56 | 0 |  | 0 | 36 | 4 |  | 8 | 0 | 0 |  | 4 | 0 | 12 |  |  | 24 |
| Pedestrians |  | 8 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 8 |
| Bicycles Scooters | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |



Peak-Hour: 5:45 PM -- 6:45 PM
Peak 15-Min: 6:00 PM -- 6:15 PM

Quality Counts


| 15-Min Count Period Beginning At | 18 - New Hampshire Ave (Northbound) |  |  |  | 18 - New Hampshire Ave (Southbound) |  |  |  | Dilston Rd/Adelphi Rd (Eastbound) |  |  |  | Dilston Rd/Adelphi Rd (Westbound) |  |  |  | Total | Hourly Totals |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Left | Thru | Right | U | Left | Thru | Right | U | Left | Thru | Right | U | Left | Thru | Right | U |  |  |
| 4:00 PM | 0 | 361 | 1 | 0 | 124 | 293 | 11 | 1 | 15 | 9 | 6 | 0 | 16 | 11 | 194 | 0 | 1042 |  |
| 4:15 PM | 0 | 380 | 4 | 0 | 136 | 470 | 22 | 0 | 15 | 7 | 6 | 0 | 23 | 13 | 192 | 0 | 1268 |  |
| 4:30 PM | 0 | 340 | 7 | 0 | 154 | 466 | 14 | 0 | 10 | 8 | 9 | 0 | 24 | 17 | 213 | 1 | 1263 |  |
| 4:45 PM | 1 | 361 | 3 | 0 | 151 | 442 | 15 | 1 | 11 | 2 | 7 | 0 | 26 | 9 | 196 | 0 | 1225 | 4798 |
| 5:00 PM | 0 | 352 | 6 | 0 | 166 | 474 | 11 | 0 | 10 | 10 | 8 | 0 | 26 | 10 | 234 | 0 | 1307 | 5063 |
| 5:15 PM | 0 | 358 | 2 | 0 | 166 | 458 | 28 | 0 | 17 | 7 | 6 | 0 | 29 | 16 | 195 | 0 | 1282 | 5077 |
| 5:30 PM | 0 | 352 | 11 | 0 | 134 | 441 | 9 | 1 | 19 | 7 | 12 | 0 | 28 | 12 | 212 | 1 | 1239 | 5053 |
| 5:45 PM | 0 | 399 | 5 | 0 | 143 | 455 | 14 | 1 | 11 | 9 | 9 | 0 | 35 | 13 | 161 | 0 | 1255 | 5083 |
| 6:00 PM | 0 | 399 | 3 | 0 | 148 | 456 | 22 | 0 | 10 | 9 | 6 | 0 | 18 | 14 | 207 | 0 | 1292 | 5068 |
| 6:15 PM | 0 | 361 | 6 | 0 | 101 | 529 | 16 | 0 | 14 | 2 | 8 | 0 | 22 | 8 | 211 | 0 | 1278 | 5064 |
| 6:30 PM | 0 | 360 | 6 | 0 | 159 | 452 | 17 | 1 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 0 | 21 | 14 | 217 | 0 | 1265 | 5090 |
| 6:45 PM | 0 | 424 | 11 | 0 | 139 | 414 | 16 | 0 | 8 | 6 | 5 | 0 | 13 | 9 | 151 | 0 | 1196 | 5031 |
| Peak 15-Min Flowrates | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Total |  |
|  | Left | Thru | Right | U | Left | Thru | Right | U | Left | Thru | Right | U | Left | Thru | Right | U |  |  |  |
| All Vehicles | 0 | 1596 | 12 | 0 | 592 | 1824 | 88 | 0 | 40 | 36 | 24 | 0 | 72 | 56 | 828 | 0 |  | 68 |
| Heavy Trucks Buses | 0 | 84 | 4 |  | 8 | 40 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 4 |  |  | 0 |
| Pedestrians |  | $0$ |  |  |  | $0$ |  |  |  | $0$ |  |  |  | $0$ |  |  |  |  |
| Bicycles Scooters | 0 | $0$ | 0 |  | 0 | $0$ | 0 |  | 0 | $0$ | 0 |  | 0 | $0$ | 0 |  |  |  |

Comments:


Peak-Hour: 7:00 AM -- 8:00 AM
Peak 15-Min: 7:30 AM -- 7:45 AM


| 15-Min Count Period Beginning At | 19 - New Hampshire Ave (Northbound) |  |  |  | 19 - New Hampshire Ave (Southbound) |  |  |  | Northampton Rd (Eastbound) |  |  |  | Northampton Rd (Westbound) |  |  |  | Total | Hourly Totals |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Left | Thru | Right | U | Left | Thru | Right | U | Left | Thru | Right | U | Left | Thru | Right | U |  |  |
| 6:00 AM | 30 | 319 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 327 | 17 | 0 | 57 | 0 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 770 |  |
| 6:15 AM | 15 | 353 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 438 | 17 | 0 | 51 | 0 | 13 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 892 |  |
| 6:30 AM | 29 | 330 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 409 | 14 | 0 | 40 | 0 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 841 |  |
| 6:45 AM | 20 | 303 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 533 | 23 | 0 | 51 | 0 | 21 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 956 | 3459 |
| 7:00 AM | 29 | 335 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 536 | 20 | 0 | 39 | 0 | 26 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 988 | 3677 |
| 7:15 AM | 34 | 396 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 541 | 30 | 0 | 62 | 0 | 25 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1096 | 3881 |
| 7:30 AM | 34 | 397 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 599 | 21 | 0 | 43 | 0 | 19 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1116 | 4156 |
| 7:45 AM | 35 | 377 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 540 | 32 | 0 | 45 | 0 | 40 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1072 | 4272 |
| 8:00 AM | 22 | 324 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 519 | 39 | 0 | 45 | 0 | 25 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 975 | 4259 |
| 8:15 AM | 23 | 288 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 478 | 23 | 0 | 49 | 0 | 23 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 887 | 4050 |
| 8:30 AM | 14 | 309 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 297 | 17 | 0 | 23 | 0 | 11 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 673 | 3607 |
| 8:45 AM | 27 | 248 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 372 | 24 | 0 | 24 | 0 | 24 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 734 | 3269 |
| Peak 15-Min Flowrates | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Total |  |
|  | Left | Thru | Right | U | Left | Thru | Right | U | Left | Thru | Right | U | Left | Thru | Right | U |  |  |  |
| All Vehicles | 136 | 1588 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 2396 | 84 | 0 | 172 | 0 | 76 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 64 |
| Heavy Trucks Buses | 4 | 44 | 0 |  | 0 | 80 | 8 |  | 16 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 52 |
| Pedestrians |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |
| Bicycles Scooters | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 |

Comments:


Peak-Hour: 7:00 AM -- 8:00 AM
Peak 15-Min: 7:30 AM -- 7:45 AM


| 15-Min Count Period Beginning At | 20 - New Hampshire Ave (Northbound) |  |  |  | 20 - New Hampshire Ave (Southbound) |  |  |  | Metzerott Rd (Eastbound) |  |  |  | Metzerott Rd (Westbound) |  |  |  | Total | Hourly Totals |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Left | Thru | Right | U | Left | Thru | Right | U | Left | Thru | Right | U | Left | Thru | Right | U |  |  |
| 6:00 AM | 0 | 331 | 46 | 0 | 27 | 319 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 68 | 0 | 31 | 0 | 822 |  |
| 6:15 AM | 0 | 332 | 38 | 0 | 20 | 436 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 90 | 0 | 37 | 0 | 953 |  |
| 6:30 AM | 0 | 334 | 43 | 0 | 17 | 419 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 109 | 0 | 34 | 0 | 957 |  |
| 6:45 AM | 0 | 291 | 50 | 0 | 31 | 524 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 65 | 0 | 27 | 0 | 989 | 3721 |
| 7:00 AM | 0 | 339 | 48 | 0 | 32 | 547 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 101 | 0 | 33 | 0 | 1101 | 4000 |
| 7:15 AM | 0 | 380 | 60 | 0 | 27 | 567 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 104 | 0 | 41 | 0 | 1181 | 4228 |
| 7:30 AM | 0 | 377 | 81 | 1 | 23 | 592 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 98 | 0 | 31 | 0 | 1204 | 4475 |
| 7:45 AM | 0 | 378 | 71 | 0 | 34 | 556 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 106 | 0 | 27 | 0 | 1173 | 4659 |
| 8:00 AM | 0 | 306 | 60 | 0 | 31 | 529 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 118 | 0 | 28 | 0 | 1073 | 4631 |
| 8:15 AM | 0 | 280 | 49 | 0 | 24 | 498 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 88 | 0 | 21 | 0 | 961 | 4411 |
| 8:30 AM | 0 | 304 | 50 | 0 | 19 | 287 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 74 | 0 | 23 | 0 | 759 | 3966 |
| 8:45 AM | 0 | 236 | 50 | 0 | 30 | 364 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 75 | 0 | 34 | 0 | 790 | 3583 |
| Peak 15-Min Flowrates | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Total |  |
|  | Left | Thru | Right | U | Left | Thru | Right | U | Left | Thru | Right | U | Left | Thru | Right | U |  |  |  |
| All Vehicles | 0 | 1508 | 324 | 4 | 92 | 2368 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 392 | 0 | 124 | 0 |  | 16 |
| Heavy Trucks Buses | 0 | 40 | 16 |  | 0 | 64 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 8 | 0 | 4 |  |  | 32 |
| Pedestrians |  | 0 |  |  |  | 16 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 6 |
| Bicycles Scooters | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 |

Comments:

Peak-Hour: 5:15 PM -- 6:15 PM
Peak 15-Min: 5:45 PM -- 6:00 PM



| 15-Min Count Period Beginning At | 20 - New Hampshire Ave (Northbound) |  |  |  | 20 - New Hampshire Ave (Southbound) |  |  |  | Metzerott Rd (Eastbound) |  |  |  | Metzerott Rd (Westbound) |  |  |  | Total | Hourly Totals |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Left | Thru | Right | U | Left | Thru | Right | U | Left | Thru | Right | U | Left | Thru | Right | U |  |  |
| 4:00 PM | 0 | 397 | 101 | 0 | 65 | 278 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 81 | 0 | 23 | 0 | 946 |  |
| 4:15 PM | 0 | 382 | 92 | 0 | 58 | 422 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 76 | 0 | 24 | 0 | 1054 |  |
| 4:30 PM | 0 | 400 | 101 | 0 | 65 | 433 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 102 | 0 | 27 | 0 | 1129 |  |
| 4:45 PM | 0 | 389 | 119 | 1 | 68 | 428 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 95 | 0 | 29 | 0 | 1130 | 4259 |
| 5:00 PM | 0 | 346 | 111 | 0 | 70 | 427 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 80 | 0 | 31 | 0 | 1066 | 4379 |
| 5:15 PM | 0 | 418 | 104 | 0 | 61 | 434 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 85 | 0 | 26 | 0 | 1128 | 4453 |
| 5:30 PM | 0 | 390 | 114 | 0 | 65 | 457 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 72 | 0 | 34 | 0 | 1132 | 4456 |
| 5:45 PM | 0 | 446 | 127 | 0 | 57 | 431 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 80 | 0 | 25 | 0 | 1166 | 4492 |
| 6:00 PM | 0 | 413 | 82 | 0 | 63 | 418 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 90 | 0 | 30 | 0 | 1096 | 4522 |
| 6:15 PM | 0 | 409 | 97 | 1 | 49 | 456 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 87 | 0 | 18 | 0 | 1117 | 4511 |
| 6:30 PM | 0 | 351 | 101 | 0 | 56 | 426 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 86 | 0 | 29 | 0 | 1052 | 4431 |
| 6:45 PM | 0 | 362 | 89 | 1 | 52 | 401 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 82 | 0 | 27 | 0 | 1015 | 4280 |
| Peak 15-Min Flowrates | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Total |  |
|  | Left | Thru | Right | U | Left | Thru | Right | U | Left | Thru | Right | U | Left | Thru | Right | U |  |  |  |
| All Vehicles | 0 | 1784 | 508 | 0 | 228 | 1724 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 320 | 0 | 100 | 0 |  | 64 |
| Heavy Trucks Buses | 0 | 32 | 8 |  | 4 | 40 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 8 |
| Pedestrians |  | 0 |  |  |  | 12 |  |  |  | 4 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 6 |
| Bicycles Scooters | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 |

Comments:

Peak-Hour: 7:00 AM -- 8:00 AM
Peak 15-Min: 7:30 AM -- 7:45 AM


| 15-Min Count Period Beginning At | 21 - New Hampshire Ave (Northbound) |  |  |  | 21 - New Hampshire Ave (Southbound) |  |  |  | Piney Branch Rd (Eastbound) |  |  |  | Piney Branch Rd (Westbound) |  |  |  | Total | Hourly Totals |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Left | Thru | Right | U | Left | Thru | Right | U | Left | Thru | Right | U | Left | Thru | Right | U |  |  |
| 6:00 AM | 37 | 306 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 283 | 123 | 0 | 82 | 0 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 850 |  |
| 6:15 AM | 37 | 322 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 319 | 224 | 0 | 58 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 969 |  |
| 6:30 AM | 16 | 283 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 305 | 230 | 0 | 79 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 924 |  |
| 6:45 AM | 17 | 288 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 331 | 270 | 1 | 67 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 988 | 3731 |
| 7:00 AM | 16 | 324 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 386 | 283 | 0 | 64 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1087 | 3968 |
| 7:15 AM | 15 | 368 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 411 | 262 | 0 | 74 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1145 | 4144 |
| 7:30 AM | 29 | 381 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 422 | 296 | 0 | 90 | 0 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1237 | 4457 |
| 7:45 AM | 20 | 327 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 391 | 301 | 0 | 97 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1150 | 4619 |
| 8:00 AM | 10 | 278 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 410 | 254 | 0 | 88 | 0 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1071 | 4603 |
| 8:15 AM | 11 | 256 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 425 | 199 | 0 | 86 | 0 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 999 | 4457 |
| 8:30 AM | 7 | 268 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 234 | 136 | 0 | 75 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 731 | 3951 |
| 8:45 AM | 10 | 222 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 299 | 155 | 0 | 75 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 769 | 3570 |
| Peak 15-Min Flowrates | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Total |  |
|  | Left | Thru | Right | U | Left | Thru | Right | U | Left | Thru | Right | U | Left | Thru | Right | U |  |  |  |
| All Vehicles | 116 | 1524 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 1688 | 1184 | 0 | 360 | 0 | 68 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 48 |
| Heavy Trucks Buses | 4 | 56 | 0 |  | 0 | 40 | 44 |  | 8 | 0 | 4 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 56 |
| Pedestrians |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |
| Bicycles Scooters | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 |

Comments:

Peak-Hour: 4:45 PM -- 5:45 PM
Peak 15-Min: 4:45 PM -- 5:00 PM


| 15-Min Count Period Beginning At | 21 - New Hampshire Ave (Northbound) |  |  |  | 21 - New Hampshire Ave (Southbound) |  |  |  | Piney Branch Rd (Eastbound) |  |  |  | Piney Branch Rd (Westbound) |  |  |  | Total | Hourly Totals |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Left | Thru | Right | U | Left | Thru | Right | U | Left | Thru | Right | U | Left | Thru | Right | U |  |  |
| 4:00 PM | 21 | 357 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 237 | 156 | 0 | 158 | 0 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 954 |  |
| 4:15 PM | 14 | 342 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 354 | 165 | 0 | 138 | 0 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1031 |  |
| 4:30 PM | 12 | 371 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 375 | 170 | 0 | 149 | 0 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1100 |  |
| 4:45 PM | 26 | 397 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 383 | 170 | 0 | 151 | 0 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1156 | 4241 |
| 5:00 PM | 21 | 382 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 354 | 189 | 0 | 152 | 0 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1117 | 4404 |
| 5:15 PM | 25 | 387 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 376 | 154 | 1 | 144 | 0 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1113 | 4486 |
| 5:30 PM | 18 | 395 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 366 | 170 | 0 | 156 | 0 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1128 | 4514 |
| 5:45 PM | 24 | 385 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 358 | 154 | 0 | 159 | 0 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1106 | 4464 |
| 6:00 PM | 25 | 383 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 354 | 165 | 0 | 131 | 0 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1083 | 4430 |
| 6:15 PM | 34 | 411 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 390 | 165 | 0 | 153 | 0 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1182 | 4499 |
| 6:30 PM | 15 | 354 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 346 | 165 | 0 | 126 | 0 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1025 | 4396 |
| 6:45 PM | 15 | 352 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 329 | 163 | 0 | 106 | 0 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 990 | 4280 |
| Peak 15-Min Flowrates | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Total |  |
|  | Left | Thru | Right | U | Left | Thru | Right | U | Left | Thru | Right | U | Left | Thru | Right | U |  |  |  |
| All Vehicles | 104 | 1588 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 1532 | 680 | 0 | 604 | 0 | 112 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 24 |
| Heavy Trucks Buses | 0 | 40 | 0 |  | 0 | 20 | 28 |  | 40 | 0 | 4 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 32 |
| Pedestrians |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |
| Bicycles Scooters | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 |

Comments:


Peak-Hour: 5:30 PM -- 6:30 PM
Peak 15-Min: 6:15 PM -- 6:30 PM


| $\begin{gathered} \text { 15-Min Count } \\ \text { Period } \\ \text { Beginning At } \end{gathered}$ | 53 - New Hampshire Ave (Northbound) |  |  |  | 53 - New Hampshire Ave (Southbound) |  |  |  | Fox St(Eastbound) |  |  |  | Fox St(Westbound) |  |  |  | Total | Hourly Totals |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Left | Thru | Right | U | Left | Thru | Right | U | Left | Thru | Right | U | Left | Thru | Right | U |  |  |
| 4:00 PM | 0 | 361 | 34 | 0 | 5 | 320 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 729 |  |
| 4:15 PM | 0 | 373 | 48 | 0 | 14 | 490 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 931 |  |
| 4:30 PM | 0 | 371 | 28 | 0 | 7 | 507 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 925 |  |
| 4:45 PM | 0 | 352 | 27 | 0 | 6 | 466 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 856 | 3441 |
| 5:00 PM | 0 | 355 | 31 | 0 | 10 | 509 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 911 | 3623 |
| 5:15 PM | 0 | 357 | 33 | 0 | 9 | 483 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 896 | 3588 |
| 5:30 PM | 0 | 385 | 35 | 0 | 8 | 482 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 9 | 1 | 924 | 3587 |
| 5:45 PM | 0 | 427 | 29 | 0 | 5 | 474 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 939 | 3670 |
| 6:00 PM | 0 | 384 | 41 | 0 | 8 | 497 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 936 | 3695 |
| 6:15 PM | 0 | 405 | 31 | 0 | 8 | 537 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 995 | 3794 |
| 6:30 PM | 0 | 349 | 29 | 2 | 10 | 482 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 878 | 3748 |
| 6:45 PM | 0 | 376 | 26 | 0 | 7 | 439 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 860 | 3669 |
| Peak 15-Min Flowrates | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Total |  |
|  | Left | Thru | Right | U | Left | Thru | Right | U | Left | Thru | Right | U | Left | Thru | Right | U |  |  |  |
| All Vehicles | 0 | 1620 | 124 | 0 | 32 | 2148 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 44 | 0 | 8 | 4 |  | 80 |
| Heavy Trucks Buses | 0 | 64 | 0 |  | 0 | 40 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 4 |
| Pedestrians |  | 0 |  |  |  | $0$ |  |  |  | $0$ |  |  |  | $0$ |  |  |  | 0 |
| Bicycles Scooters | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | $0$ | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | $0$ | 0 |  |  | 0 |

Comments:

## Appendix B: Speed Sentry Data



Start: 2022-02-07
End: 2022-02-14
Times: 0:00-23:59

## Overall Summary

Total Days of Data: 8
Speed Limit: 40
Average Speed: 34.13
50th Percentile Speed: 34.53
85th Percentile Speed: 41.89
Pace Speed Range: 30-40
Violation Threshold: Speed Limit + 10
Speed Range: 1 to 150

Minimum Speed: 5
Maximum Speed: 81
Display Mode: Display Off
Average Volume per Day: 5803.9
Total Volume: 46431



Vehicles Slowed $\square$ Other

50


20


Start: 2022-02-07
End: 2022-02-14
Times: 0:00-23:59
Violation Threshold: Speed Limit + 10
Speed Range: 1 to 150

| Time | Sign Mode | Speed Limit | Total \# Vehicles | Total \# Violator | Violator | Avg \# Vehicles | Avg \# Violators | Min Speed | Max Speed | Avg Speed | $\begin{aligned} & 50 \% \\ & \text { Speed } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 85 \% \\ & \text { Speed } \end{aligned}$ | Sign <br> Effectiveness |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0:00 | Display Off | 40 | 775 | 57 | 7.4\% | 110.7 | 8.1 | 5 | 65 | 37.2 | 37.4 | 45.7 | 29.7\% |
| 1:00 | Display Off | 40 | 468 | 32 | 6.8\% | 66.9 | 4.6 | 8 | 69 | 38.2 | 38.3 | 45.4 | 29.5\% |
| 2:00 | Display Off | 40 | 371 | 25 | 6.7\% | 53.0 | 3.6 | 6 | 67 | 38.9 | 39.0 | 45.7 | 26.6\% |
| 3:00 | Display Off | 40 | 404 | 24 | 5.9\% | 57.7 | 3.4 | 8 | 73 | 39.1 | 39.1 | 46.2 | 25.4\% |
| 4:00 | Display Off | 40 | 764 | 54 | 7.1\% | 109.1 | 7.7 | 6 | 70 | 39.4 | 39.6 | 47.0 | 25.7\% |
| 5:00 | Display Off | 40 | 1720 | 65 | 3.8\% | 245.7 | 9.3 | 5 | 63 | 36.2 | 36.8 | 44.7 | 31.7\% |
| 6:00 | Display Off | 40 | 2474 | 62 | 2.5\% | 353.4 | 8.9 | 5 | 66 | 35.6 | 36.0 | 43.2 | 33.2\% |
| 7:00 | Display Off | 40 | 2793 | 46 | 1.6\% | 399.0 | 6.6 | 5 | 66 | 33.4 | 34.2 | 42.0 | 42.1\% |
| 8:00 | Display Off | 40 | 2437 | 76 | 3.1\% | 348.1 | 10.9 | 5 | 67 | 36.2 | 36.7 | 43.9 | 33.9\% |
| 9:00 | Display Off | 40 | 1854 | 58 | 3.1\% | 309.0 | 9.7 | 5 | 68 | 36.5 | 37.1 | 44.5 | 32.2\% |
| 10:00 | Display Off | 40 | 2218 | 70 | 3.2\% | 316.9 | 10.0 | 5 | 67 | 36.9 | 37.4 | 44.2 | 33.4\% |
| 11:00 | Display Off | 40 | 2239 | 71 | 3.2\% | 319.9 | 10.1 | 5 | 81 | 36.6 | 36.7 | 43.6 | 33.4\% |
| 12:00 | Display Off | 40 | 2417 | 66 | 2.7\% | 345.3 | 9.4 | 5 | 62 | 35.8 | 36.2 | 43.2 | 34.9\% |
| 13:00 | Display Off | 40 | 2486 | 63 | 2.5\% | 355.1 | 9.0 | 5 | 73 | 35.1 | 35.9 | 42.9 | 35.4\% |
| 14:00 | Display Off | 40 | 2773 | 56 | 2.0\% | 396.1 | 8.0 | 5 | 63 | 34.8 | 35.8 | 42.5 | 38.9\% |
| 15:00 | Display Off | 40 | 2960 | 36 | 1.2\% | 422.9 | 5.1 | 5 | 65 | 31.8 | 32.7 | 40.5 | 47.0\% |
| 16:00 | Display Off | 40 | 2889 | 37 | 1.3\% | 412.7 | 5.3 | 5 | 62 | 31.2 | 31.5 | 39.2 | 50.2\% |
| 17:00 | Display Off | 40 | 2930 | 23 | 0.8\% | 418.6 | 3.3 | 5 | 75 | 28.0 | 28.2 | 35.7 | 51.1\% |
| 18:00 | Display Off | 40 | 2791 | 13 | 0.5\% | 398.7 | 1.9 | 5 | 78 | 31.1 | 31.3 | 38.2 | 47.4\% |
| 19:00 | Display Off | 40 | 2401 | 14 | 0.6\% | 343.0 | 2.0 | 5 | 73 | 31.3 | 31.2 | 39.0 | 39.4\% |
| 20:00 | Display Off | 40 | 2033 | 30 | 1.5\% | 290.4 | 4.3 | 5 | 67 | 32.9 | 32.8 | 40.8 | 37.9\% |
| 21:00 | Display Off | 40 | 1712 | 37 | 2.2\% | 244.6 | 5.3 | 5 | 68 | 33.6 | 33.7 | 41.1 | 36.9\% |
| 22:00 | Display Off | 40 | 1398 | 45 | 3.2\% | 199.7 | 6.4 | 6 | 66 | 35.7 | 35.6 | 43.1 | 35.1\% |
| 23:00 | Display Off | 40 | 1124 | 45 | 4.0\% | 160.6 | 6.4 | 5 | 68 | 36.8 | 37.4 | 44.6 | 35.6\% |
| Total Volumes/ Avg |  |  | 46431 | 1105 | 2.4\% | 6677.1 | 159.3 | 5 | 81 | 35.1 | 35.4 | 42.8 | 36.1\% |
| Total/Avg w/o Feedback |  |  | 46431 | 1105 | 2.4\% | 6677.1 | 159.3 | 5 | 81 | 35.1 | 35.4 | 42.8 | 36.1\% |
| Total/Avg w/ Feedback |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a |

Start: 2022-02-07
End: 2022-02-14
Times: 0:00-23:59
Speed Bins: Size 5, Range 1 to 150
Time View: By Hour (Total Volumes)

| Time | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ \text { to } \\ 5 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6 \\ & \text { to } \\ & 10 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 11 \\ & \text { to } \\ & 15 \end{aligned}$ | 16 to 20 | $\begin{aligned} & 21 \\ & \text { to } \\ & 25 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 26 \\ & \text { to } \\ & 30 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 31 \\ & \text { to } \\ & 35 \end{aligned}$ | 36 <br> to <br> 40 | 41 <br> to $45$ | 46 <br> to <br> 50 | 51 <br> to <br> 55 | $\begin{aligned} & 56 \\ & \text { to } \\ & 60 \end{aligned}$ | 61 to 65 | $\begin{aligned} & 66 \\ & \text { to } \\ & 70 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 71 \\ & \text { to } \\ & 75 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 76 \\ & \text { to } \\ & 80 \end{aligned}$ | 81 <br> to <br> 85 | $\begin{aligned} & 86 \\ & \text { to } \\ & 90 \end{aligned}$ | 91 to 95 | $\begin{gathered} 96 \\ \text { to } \\ 100 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 101 \\ \text { to } \\ 150 \end{gathered}$ | Avg Speed | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0:00 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 8 | 35 | 93 | 164 | 218 | 128 | 64 | 37 | 13 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 37.4 | 775 |
| 1:00 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 6 | 16 | 37 | 101 | 120 | 107 | 45 | 22 | 6 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38.4 | 468 |
| 2:00 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 31 | 68 | 108 | 98 | 29 | 17 | 7 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 39.1 | 371 |
| 3:00 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 9 | 38 | 76 | 101 | 96 | 56 | 21 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 39.1 | 404 |
| 4:00 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 2 | 29 | 78 | 110 | 195 | 184 | 105 | 35 | 13 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 39.2 | 764 |
| 5:00 | 4 | 13 | 17 | 41 | 92 | 233 | 360 | 417 | 320 | 158 | 45 | 19 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36.3 | 1720 |
| 6:00 | 4 | 26 | 22 | 51 | 156 | 363 | 523 | 628 | 479 | 160 | 49 | 11 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 35.5 | 2474 |
| 7:00 | 3 | 36 | 49 | 97 | 227 | 498 | 679 | 646 | 365 | 147 | 35 | 9 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33.6 | 2793 |
| 8:00 | 1 | 16 | 29 | 47 | 111 | 307 | 560 | 641 | 462 | 187 | 55 | 17 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36.2 | 2437 |
| 9:00 | 2 | 20 | 15 | 35 | 99 | 218 | 375 | 491 | 372 | 169 | 41 | 12 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36.5 | 1854 |
| 10:00 | 2 | 21 | 22 | 40 | 82 | 199 | 457 | 653 | 484 | 188 | 55 | 12 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 37.1 | 2218 |
| 11:00 | 1 | 14 | 18 | 34 | 106 | 259 | 512 | 643 | 419 | 162 | 48 | 18 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36.5 | 2239 |
| 12:00 | 2 | 26 | 32 | 53 | 103 | 309 | 543 | 671 | 444 | 168 | 47 | 16 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 35.9 | 2417 |
| 13:00 | 9 | 54 | 39 | 56 | 141 | 285 | 566 | 714 | 395 | 164 | 44 | 15 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 35.1 | 2486 |
| 14:00 | 6 | 43 | 35 | 63 | 128 | 377 | 710 | 724 | 483 | 148 | 41 | 11 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 35.0 | 2773 |
| 15:00 | 26 | 99 | 91 | 112 | 260 | 553 | 771 | 569 | 324 | 119 | 27 | 5 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 31.9 | 2960 |
| 16:00 | 19 | 118 | 105 | 137 | 279 | 510 | 766 | 574 | 261 | 83 | 31 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 31.0 | 2889 |
| 17:00 | 51 | 230 | 189 | 199 | 339 | 525 | 681 | 438 | 187 | 68 | 16 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28.0 | 2930 |
| 18:00 | 4 | 39 | 67 | 132 | 313 | 665 | 826 | 482 | 194 | 56 | 8 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 31.1 | 2791 |
| 19:00 | 1 | 38 | 47 | 118 | 296 | 580 | 589 | 443 | 210 | 65 | 12 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 31.3 | 2401 |
| 20:00 | 5 | 29 | 37 | 75 | 201 | 402 | 511 | 452 | 209 | 82 | 23 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 32.8 | 2033 |
| 21:00 | 1 | 32 | 33 | 50 | 138 | 332 | 409 | 397 | 212 | 71 | 26 | 9 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33.3 | 1712 |
| 22:00 | 0 | 16 | 11 | 20 | 64 | 188 | 374 | 371 | 226 | 83 | 27 | 13 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 35.7 | 1398 |
| 23:00 | 2 | 5 | 9 | 22 | 42 | 132 | 223 | 329 | 212 | 103 | 31 | 9 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 37.0 | 1124 |
| Total | 144 | 891 | 872 | 1400 | 3277 | 7212 | 0954 | 1025 | 6871 | 2680 | 793 | 233 | 54 | 18 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 34.2 | 46431 |



Start: 2022-02-07
End: 2022-02-14
Times: 0:00-23:59

Speed Bins: Size 5, Range 1 to 150
Time View: By Hour (Total Volumes)

Total Volume by Speed Distribution


Volume over Time
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New Hampshire Ave @ Fox St, SB


Start: 2022-02-14
End: 2022-02-21
Times: 0:00-23:59
Violation Threshold: Speed Limit + 10
Speed Range: 1 to 150

## Overall Summary

Total Days of Data: 8
Speed Limit: 40
Average Speed: 38.32
50th Percentile Speed: 39.77
85th Percentile Speed: 47.54
Pace Speed Range: 36-46

Minimum Speed: 5
Maximum Speed: 102
Display Mode: Display Off
Average Volume per Day: 11086.4
Total Volume: 88691


Violators $\square$ Inside Threshold $\square$ Compliant


Vehicles Slowed
Other

## 60



30


Start: 2022-02-14
End: 2022-02-21
Times: 0:00-23:59
Violation Threshold: Speed Limit + 10
Speed Range: 1 to 150

| Time | Sign Mode | Speed Limit | Total \# Vehicles | Total \# Violator | Violator | Avg \# Vehicles | Avg \# Violators | Min Speed | Max Speed | Avg Speed | $\begin{aligned} & 50 \% \\ & \text { Speed } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 85 \% \\ & \text { Speed } \end{aligned}$ | Sign <br> Effectiveness |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0:00 | Display Off | 40 | 2350 | 388 | 16.5\% | 335.7 | 55.4 | 5 | 102 | 41.8 | 42.8 | 50.9 | 48.7\% |
| 1:00 | Display Off | 40 | 1633 | 206 | 12.6\% | 233.3 | 29.4 | 5 | 91 | 41.5 | 42.5 | 49.6 | 48.4\% |
| 2:00 | Display Off | 40 | 1267 | 236 | 18.6\% | 181.0 | 33.7 | 5 | 90 | 42.8 | 43.6 | 51.6 | 45.4\% |
| 3:00 | Display Off | 40 | 1291 | 245 | 19.0\% | 184.4 | 35.0 | 5 | 81 | 42.7 | 43.6 | 51.9 | 45.3\% |
| 4:00 | Display Off | 40 | 2210 | 413 | 18.7\% | 315.7 | 59.0 | 5 | 80 | 42.9 | 43.7 | 51.6 | 43.2\% |
| 5:00 | Display Off | 40 | 3445 | 529 | 15.4\% | 492.1 | 75.6 | 5 | 80 | 41.0 | 42.7 | 50.5 | 46.8\% |
| 6:00 | Display Off | 40 | 4243 | 487 | 11.5\% | 606.1 | 69.6 | 5 | 84 | 40.2 | 41.6 | 49.0 | 51.2\% |
| 7:00 | Display Off | 40 | 3909 | 265 | 6.8\% | 651.5 | 44.2 | 5 | 78 | 34.8 | 36.8 | 45.4 | 55.4\% |
| 8:00 | Display Off | 40 | 3940 | 348 | 8.8\% | 656.7 | 58.0 | 5 | 78 | 37.1 | 38.8 | 47.3 | 55.5\% |
| 9:00 | Display Off | 40 | 3721 | 419 | 11.3\% | 620.2 | 69.8 | 5 | 87 | 40.3 | 41.8 | 49.2 | 52.2\% |
| 10:00 | Display Off | 40 | 4014 | 449 | 11.2\% | 573.4 | 64.1 | 5 | 78 | 40.8 | 41.8 | 48.9 | 49.3\% |
| 11:00 | Display Off | 40 | 4252 | 386 | 9.1\% | 607.4 | 55.1 | 5 | 85 | 39.8 | 41.1 | 48.0 | 50.5\% |
| 12:00 | Display Off | 40 | 4378 | 361 | 8.2\% | 625.4 | 51.6 | 5 | 76 | 39.1 | 40.4 | 47.4 | 50.9\% |
| 13:00 | Display Off | 40 | 4458 | 318 | 7.1\% | 636.9 | 45.4 | 5 | 75 | 39.1 | 40.3 | 47.1 | 51.6\% |
| 14:00 | Display Off | 40 | 4678 | 310 | 6.6\% | 668.3 | 44.3 | 5 | 82 | 38.4 | 39.7 | 47.1 | 54.6\% |
| 15:00 | Display Off | 40 | 5066 | 249 | 4.9\% | 723.7 | 35.6 | 5 | 79 | 34.5 | 36.9 | 45.2 | 62.1\% |
| 16:00 | Display Off | 40 | 5082 | 250 | 4.9\% | 726.0 | 35.7 | 5 | 76 | 34.9 | 37.0 | 45.8 | 63.9\% |
| 17:00 | Display Off | 40 | 5010 | 173 | 3.5\% | 715.7 | 24.7 | 5 | 71 | 32.9 | 34.6 | 43.8 | 63.6\% |
| 18:00 | Display Off | 40 | 5016 | 175 | 3.5\% | 716.6 | 25.0 | 5 | 68 | 34.2 | 36.2 | 44.5 | 62.8\% |
| 19:00 | Display Off | 40 | 4405 | 214 | 4.9\% | 629.3 | 30.6 | 5 | 74 | 36.2 | 37.8 | 45.7 | 59.8\% |
| 20:00 | Display Off | 40 | 4055 | 315 | 7.8\% | 579.3 | 45.0 | 5 | 83 | 39.4 | 40.4 | 47.6 | 55.3\% |
| 21:00 | Display Off | 40 | 3759 | 340 | 9.0\% | 537.0 | 48.6 | 5 | 83 | 40.3 | 41.3 | 48.1 | 54.8\% |
| 22:00 | Display Off | 40 | 3506 | 431 | 12.3\% | 500.9 | 61.6 | 5 | 85 | 40.7 | 41.4 | 49.1 | 54.0\% |
| 23:00 | Display Off | 40 | 3003 | 414 | 13.8\% | 429.0 | 59.1 | 5 | 81 | 41.4 | 42.2 | 49.8 | 51.6\% |
| Total Volumes/ Avg |  |  | 88691 | 7921 | 8.9\% | 12945.6 | 1156.1 | 5 | 102 | 39.0 | 40.4 | 48.1 | 53.2\% |
| Total/Avg w/o Feedback |  |  | 88691 | 7921 | 8.9\% | 12945.6 | 1156.1 | 5 | 102 | 39.0 | 40.4 | 48.1 | 53.2\% |
| Total/Avg w/ Feedback |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a |

Start: 2022-02-14
End: 2022-02-21
Times: 0:00-23:59
Speed Bins: Size 5, Range 1 to 150
Time View: By Hour (Total Volumes)

| Time | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ \text { to } \\ 5 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 6 \\ \text { to } \\ 10 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 11 \\ & \text { to } \\ & 15 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 16 \\ & \text { to } \\ & 20 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21 \\ & \text { to } \\ & 25 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 26 \\ & \text { to } \\ & 30 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 31 \\ & \text { to } \\ & 35 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 36 \\ & \text { to } \\ & 40 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 41 \\ & \text { to } \\ & 45 \end{aligned}$ | 46 <br> to <br> 50 | $\begin{aligned} & 51 \\ & \text { to } \\ & 55 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 56 \\ & \text { to } \\ & 60 \end{aligned}$ | 61 <br> to <br> 65 | $\begin{aligned} & 66 \\ & \text { to } \\ & 70 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 71 \\ & \text { to } \\ & 75 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 76 \\ & \text { to } \\ & 80 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 81 \\ & \text { to } \\ & 85 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 86 \\ & \text { to } \\ & 90 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 91 \\ & \text { to } \\ & 95 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 96 \\ \text { to } \\ 100 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 101 \\ \text { to } \\ 150 \end{gathered}$ | Avg Speed | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0:00 | 4 | 47 | 39 | 39 | 39 | 69 | 164 | 500 | 617 | 444 | 259 | 89 | 26 | 6 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 41.8 | 2350 |
| 1:00 | 3 | 32 | 24 | 26 | 30 | 39 | 132 | 346 | 475 | 320 | 132 | 43 | 16 | 7 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 41.5 | 1633 |
| 2:00 | 1 | 11 | 27 | 15 | 22 | 27 | 90 | 246 | 334 | 258 | 160 | 47 | 15 | 7 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 42.8 | 1267 |
| 3:00 | 2 | 27 | 19 | 18 | 16 | 26 | 86 | 249 | 325 | 278 | 139 | 53 | 29 | 15 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 42.9 | 1291 |
| 4:00 | 3 | 38 | 47 | 44 | 21 | 32 | 135 | 387 | 580 | 510 | 252 | 105 | 38 | 11 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 42.9 | 2210 |
| 5:00 | 13 | 85 | 91 | 68 | 36 | 99 | 278 | 640 | 917 | 689 | 347 | 134 | 37 | 8 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 41.2 | 3445 |
| 6:00 | 11 | 81 | 106 | 85 | 88 | 155 | 417 | 966 | 1115 | 732 | 329 | 98 | 42 | 13 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 40.2 | 4243 |
| 7:00 | 35 | 195 | 191 | 201 | 222 | 299 | 519 | 785 | 743 | 454 | 179 | 59 | 15 | 8 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 34.9 | 3909 |
| 8:00 | 18 | 134 | 133 | 150 | 192 | 245 | 474 | 879 | 834 | 533 | 225 | 77 | 26 | 13 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 37.2 | 3940 |
| 9:00 | 9 | 85 | 76 | 75 | 85 | 149 | 365 | 784 | 980 | 694 | 289 | 89 | 31 | 7 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 40.2 | 3721 |
| 10:00 | 8 | 85 | 63 | 56 | 66 | 135 | 358 | 937 | 1134 | 723 | 311 | 96 | 28 | 10 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 40.7 | 4014 |
| 11:00 | 18 | 77 | 101 | 74 | 96 | 152 | 438 | 985 | 1201 | 724 | 265 | 90 | 24 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 39.7 | 4252 |
| 12:00 | 12 | 89 | 78 | 94 | 84 | 170 | 525 | 1145 | 1198 | 622 | 253 | 83 | 18 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 39.3 | 4378 |
| 13:00 | 11 | 100 | 88 | 87 | 92 | 201 | 575 | 1071 | 1271 | 644 | 233 | 54 | 24 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 39.0 | 4458 |
| 14:00 | 14 | 92 | 78 | 116 | 135 | 234 | 617 | 1181 | 1273 | 628 | 216 | 72 | 16 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38.6 | 4678 |
| 15:00 | 36 | 217 | 223 | 266 | 369 | 463 | 678 | 1047 | 1009 | 509 | 171 | 58 | 12 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 34.5 | 5066 |
| 16:00 | 29 | 206 | 189 | 252 | 353 | 436 | 717 | 1116 | 992 | 542 | 174 | 52 | 13 | 7 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 34.9 | 5082 |
| 17:00 | 58 | 262 | 250 | 333 | 383 | 543 | 749 | 1026 | 858 | 375 | 115 | 40 | 13 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 32.7 | 5010 |
| 18:00 | 30 | 208 | 193 | 255 | 341 | 492 | 766 | 1136 | 978 | 442 | 135 | 34 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 34.2 | 5016 |
| 19:00 | 21 | 144 | 122 | 154 | 210 | 369 | 662 | 1090 | 932 | 487 | 151 | 45 | 14 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36.1 | 4405 |
| 20:00 | 17 | 75 | 82 | 68 | 73 | 178 | 500 | 1077 | 1087 | 583 | 221 | 65 | 16 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 39.2 | 4055 |
| 21:00 | 3 | 76 | 65 | 45 | 59 | 136 | 396 | 939 | 1064 | 636 | 237 | 66 | 21 | 12 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 40.3 | 3759 |
| 22:00 | 10 | 59 | 65 | 55 | 47 | 137 | 360 | 801 | 980 | 561 | 255 | 118 | 36 | 14 | 7 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 40.7 | 3506 |
| 23:00 | 5 | 61 | 61 | 50 | 41 | 77 | 294 | 670 | 752 | 578 | 248 | 89 | 51 | 14 | 9 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 41.3 | 3003 |

Total $\begin{array}{lllllll}371 & 2486 & 2411 & 2626 & 3100 & 4863\end{array}$
10295200032164912966
$\begin{array}{llllllll}5296 & 1756 & 565 & 189 & 65 & 32 & 13 & 3\end{array}$
$38.3 \quad 88691$


Start: 2022-02-14
End: 2022-02-21
Times: 0:00-23:59

Speed Bins: Size 5, Range 1 to 150
Time View: By Hour (Total Volumes)

Total Volume by Speed Distribution


Volume over Time


## Appendix C: Field Photographs of Existing Condition

MD 650 (NEW HAMPSHIRE AVENUE) HIGH INJURY NETWORK SAFETY STUDY
ROAD SAFETY AUDIT (RSA) REPORT APPENDICIES

## Sidewalk and Trailhead Disrepair



MD 650 (NEW HAMPSHIRE AVENUE) HIGH INJURY NETWORK SAFETY STUDY
ROAD SAFETY AUDIT (RSA) REPORT APPENDICIES

New Hampshire Avenue (MD 650) at Piney Branch Road (MD 320) to New Hampshire Avenue (MD 650) at Southampton Drive
Obstructed Sidewalks


MD 650 (NEW HAMPSHIRE AVENUE) HIGH INJURY NETWORK SAFETY STUDY
ROAD SAFETY AUDIT (RSA) REPORT APPENDICIES

Limited Visibility with Crosswalks


Poor pedestrian visibility at crosswalk for vehicles turning right onto New Hampshire Avenue (MD 650)


Poor pedestrian visibility at crosswalk for vehicles turning right onto Piney Branch Road (MD 320)

Missing or Faded Pavement Marking


## Destroyed Light pole



Utility Pole Replacement


Structural integrity of utility pole is poor.

Speed Limit


40 mph posted speed limit is not uniform with 35 mph posted speed limit throughout the study corridor.

Broken Items



Pedestrian APS Push Button not operating as designed

Pothole(s)


Pothole in roadway poses safety risk


Sidewalk Disrepair


Sidewalk cracked and uneven.


MD 650 (NEW HAMPSHIRE AVENUE) HIGH INJURY NETWORK SAFETY STUDY
ROAD SAFETY AUDIT (RSA) REPORT APPENDICIES

Pedestrian Crosswalk Hazards


Missing crosswalk pavement markings and stop lines at intersection


Vehicles make right turn onto Southampton Drive from southbound New Hampshire Avenue (MD 650) at high speeds.

Roadway / Motorist Hazards


MD 650 (NEW HAMPSHIRE AVENUE) HIGH INJURY NETWORK SAFETY STUDY
ROAD SAFETY AUDIT (RSA) REPORT APPENDICIES

Trip Hazards and Non-ADA Accessible Sidewalks


MD 650 (NEW HAMPSHIRE AVENUE) HIGH INJURY NETWORK SAFETY STUDY ROAD SAFETY AUDIT (RSA) REPORT APPENDICIES

Roadway / Motorists


MD 650 (NEW HAMPSHIRE AVENUE) HIGH INJURY NETWORK SAFETY STUDY
ROAD SAFETY AUDIT (RSA) REPORT APPENDICIES

Miscellaneous Safety Concerns



Old sign needs to be removed


Utility pole needs to be removed

Non-ADA Accessible Sidewalks \& Ramps



No ADA compliant pedestrian ramps at pedestrian refuge island


No ADA compliant pedestrian ramps at pedestrian refuge island

Pedestrian Crosswalk Hazards


MD 650 (NEW HAMPSHIRE AVENUE) HIGH INJURY NETWORK SAFETY STUDY
ROAD SAFETY AUDIT (RSA) REPORT APPENDICIES

Obstructed Sidewalks


New Hampshire Avenue (MD 650) West Sidewalk


MD 650 (NEW HAMPSHIRE AVENUE) HIGH INJURY NETWORK SAFETY STUDY
ROAD SAFETY AUDIT (RSA) REPORT APPENDICIES

Roadway / Motorist Hazards


Steel plate poses safety risk to motorists


Miscellaneous Safety Concerns


MD 650 (NEW HAMPSHIRE AVENUE) HIGH INJURY NETWORK SAFETY STUDY
ROAD SAFETY AUDIT (RSA) REPORT APPENDICIES

Non-ADA compliant Ramp


Detectable warning surface (DWS) missing from ramp

Pedestrian Crosswalk Hazards


Non-ADA Accessible Sidewalks \& Ramps


Roadway / Motorist Hazards


New Hampshire Avenue (MD 650) NB


Uneven pavement surface and potholes pose a risk to motorists

Sign Replacement / Relocation / Removal



Street sign is not adequately secured to utility pole.


Stop sign does not align with stop line.

Non-ADA Accessible Sidewalks \& Ramps


No sidewalk between pedestrian access and bus stop


There is no pedestrian ramp to access the sidewalk after crossing the service road via the pedestrian cut through from mainline SB New Hampshire Avenue.

Redundant Pedestrian Push Button


Two pedestrian push buttons

Non-ADA Compliant Pedestrian Push Button


Roadway / Motorist Hazards


MD 650 (NEW HAMPSHIRE AVENUE) HIGH INJURY NETWORK SAFETY STUDY
ROAD SAFETY AUDIT (RSA) REPORT APPENDICIES

Non-ADA Accessible Sidewalks \& Ramps


MD 650 (NEW HAMPSHIRE AVENUE) HIGH INJURY NETWORK SAFETY STUDY
ROAD SAFETY AUDIT (RSA) REPORT APPENDICIES

Sidewalk Drainage


MD 650 (NEW HAMPSHIRE AVENUE) HIGH INJURY NETWORK SAFETY STUDY
ROAD SAFETY AUDIT (RSA) REPORT APPENDICIES

Lighting


New Hampshire Avenue (MD 650) West Sidewalk


New Hampshire Avenue (MD 650) East Sidewalk


No lighting along sidewalk

Miscellaneous Hazards


Tree growing from storm drain

MD 650 (NEW HAMPSHIRE AVENUE) HIGH INJURY NETWORK SAFETY STUDY
ROAD SAFETY AUDIT (RSA) REPORT APPENDICIES

## Pedestrian crossing Mid-block



Pedestrian crossing New Hampshire Ave (MD 650) mid-block, unprotected, at Fox Street. The nearest marked pedestrian crossing with full pedestrian facilities is over 1,000 feet away.

