

## David Woosley

---

**From:** Hagen, Robert H [rhagen@ku.edu]  
**Sent:** Monday, October 04, 2004 8:41 AM  
**To:** David Woosley; Brune, Caroljean S  
**Subject:** Oct 4 Traffic Safety meeting

David & Caroljean,

Even though the Traffic Safety Commission always meets on the first monday of each month, the Lawrence High School music department went ahead and scheduled their fall semester concert for 7:30 this evening anyway--a conflict that only became apparent when I examined various family calendars this weekend. What were they thinking? Because LHS probably won't postpone the concert, I regret that I will have to miss tonight's TSC meeting in order to fulfill parental duties.

I do have a couple of comments on the proposed traffic calming priority policy, which you are welcome to toss into the discussion.

First, I wonder about the weight assigned to crashes. (5 points for a fatal crash looks quite out of place!) The relevance of an accident depends on the details: traffic calming may have little relevance in the case of a drunk driver that crashed into someone's living room at 2 AM--but may be central in the case of a rush hour collision at an intersection. It might be more appropriate to consider accident history apart from the point-generating items like traffic volume and presence of sidewalks or schools. I would suggest deleting the "Crashes" paragraph entirely, and instead adding a couple of sentences like this to the last paragraph:

"In addition to point total, the record of accidents along the project corridor(s) will be considered. A proposed project may be assigned higher priority if the history of crashes indicates dangerous conditions not revealed by other criteria."

I suspect that there is a high correlation between excess speeds and accidents anyway, so that nothing is lost by setting the accident record aside from the point totals.

Second, I wonder whether the cost of various calming devices might need to be considered. For example, if traffic circles are many times more expensive than speed humps, would it be more effective to complete several cheap--but lower priority--projects instead of a single high cost project? Separate priority list for different types of project might be necessary. (I don't have any suggestions for a solution!)

Third, I wonder how projects that the TSC and city commission have already approved might fall out on the proposed point distribution. This could provide us with a way of gauging how well the weighting scheme works. I rooted around in my collection of old TSC papers and found a copy of the University Place NA traffic report. The numbers for Indiana St near 17th gave a score of around 80 (depending on which block I used). How does that compare to other projects: Arizona near 6th, for example? The University Place figures also raise the question of scale: should a project be considered on an item-by-item basis (for example, adding one speed hump at a time) or as an integrated whole?

Regards to all,

Bob Hagen



**DRAFT**  
**TRAFFIC CALMING PROJECT**  
**PRIORITY RANKING SYSTEM**

**Resolution No. \_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_\_, 2004**

TRAFFIC-CALMING PROJECTS will be ranked using the following point system to determine which projects will be constructed first with available funding:

**SPEED** – 5 points will be assigned for each mile per hour that the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile speed exceeds the lawful speed limit.

**VOLUME** – 1 point will be assigned for every 100 vehicles per day on local streets; 1 point will be assigned for every 300 vehicles per day on collector streets. Points will not be assigned for volume on arterial streets.

**CRASHES** – 1 point will be assigned for each reported property damage crash along the project corridor(s) during the previous 3 years; 2 points will be assigned for each reported injury crash along the project corridor(s) during the previous 3 years; 5 points will be assigned for each reported fatal crash along the project corridor(s) during the previous 3 years.

**SIDEWALKS** – 5 points will be assigned if there is not a continuous sidewalk along both sides of the project corridor(s); 10 points will be assigned if there is not a continuous sidewalk along either side of the project corridor(s).

**SCHOOLS** – 10 points will be assigned for each unprotected official school crosswalk that crosses the project corridor(s).

**PEDESTRIAN GENERATORS** – 5 points will be assigned for each park or elementary school adjacent to the project corridor(s).

Projects will be prioritized based on the total number of points and may be added to the priority list at any time.