BOARD OF PUBLIC WORKS MEMBERS

STEVE S. KANG
PRESIDENT

JENNY CHAVEZ
VICE PRESIDENT

JOHN GRANT
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

FAITH I. MITCHELL
COMMISSIONER

ERNESTO CARDENAS
COMMISSIONER

TJ KNIGHT
ACTING EXECUTIVE OFFICER

CITY OF LOS ANGELES

CALIFORNIA

KAREN BASS
MAYOR

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

BUREAU OF ENGINEERING

CRYSTAL LEE
PE, MSCE, ENV-SP, SHRM
CITY ENGINEER

BUREAU OF STREET SERVICES

KEITH MOZEE
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR AND GENERAL MANAGER

November 5, 2026

The Honorable City Council
c/o Patrice Lattimore, City Clerk
Office of the City Clerk
Room 360, City Hall

COUNCIL FILE NO. 26-0481 – SIDEWALK REPAIR PRIORITIZATION

SUMMARY

On August 11, 2026, the Council provided updated direction to the Bureau of Engineering (BOE) to report back with recommendations to update the Access Request Prioritization (ARP) Matrix and the City Facilities and Program Access Improvement Prioritization, including the incorporation of an equity-based criteria, high pedestrian-traffic areas, and locations with increased liability exposure. This report is the first step in providing recommended updates to the project prioritization matrices for the Sidewalk Repair Program (SRP) to support the implementation of the *Willits Settlement Agreement* (Settlement). It presents a revised ARP Prioritization Matrix with scoring that emphasizes damage severity, updated data sources, and integrates new equity and priority metrics. Updates on other SRP sub-programs and the new *non-Willits* StreetsLA Sidewalk Maintenance Program are further provided.

RECOMMENDATION

That the City Council:

1. APPROVE the Sidewalk Repair Program Access Request Program (ARP) Prioritization Matrix as detailed in Table 1 and StreetsLA Sidewalk Maintenance Proposed Prioritization Matrix in Table 2.

2. AUTHORIZE the City Engineer, in coordination with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Coordinator for the Public Right of Way, to make any technical corrections, clarifications, or revisions to the Sidewalk Repair Program ARP Matrix, including any new instructions, in order to effectuate the intent of this report. Said corrections/clarifications/changes may be made orally, electronically or by any other means.

BACKGROUND

Taking effect on August 25, 2016, the Settlement outlines the parameters of the City's commitment to remediate barriers to those with mobility disabilities in our public pedestrian facility network, including expending $1.37 billion over 30 years "*to satisfy the City's legal obligations to provide Program Access to its Pedestrian Facilities, when viewed in their entirety, for individuals with Mobility Disabilities.*" (Settlement Provision III. 3. iv.). The Settlement outlines that while the City has the authority to select sites in their preferred order, certain types of barriers and certain types of facilities are the highest priority when improving accessibility for Angelenos.

The Settlement highlights the significance of barriers being experienced by class members with a proximity to residential areas and corridors that allow access to transit opportunities:

"the selection of locations where…construction will be conducted…and the order and scope of the particular projects shall be determined by the City in its discretion, subject to the following priorities…the highest priority shall go to requests for Program Access Improvements in residential neighborhoods or that are necessary to provide access to bus stops or other forms of public transit…" Settlement Provision 12.8(d)

To implement the intent of this Settlement, and ensure a consistent approach, the City's Sidewalk Repair Program, has multiple sub-programs – each designed to address some of these specific priorities, and each of these sub-programs has a method for prioritizing sites – known as a 'Prioritization Matrix'. These Prioritization Matrices were developed by BOE, as the lead City agency responsible for implementation of the Settlement, and approved by the City Council in 2018 (Council File No. 14-0163-S3). Each of the three sub-programs is described below.

1) <u>Sub-Programs</u>

a) Access Request Program (ARP)

The City's ARP remediates barriers to equal access, as experienced and identified by persons with mobility disabilities, such persons being Settlement Class Members, in pedestrian facilities such as sidewalks, intersections, crosswalks, curb ramps, or other pedestrian pathways in whole or in part, owned, controlled or maintained by or otherwise within the responsibility of the City of Los Angeles. Per the Settlement and the ADA, barriers to access can be any condition that is not in compliance with applicable federal and state disabled access requirements, including the ADA. Remediation of access barriers into full compliance with disabled access standards is required.

The SRP is required to expend a minimum of 20% of the Annual Commitment, or the annual portion of the overall $1.37 billion Settlement Commitment, on Access Requests. The total commitment is implemented by spending approximately $35.7 million annually through August 24, 2026, and $41.2 million for five years starting August 25, 2026. In practice, over the past decade, the ARP has constituted the majority of the SRP's expenditures to process the significant backlog, addressing which has been a priority for stakeholders, including the City Council and Class Counsel. Despite this fact, there are

currently over 4,500 verified eligible requests in this Program's queue, pointing to the ongoing great need for this type of barrier removal to provide equal access to Angelenos with mobility disabilities.

b) City Facilities

Per the Settlement, "*City government offices and facilities (including the pedestrian rights of way adjacent to facilities owned or operated by the City, and the paths of travel leading from such adjacent pedestrian rights of way to the primary entrances to such facilities)"* are prioritized (Settlement Provision 12.7 a. 1.). Historically for each City facility improved under the SRP or other capital improvement programs, all access barriers have been removed and made compliant with applicable federal and state disabled access requirements. In practice, prioritization among City facilities has been driven by available funding, with proprietary departments and the Library Department providing funding and/or in-kind project delivery for remediation of their frontages.

c) General Program Access Improvements

The General Program Access Improvement (GPAI) sub-program implements other remediation priorities citywide with some discretion and flexibility, subject to the priorities outlined in the Settlement. The Settlement prescribes that GPAI resources be allocated toward remediating barriers such as missing curb ramps and sidewalk uplifts due to tree roots. The Settlement further prescribes that:

> *"The selection and timing of particular projects for Program Access Improvements…shall be determined by the City in its discretion, subject to the following priorities: (a) Program Access Improvements needed to address Pedestrian Facilities serving the following (in descending order of prioritization): (i) City government offices and facilities…(ii) transportation corridors; (iii) hospitals, medical facilities, assisted living facilities, and other similar…" Settlement Section 12.7. Project Prioritization*

2) <u>Ongoing Program Improvements</u>

Since the SRP's inception in 2016, BOE has been committed to continuous improvement, using insights from both program data and key stakeholders, such as Willits' Settlement Class Counsel, elected officials, and individuals from the disability community.

BOE has improved its processes over time to make sure that its response is as effective and efficient as possible and meets the high priority needs with the financial and staffing resources available, while meeting the mandate of the Settlement for full compliance with disabled access standards.

At the program's inception, standard practice involved remediating full blocks of sidewalk from corner to corner. While comprehensive, this approach proved costly on a per-request basis, hindering the number of access requests the program was able to fulfill. Consequently, BOE transitioned first to property frontage remediation, then to barrier-only scoping. This refinement in strategy prioritized the mitigation of reported barriers over total reconstruction, ensuring a more targeted and efficient response to Access Requests.

Furthermore, Access Request sites are now packaged geographically to address critical sidewalk issues while minimizing travel time between projects, enhancing community accessibility, and reducing ongoing short-term construction impacts. Grouping pending Access Request sites located within approximately a half-mile radius of high-priority projects has proved to be a more efficient approach to fixing as many sites as possible with allocated resources. In some cases, this approach has allowed the program to accelerate lower priority barriers by bundling them with higher priority ones.

This report provides an update on the selection criteria for City Facilities and GPAI sites and an updated ARP Prioritization Matrix, still centered around the values and priorities of the Settlement, but which incorporates direction from elected officials and uses additional data to provide a holistic approach to selecting ARP sites.

DISCUSSION

1) <u>Access Request Program (ARP)</u>

Under the Settlement, the City has agreed to (1) review and investigate requests in the order received; (2) give priority to requests in residential neighborhoods or that are necessary to provide access to public transit; and (3) to use its best efforts to the extent feasible, complete requests within 120 days of receipt.

Access Request projects are currently prioritized via the Council established ARP Prioritization Matrix (Council File No. 14-0163-S3, January 2018), shown below. This matrix recommends that requests should be, where possible, completed in the order received with priority assigned to requests that are on the frontage of a residentially zoned property, within 500 feet of a bus stop, and have not been completed within 120 days of receipt.

Access Request Program Prioritization Matrix			**Possible Points**
Priority Per Settlement	**Access Request Program**	Residential neighborhood	15
		Within 500 feet of a bus or transit stop	15
Priority Per Settlement	**Program Queue**	Over 120 Days	15
		Highest Possible Points	**45**

Based on feedback from SRP stakeholders and City Council direction, BOE has developed a revised ARP Prioritization Matrix with three main differences:

a) Incorporating Damage Severity Criteria

Sites with high damage cause the most significant barriers to the greatest number of people with mobility disabilities. The City Council recently adopted a new Damage Severity matrix (Council File No. 25-1142) to allow for the objective measurement of

pedestrian infrastructure inaccessibility in barrier removal projects whose scopes can be established based on barrier severity as a primary consideration.

This criterion is slated for future implementation utilizing data from the Citywide Pedestrian Facility Inventory and Assessment (Citywide Assessment). The Citywide Assessment will be conducted in two main phases. The initial phase, which is currently undergoing data validation, includes approximately one third of the City (the area surrounding 2028 Olympic and Paralympic Games (2028 Games) Venues and the Los Angeles Department of Transportation's (LADOT) Central Yard service area). (See Council File No. 21-1469-S4). The citywide phase, in which LADOT's two other service areas will be assessed, was funded in the current fiscal year and is expected to begin in mid-2027.

As areas of the City are assessed, and upon adoption of the matrix below (Table 1), the BOE will implement the damage severity matrix for Access Requests in those areas. Until the full Citywide Assessment data is available, a proxy measure for damage, "high priority barriers," will be utilized in areas where the assessment data is not yet available. High priority barriers will include missing curb ramps or sidewalks with damage from tree roots. These high priority barriers are identified in the Settlement and are generally considered to cause sidewalks to be the most inaccessible.

b) Incorporating Equity Criteria

The City is committed to ensuring that individuals with mobility disabilities traversing the City are able to benefit from this program, and that communities with a greater need for investment are prioritized. On January 29, 2025, the City Council adopted the Community Health Equity (CHE) Index as the City's equity framework for transportation projects (CF 23-0935). LADOT recommended the CHE Index due to its comprehensive methodology and its focus on transportation-related indicators relevant to the needs of Los Angeles Communities. These indicators are highly relevant for the Sidewalk Repair Program as they identify neighborhoods with higher utilization of pedestrian facilities and transit services, including among people with mobility disabilities. Under the revised prioritization matrix shown in Table 1, sites will receive additional points if they fall within the top two quintiles as Priority Transportation Equity Areas.

c) Updating Residential & Transit Proximity Measures

A site's proximity to a residential area and to a transit stop were already included in the existing matrix as these parameters are specifically mentioned in the Settlement. This update refines these measures so that transit stops and residential measures are more optimally applied.

It is recommended that Council approve the following ARP Prioritization Matrix:

Table 1: ARP Prioritization Matrix

Category	Metric	Possible Points

1. Damage Severity	*Where Assessment Data is available* <u>Method a:</u> Damage Severity Index	Very Severe Damage	30
		Severe Damage	20
		Moderate Damage	10
	Where Assessment Data is not available <u>Method b:</u> High Priority Barrier	High Priority barrier type present: missing curb ramp	30
		High Priority barrier type present: tree roots damage	20
2. Site Priority	Proximity to Transit Stop	Within 1000' of a bus or transit stop	10
	Proximity to residential area	Within 250' of a residentially zoned area	10
	Equity Priority Score	Within top two quintiles of CHE Index*	10
Total	**HIGHEST POSSIBLE POINTS**		**60**

d) Metric Details:

Damage Method a)

Damage Severity Index - Consistent with the Settlement, prioritize highest damage barriers - particularly broken, displaced and/or upheaved sidewalk or pavement within walkway surfaces and missing or non-compliant curb ramps. *(See Appendix 1 for Complete Damage Severity Matrix)*

Damage Method b)

Priority Barrier - Consistent with the Settlement, prioritize the highest priority barriers including installation of missing curb ramps and repair of damage caused, or presumably caused, by tree roots to sidewalk or walkway surfaces.

Note: To ensure that the BOE is using the best data available to it, even when method b is utilized as a whole, if and when more specific, current, or detailed data becomes available, at the verification of the City Engineer, sites may be scored using method a.

Site Priority

1. *Within 1,000 feet of a bus or transit stop* – Increase radius from a bus or transit stop from 500 feet to 1,000 feet to better capture all locations on a transit line.
2. *Residential* - Revise methodology for defining "within a residential neighborhood" from fronting a residential zone to being within 250 feet of a residentially zoned parcel to better capture all areas within residential walksheds.

3. *Equity Priority Score* - Sites situated within a census tract within the top two quintiles under the City's CHE Index will earn 10 Equity Priority score points. Sites situated in other census tracts will not earn any Equity Priority score points.
    - *The ARP matrix will use the City's official Council-designated transportation or mobility equity measure. At the time of this report, the Community Health Equity Index was the officially designated measure.

e) Implementation

Within 60 days of adoption of the revised prioritization, all 4,500+ pending Access Requests would be reprioritized based on the revised matrix. Access Requests that earned the highest priority score under the original prioritization matrix and are currently in some stage of project delivery would be completed according to their previously determined prioritization scores. Revised prioritization scores and updated estimated wait times would be created and made available for all pending Access Requests that are not in project delivery.

2) <u>City Facilities Sub-Program</u>

In 2018, the City Council established a Prioritization Matrix for the City Facilities sub-program. (Council File No. 14-0163-S3). These criteria were also intended for use in the General Program Access Improvements (GPAI) sub-program. Practical application of the GPAI has provided significant operational insights.

In recent years, funding for GPAIs has come from restricted funding sources such as proprietary department funding and/or Library Department funding and has been allocated to the sites with the highest priority owned by the relevant department.

While a revised prioritization matrix would allow the City to refocus its City Facilities sub-program on more severe areas of damage, BOE is only able to follow the Council-adopted prioritization matrix when provided with unrestricted funding.

a) Implementation

When established, the criteria in the matrix was designed to rank potential projects from a comprehensive citywide inventory. However, the sub-program has been limited to repairs specifically funded by proprietary or special funded departments—such as the Library, Port of Los Angeles (POLA), Los Angeles World Airports (LAWA), and the Department of Water and Power (DWP)—which fund repairs adjacent to facilities they own. The prioritization matrix is respectively applied to the limited subset of facilities owned by these departments.

As a result, facility improvements are conducted as funded, not based on a centralized, citywide project list. BOE and its partners therefore prioritize sites among agency-specific proprietary locations regardless of the sites' relative priority or damage severity scores when compared against all City Facility sites citywide.

Therefore, while a revised prioritization matrix will allow the City to realign this sub-program with key priorities, it will not be fully implementable across all City Facility types

until additional flexible funding is allocated. Should this funding be allocated, a multi-faceted selection process would be used, employing professional judgment and considering factors like reported barriers, public-serving nature, department priorities, and geographic equity. BOE is currently collaborating with Program stakeholders and sister departments to present a revised matrix in the near future.

3) General Program Access

From 2022 through late 2025, the City has chosen not to broadly implement the GPAI sub-program but rather focus available resources on addressing the growing backlog of Access Requests. Since October 2025, following direction from the Mayor's Office via Executive Directive (ED) No. 16 to focus on removing barriers in pedestrian facilities that will be important to pedestrian access for the LA28 Games, BOE has incorporated some GPAI sites into its implementation plan. The above-mentioned City Facilities criteria were also intended for use in the GPAI sub-program, and GPAI site selection has broadly utilized this matrix, with a focus on two main factors:

- Identification of locations situated along LA28 Games primary and secondary transportation corridors, where pedestrians are expected to travel.
- Prioritization of sites within proximity to those transportation corridors characterized by severe or very severe accessibility barriers.

In addition to aligning with broader municipal priorities and strategic initiatives, BOE is leveraging ED No. 16 to pilot the use of objective damage severity data from the assessment to support project site selection and grouping (packaging) for our GPAI sub-program. The goal of the pilot is to demonstrate the efficient and effective removal of critical accessibility barriers along high-priority corridors while enhancing larger community accessibility.

Findings from this pilot phase will facilitate the development of a comprehensive, data driven GPAI scoring matrix which will be integrated into the City's broader SRP in collaboration with SRP Stakeholders. This matrix is intended for citywide implementation by Fiscal Year 27/28, upon the completion of the citywide assessment, providing a standardized and objective methodology for the prioritization of future work.

Non-Willits Sidewalk Maintenance Program (StreetsLA)

In Fiscal Year 2026-27, the Mayor and Council established funding and staff for a new pedestrian facility asset management and maintenance program within the Bureau of Street Services (StreetsLA). This program is intended to implement the Asset Management Framework outlined in CF 25-1142, which delineates asset management, maintenance, and capital improvement responsibilities similar to other asset classes in the public right-of-way. BSS will serve as the asset manager and maintenance agency for all pedestrian facilities, including the ownership of all asset records, while BOE will provide capital project delivery support for these activities, as requested. The maintenance activities performed by this program are *not* eligible for credit under the Willits Settlement, but should be coordinated with Willits-eligible activities to maximize the condition of the City's overall pedestrian facility network.

As StreetsLA prepares to fill the positions within this new program starting in January, StreetsLA is seeking to establish program design and prioritization methodology. As the funding for this program is not under the Willits Settlement, the City has full discretion to deploy these resources based on City priorities. The program aims to apply maintenance treatments to already existing pedestrian facilities.

As an interim measure, StreetsLA will use maintenance program resources to address known risk-and-liability locations based on claims data. StreetsLA will identify claims locations and the suitability of maintenance treatments to reduce risk at each location. StreetsLA will request BOE support to review locations where maintenance treatments cannot address the hazardous condition and determine the best method to remediate the location with maintenance program funding. The list of known risk-and-liability locations pending treatment is expected to fully utilize the program resources for the first year.

Pursuant to Council instructions during the FY 2026-27 budget (CAO Memo #64), StreetsLA proposes using the following scoring prioritization matrix for addressing the sidewalk maintenance backlog for future fiscal years:

Table 2: StreetsLA Sidewalk Maintenance Proposed Prioritization Matrix

Category		**Metric**	**Possible Points**
1. Damage Severity	Damage Severity Index	Severe Damage	30
		Moderate Damage	20
2. Site Priority	High liability location	Settled liability claim	20
	Equity Priority Score	Within top two quintiles of CHE Index*	10
	Mobility Plan 2035 Pedestrian Enhanced District	Site located on MP2035 PED Corridor	10
	Mobility Plan 2035 Transit Enhanced Network	Within 1000 feet of a transit stop on the MP2035 TEN	10
Total	**HIGHEST POSSIBLE POINTS**		**80**

Damage Severity

Damage Severity Index - In order to maximize the limited funding available, the StreetsLA Sidewalk Maintenance crews will apply maintenance treatments to sidewalks with severe to moderate damage *(See Appendix 1 for Complete Damage Severity Matrix).*

Site Priority

1. *High Liability Location* – Sites involved in a settled liability claim, verified by the Office of the City Attorney will receive 20 points.

2. *Equity Priority Score* - Sites situated within a census tract within the top two quintiles under the City's CHE Index will earn 10 Equity Priority score points. Sites situated in other census tracts will not earn any Equity Priority score points.

3. *Mobility Plan 2035 Pedestrian Enhanced District* - Sites located on a Mobility Plan 2035 Pedestrian Enhanced District will receive 10 points.

4. *Mobility Plan 2035 Transit Enhanced Network* - Sites located on a Mobility Plan 2035 Transit Enhanced Network Corridor will receive 10 points.

FISCAL IMPACT

There is no fiscal impact related to implementing the recommendations contained in this report.

If you have any questions, please contact Julia Sanchez de la Vega at Julia.SanchezdelaVega@lacity.org or Shirley Lau at Shirley.Lau@lacity.org.

Respectfully submitted,

Crystal Lee
box SIGN 4L7KX8JK-4ZVQ5WWK

Crystal Lee, PE, MSCE, ENV-SP, SHRM
City Engineer
Bureau of Engineering

for

Keith Mozee
Executive Director & General Manager
Bureau of Street Services

CL/KD:jsdlv:hr

KM/SL:sr:ay

Attachment

cc: Andrea Greene, Office of the Mayor
Steve S. Kang, Board of Public Works
Faith Mitchell, Board of Public Works

Appendix 1: Sidewalk and Curb Ramp Damage Severity Matrix

Pedestrian Facility Type	Barrier Type	Barrier Severity Category			
		Very Severe	Severe	Moderate	Minor
Sidewalk	Scoping	*Gap* in sidewalk where the existing terrain is *greenfield* and/or space has not been allocated for pedestrian use.	*Gap* in sidewalk comprised of an *unprepared surface* (dirt, grass, etc.).	*Gap* in sidewalk comprised of a *non-standard prepared pedestrian surface* (decomposed granite, pavers, asphalt).	—
	Obstructed Clear Width	< 32"	32" – 35.9"	36" – 47.9"	48" – 59.9"
	Cross Slope	> 17%	17% – 11.1%	11% – 5.1%	5% – 1.9%
	Running Slope	*Roadway grade* + 10% or more	*Roadway grade* + 6.0% to 9.9%	*Roadway grade* + 2.0% to 5.9%	*Roadway grade* + 1.9% or less
	Uplift	≥ 3.1"	3" – 2.1"	2" – 1.1"	1" – 0.5" unbeveled
	Openings	> 4"	4" – 2.1"	2" – 1.1"	1" – 0.5"
Curb Ramp	Scoping	Missing curb ramp(s) at *marked crossings*.	Missing curb ramp(s) at *marked crossings*.	—	—
	Scoping	Missing curb ramp(s) at *unmarked, signalized* crossings at intersections of four-ways or greater.	Missing curb ramp(s) at *unmarked, signalized* crossings at intersections of four-ways or greater.	—	—
	Scoping	Missing curb ramp(s) at *unmarked, unsignalized* crossings at intersections of *residential/local streets* of four-ways or greater without an accessible crossing within 200'.	Missing curb ramp(s) at *unmarked, unsignalized* crossings at intersections of *residential/local streets* of four-ways or greater without an accessible crossing within 200'.	Missing curb ramp(s) at *unmarked, unsignalized* crossings at intersections of *collector/arterial streets* of four-ways or greater without an *accessible crossing* within 200'.	Missing curb ramp(s) at *unmarked, unsignalized* crossings at intersections of *collector/arterial streets* of four-ways or greater with an *accessible crossing* within 200'.
	Top Landing	No landing or top landing of less than 32" in length or width is provided and the curb ramp running slope is > 17%.	No landing or top landing of less than 32" in length or width is provided and the curb ramp running slope is 17% – 11.1%.	No landing or top landing of less than 32" in length or width is provided and the curb ramp running slope is 11% – 5.1%.	No landing or a top landing is less than 32" in length or width is provided and the curb ramp running slope is 5.0% or less.
Curb Ramp *(continued)*	Top Landing Slopes	> 10% in any direction	10% – 6.1% in any direction	6.0% – 4.1% in any direction	4.0% – 2.1% in any direction
	Ramp Run Width	< 32"	32" – 35.9"	36" – 47.9"	36" – 47.9"
	Ramp Run Running Slope	> 17%	17% – 13.1%	13% – 10.1%	10% – 8.34%
	Ramp Run Cross Slope	> 10%	10% – 6.1%	6% – 4.1%	4% – 2.1%
	Openings within Top Landing or Ramp Run	> 2.5"	2.5" – 1.1"	1" – 0.5"	< 0.5"
	Uplifts within Top Landing or Ramp Run	> 2"	2" – 1.1"	1" – 0.5"	< 0.5"
	Clear Space at Bottom of Curb Ramp Run	Clear space is not provided within the width of the crossing, or provided clear space is < 32" in any dimension, or provided clear space has a running slope > 17%.	Clear space is not provided within the width of the crossing, or provided clear space is < 36" in any dimension, or provided clear space has a running slope between 17% - 12.1%.	Clear space is provided within the width of the crossing or provided clear space is 36" – 47.9" in any dimension, or provided clear space has a running slope between 12% – 8.1%.	Clear space is provided within the width of the crossing or provided clear space is 36" – 47.9" in any dimension, or provided clear space has a running slope between 8% – 5.1%.
	Turning Space at Bottom of Curb Ramp Run	Turning space is not provided within the width of the crossing, or provided turning space is < 32" in any dimension, or provided clear space has a running slope > 10%.	Turning space is not provided within the width of the crossing, or provided turning space is < 36" in any dimension, or provided clear space has a running slope between 10% – 8.1%.	Turning space is provided within the width of the crossing, or provided turning space is 36" – 47.9" in any dimension, or provided clear space has a running slope 8% – 5.1%.	—
	Grade Breaks at Top and Bottom of Curb Ramp Run	> 2"	2" – 1.1"	1" – 0.5"	< 0.5"
	Detectable Warning Surface	Uplifts or openings > 2"	Uplifts or openings 2" or less	Not provided (never installed)	Color is non-yellow or yellow and does not provide required contrast.
	Curb Ramp Type	—	—	One curb ramp is provided to serve two crossings (i.e. diagional curb ramp)	—