CITY OF NEWTON

IN BOARD OF ALDERMEN

PUBLIC SAFETY & TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE AGENDA

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 6, 2013

7:45 PM
Aldermanic Chambers

ITEMS SCHEDULED FOR DISCUSSION:

#278-11 ALD. YATES, requesting a report from His Honor the Mayor on the likely impacts on traffic in Newton from the changes to the Route 9/128 intersection as part of the Add-A-Lane Project. [09/26/11 @ 2:37 PM]
HELD 6-0 on 01/23/13

#50-13 PUBLIC SAFETY & TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE, requesting a discussion with the Department of Conservation & Recreation (DCR) regarding traffic issues on Quinobequin Road. [01/24/13 @ 9:42 AM]

ITEMS NOT SCHEDULED FOR DISCUSSION:

#96-13 CLERK OF THE BOARD, requesting that the fines provided in Chapter 19, Section 199(d) be deleted as new fines for the violation of Section 199 have been added to Chapter 19, Section 9 by Ordinance A-2 which was passed by the Board on July 9, 2012. [02/12/2013 @ 3:17 PM]

#35-13 ALD. YATES, requesting an update from the Chief of Police on the status of the recommendation of the Police Department on school security in a 2008 report. [01/14/13 @ 1:34 PM]

REFERRED TO PUBLIC SAFETY & TRANS. AND FINANCE COMMITTEES

#428-12 ALD. CICCONE & FULLER requesting a discussion with the Executive Office and the Police Department regarding police staffing and overtime costs. [12/07/12 @ 1:34 PM]
HELD 6-0, Ald. Swiston not voting on 01/09/13

#391-12 ALD. LENNON, filing on 11/14/12 an appeal from TC36-12, which requested parking spaces on Richardson Street, which are currently reserved for Parks & Recreation Employees on weekdays, be changed back to metered parking spaces (Ward 1), approved as amended by Traffic Council on October 25, 2012.
HELD 5-0, Ald. Fuller not voting on 01/23/13

The location of this meeting is handicap accessible and reasonable accommodations will be provided to persons requiring assistance. If you have a special accommodation need, please contact the Newton ADA Coordinator Trisha Guditz at 617-796-1156 or tguditz@newtonma.gov or via TDD/TTY at (617) 796-1089 at least two days in advance of the meeting.

#337-12 ALD. LINSKY, CICCONE, ALBRIGHT & JOHNSON, requesting authorization for the installation of a bicycle corral adjacent to 321 Walnut Street, Newtonville. [10/11/12 @ 8:18 PM]
HELD 6-0, Ald. Kalis not voting on 11/07/12
HELD 7-0 on 12/05/12

REFERRED TO FINANCE AND APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES

#322-12 HIS HONOR THE MAYOR submitting the FY14-FY18 Capital Improvement Program pursuant to section 5-3 of the Newton City Charter. [10/09/12 @ 2:38 PM]

#300-12 DIRECTOR OF PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT, requesting amendments to Chapter 19 to establish parameters around which parking meter "holidays" may be allowed and identifying the authority for making determinations of eligibility. [09/24/12 @ 3:17 PM]
HELD 5-1-0, Ald. Johnson opposed, Fuller and Yates not voting on 02/06/13

#299-12 DIRECTOR OF PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT, requesting a discussion regarding a policy-based management plan for parking. [09/24/12 @ 3:17 PM]
HELD 6-0, Ald. Fuller and Yates not voting on 02/06/13

REFERRED TO PUBLIC SAFETY/TRANSPORTATION & FINANCE COMMITTEES

#281-12 HARRY SANDERS requesting creation of an ordinance to allow pawnbrokers in the City of Newton pursuant to G.L. c. 140 section 70 with potential for non-fixed location of business. Secured property storage would not entail retail walk-in; model would entail possible satellite locations enabling the possibility of integrating Newton students. [08/31/12 @ 12:25 PM]

#268-12 WARD 2 ALDERMEN, filing an appeal from TC29-12 (A&B), which requested removal of metered parking spaces on Walnut Street across from Washington Park and Madison Avenue (Ward 2), approved by Traffic Council on July 26, 2012. (Appeal filed 08/13/12)
A) HELD removal of Meter #266, Walnut Street across from Washington Park (6-0, Ald. Kalis not voting) on 10/03/12
B) APPEAL DENIED removal of Meters #253 and #254, Walnut Street across from Madison Avenue (6-0, Ald. Kalis not voting) on 10/03/12

#267-12 ALD. CICCONE, proposing that **Sec. 19-309. Requirements as to vehicles generally. and 19-332. Procedure for obtaining licenses.** be amended to include limousines and that **Sec. 19-338 Limousine Permits** be amended to include an annual fee of $25 and an annual inspection. [08/21/12 @ 10:29 AM]
HELD 6-0, Ald. Kalis not voting on 10/03/12

REFERRED TO FINANCE AND APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES

#257-12 RECODIFICATION COMMITTEE recommending (1) review of the Fees, Civil Fines/Non-Criminal Disposition contained in Chapter 17 LICENSING AND PERMITS GENERALLY and Chapter 20 CIVIL FINES/NON-CRIMINAL DISPOSITION CIVIL FINES to ensure they are in accordance with what is being charged and (2) review of the acceptance of G.L. c. 40 §22F, accepted on July 9, 2001, which allows certain municipal boards and officers to fix reasonable fees for the issuance of certain licenses, permits, or certificates.

#240-12 RECODIFICATION COMMITTEE requesting that C**hapter 19 MOTOR VEHICLES AND TRAFFIC** be amended to determine who has jurisdiction for parking on municipal land, the owning department as described in **Sec. 19-224. Parking prohibited on city grounds.** or the Traffic Council as described in **Sec. 19-26. Authority and role of Traffic Council.**

#239-12 RECODIFICATION COMMITTEE requesting a discussion as to whether the increased Tiger Permit Fees in C**hapter 19 MOTOR VEHICLES AND TRAFFIC** and the process established as part of the temporary Tiger program are still valid for the smaller permanent program.

#238-12 RECODIFICATION COMMITTEE requesting a discussion to determine whether Hawk lights should be regulated in C**hapter 19 MOTOR VEHICLES AND TRAFFIC** or in the *Traffic and Parking Regulations.*

#237-12 RECODIFICATION COMMITTEE requesting a discussion relative to amending **Sec. 19-188 Establishment of spaces and installation of parking meters; type of meters; operation and maintenance.** of **Chapter 19 MOTOR VEHICLES AND TRAFFIC** b**y** deleting in paragraph (a) the reference to specific denominations for payment.

#236-12 RECODIFICATION COMMITTEE recommending **Sec. 19-175. Angle parking.** of **Chapter 19 MOTOR VEHICLES AND TRAFFIC** be amended by deleting the words "board of aldermen" and inserting in place thereof the words "traffic council" and by inserting after the word "and" the words "the commissioner of public works".

#235-12 RECODIFICATION COMMITTEE recommending that **Sec. 19-113. Pedestrians crossing ways or roadways.** in **Chapter 19 MOTOR VEHICLES AND TRAFFIC** be amended by removing the existing description of a marked crosswalk.

#234-12 RECODIFICATION COMMITTEE recommending that the definition of *Speed humps* in **Sec. 19-1.** of **Chapter 19 MOTOR VEHICLES AND TRAFFIC** be amended to make it consistent with current design/practice standards.

#233-12 RECODIFICATION COMMITTEE recommending that the definition of *Crosswalk* in **Sec. 19-1.** of **Chapter 19 MOTOR VEHICLES AND TRAFFIC** be amended to define that it is a portion of a roadway clearly indicated for pedestrians crossing with marked lines only.

#232-12 FRANK TERRIO on behalf of NEWTON YELLOW CAB requesting either an exemption from the City of Newton Ordinances 2012, Sec. 19-309. **Requirements as to vehicles generally - c), no vehicle shall be approved for use as a taxicab or public automobile or van in the city when the vehicle is ten (10) years old or older, the age of each vehicle to be determined from the year of manufacture to the year for which the vehicle license is to issue**. or an amendment to allow a vehicle to be used as a taxicab, public auto or van when the vehicle is over ten years old if it passes Police Department inspection. [08/02/12 @ 2:53 PM]
HELD 7-0 on 10/03/12

#196-12 ANN BASSI et al. filing an appeal from TC-68-11, which requested a one-hour parking restriction on school days between 8:00 a.m. – 3:00 p.m. on Atwood Avenue (Ward 2), voted No Action Necessary by Traffic Council on June 14, 2012. (Appeal filed 07/02/12).

#194-12 ALD. CICCONE proposing that **Sec. 19-309. Requirements as to vehicles generally. and 19-332. Procedure for obtaining licenses.** be amended to include vans and that **Sec. 17-3. Fees for certain licenses and permits.** be amended to include a $25 annual fee for vans. [06/21/12 @ 11:28AM]
HELD 6-0, Ald. Kalis not voting on 10/03/12

#125-12 ALD. YATES, HARNEY, SANGIOLO & GENTILE, requesting the Transportation Advisory Group (TAG) to work with the Town of Wellesley, MetroWest Regional Transit Authority, Mass Bay Community College, Wellesley College and other institutions that provide bus service to the MBTA and Newton Wellesley Hospital to operate their vehicles along Route 16 and request that they pick-up and discharge passengers in Lower Falls. [04/20/12 @ 1:55 PM]

#69-12 DANIEL HERMON, One International Place, 100 Oliver Street, Suite 1400, Boston, MA 02110 requesting issuance of a van license to operate Dan's Coach in Newton. [03/08/12 @ 2:16 PM]

REFERRED TO PS&T AND PUBLIC FACILITIES COMMITTEES

#413-11 ALD. CICCONE, SALVUCCI, GENTILE & LENNON updating the Public Facilities and Public Safety & Transportation Committees on the progress of renovations to the city's fire stations. [11/17/11 @11:07 AM]

#137-11 ALD. DANBERG AND FULLER requesting possible changes to City Ordinance 19-191, Parking Meter Fees, to require a minimum purchase at long-term parking meters in order to discourage short-term use. [4/26/11 @ 9:52 AM]
HELD 5-0, Ald. Fuller not voting on 01/23/13

REFERRED TO PS&T AND PUBLIC FACILITIES COMMITTEE

#41-11 ALD. JOHNSON, LENNON AND DANBERG requesting discussion of the elimination, except during snow emergencies, of the overnight parking ban which is in effect from November 15 through April 15. [01/18/11 @ 9:00 PM]
PUBLIC FACILITIES HELD 6-0 (Ald. Salvucci not voting) on 02/09/11
HELD 6-0 on 02/09/11

#279-10 ALD. JOHNSON, ALBRIGHT & LINSKY, requesting the development of a comprehensive traffic and parking plan for the Newton North High School neighborhood with the following streets as its borders: Commonwealth Avenue, Washington, Harvard and Valentine Streets. This plan to be completed by November 30, 2010 will include a fix to short term (immediate needs) and longer term needs to effectively manage the traffic circulation within the neighborhood, provide pedestrian and vehicular safety, and preserve quality of life for the neighborhood, school staff and faculty. [10/06/10 @ 12:33 PM]
HELD 5-0, Ald. Johnson not voting on 01/23/13

Respectfully submitted,

Allan Ciccone, Jr. Chairman

City of Newton

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS
TRANSPORTATION DIVISION
110 Crafts Street
Newton, MA 02460

Setti D. Warren
Mayor

DATE: February 22, 2013

TO: Thomas F. Broderick, P.E., Chief Engineer, MassDOT

FROM: William G. Paille, P.E., Director of Transportation

RE: **Needham/Wellesley – I-95/Route 128 Transportation Improvement Project**
Project File No. 603711; Bridge V Contract

I received your letter (Dated December 28, 2012) providing responses to the City's comments/questions (Dated February 16, 2012) regarding the I-95/Route 128 Add-a-Lane project. The City appreciates MassDOT and the design team for meeting with the Board of Alderman on March 7, 2012 and performing the additional traffic analysis and simulations in order to respond accordingly to our concerns. Although we generally concur with a majority of the responses, there are still several concerns and issues that we believe have not been completely addressed. As a result, we are providing the following:

Original Comment:

1. *It is a given that the proposed signals on Route 9 at 1-95 will cause greater delays to Route 9 through traffic. Please justify why the two ramps must be eliminated and why it cannot be left "as is."*

   Response: The proposed alterations to the Route 9 and 1-95/Route 128 interchange are being implemented as a safety improvement. The reconfiguration of the interchange ramps eliminates weave segments on both Route 9 and 1-95/Route•128, therefore improving safety of the vehicles traveling through the interchange. When the signalized condition, initially analyzed as a temporary measure to manage traffic during construction, was found to be feasible from a traffic operations perspective, additional analysis was conducted to determine if the measures could serve the projected future traffic volumes. The capacity analysis completed as part of this project does indicate that drivers will experience additional delay, but the new traffic signals are only two phases and operate at acceptable levels-of-service. FHWA has also recommended at traffic seminars to eliminate clover interchanges where feasible. This work is viewed as a positive safety improvement to the corridor.

   City Response: The City was not provided a copy of the most recent traffic analysis data and therefore cannot comment with respect to existing/future levels of service, vehicle queues and/or delay along Route 9. However, based on the response to Question #8 herein, it appears the proposed project will result in queues of 30 seconds or less while experiencing a level of service C or better at the ramps, and level of service D or better for individual movements.

Original Comment:

1A. *A related concern that the new signals will cause delays for westbound Route 9 traffic and some vehicles will divert to Quinobequin Road to access 1-95 northbound at the Route 16 interchange. The functional design report (LOS tables) does not give queue length*

information so it's unclear if the Route 9 westbound on-ramp to 1-95 northbound will be blocked by queues of vehicles at the signal.

Response: The addition of the traffic signals on Route 9 at the I-95/Route 128 interchange are not expected to increase delay enough to encourage the traveling public to utilize Quinobequin Road as an alternative route. The movement from Route 9 westbound onto I-95/Route 128 northbound is not proposed to be under signal control and therefore is not expected to experience additional delay. The ramp entrance will be appropriately modified with the proper storage length. With the efficient traffic operations of this movement, Quinobequin Road is not expected to be a more desirable route to travel northbound to I-95/Route 128. The VISSIM analysis prepared through the 75% review stage indicates that the proposed traffic signal is not expected to result in extensive queuing to vehicles traveling westbound on Route 9. The ramp entrance from Route 9 has also been revised wider and longer to accommodate the minimal queuing found within the VISSIM model. Traveling on Route 9 westbound and continuing onto I-95/Route 128 to be able to travel at highway speed is expected to continue to take less time than traveling at a much lower speed along Quinobequin Road only to incur further delay when turning onto Route 16 to merge onto I-95/Route 128.

City Response: The City remains concerned that traffic during and after construction will continue to divert onto side streets adjacent to Route 9. Although, we understand traffic simulation and analysis cannot predict this trend, the City respectfully requests that MassDOT perform baseline traffic counts along specific streets that could be impacted as a result of the project. These counts should be performed prior to the start of construction.

Original Comment:

1B. *Please describe how 3 lanes of traffic (2 let turn lanes, and 1 right turn lane) can safely merge to one lane before leaving Route 9 to access 1-95. The questions submitted by Alderman Yates (see below) generally pertain to the proposed signals at Route 9 and 1-95.*

Response: Route 9 eastbound provides two left-turn lanes onto the I-95/Route 128 northbound on-ramp, which are then merged to a single lane before entering onto I-95/Route 128 northbound. The one right-turn lane from Route 9 westbound onto the I-95/Route 128 northbound on-ramp will be extended along the ramp for the necessary storage length. This ramp entrance will merge into the right most lane maintaining the two lane cross-section of the on-ramp before the ramp merges to a single lane prior to entering I-95/Route 128 northbound. There will be a significant gap to merge once the signal turns red on Route 9. All the vehicles in the far right ramp lane will clear. A review .of the supplemental VISSIM analysis conducted at this location indicates that all vehicles accessing I-95/Route 128 northbound from Route 9 will be able to safely and efficiently use the ramp. The ramp entrance will be modified and the appropriate storage lengths will be added to this location. The final ramp entrance modification will be provided on the 100% design plans as a result of the VISSIM model.

City Response: The City concurs with the response.

Original Comment:

2. *The City is concerned that the CTPS traffic projections may underestimate the impacts of the new interchange at Kendrick St, coupled with the stated development assumptions and background growth in traffic volumes. The City asked MassDOT to study potential impacts and needs for mitigation under a scenario where the traffic volumes increased to HIGHER levels than those forecast by CTPS. However, the consultant's report only address the impacts associated with the CTPS ACTUAL traffic numbers, which as expected, have a minimal impact on Nahanton Street. In summary, this report fails to address any of the City's concerns relative to future traffic volumes on Nahanton Street. The questions submitted by Alderman Kalis (see below) generally pertain to concerns about the traffic projections for Nahanton Street.*

Response: The analysis completed in the functional design report utilizes the CTPS traffic projections as they are the best estimate of future traffic volumes within the study area. The traffic volume impacts of the Kendrick Street ramps can be approximated by comparing the No Build and Build scenarios projected by CTPS. The CTPS projections are not showing a significant impact along Nahanton Street.

Additional traffic analysis was completed and submitted in December 2011. The study examined existing and projected traffic operations (both with and without the project) at the following intersections:

- *Nahanton Street at Wells Avenue*
- *Nahanton Street at Winchester Street*
- *Nahanton Street at Dedham Street*
- *Dedham Street at Brookline Street*

Three of the four intersections currently operate at poor levels-of-service. The study also investigated the level of mitigation required to improve the overall level-of-service at these intersections which is summarized below:

- *Nahanton Street/Wells Avenue/Nahanton Park — Phasing and timing alterations do not improve operations sufficiently and additional capacity is likely required on the eastbound and northbound. approaches.*
- *Nahanton Street/Winchester Street —Added capacity to the Winchester Street approach does not significantly improve operations and the installation of a traffic signal may be required. Signal warrant analysis justifies the installation of a new traffic signal. The City of Newton may want to consider upgrading this intersection now.*
- *Dedham Street/Carlson Avenue/Brookline Street — Improvements beyond timing alterations are needed in order to significantly improve traffic operations at this location.*

Based on the proposed minor increases in traffic volumes and the future capacity analyses performed, the Route 128 Add-A-Lane project will have a minimal effect on future operations at the four identified intersections 'on Nahanton Street and therefore no mitigation is proposed as part of the Add-A-Lane project. MassDOT is willing to monitor these locations following the opening of the Kendrick Street ramp to determine if there are significant traffic increases along Nahanton Street. It should be noted that any future development for business proposed in the area is responsible for their traffic analysis.

City Response: Although the City understands the intersection of Nahanton Street and Wells Avenue is already near or at full capacity, there is concern the project will result in greater impact to this intersection. In addition, although the Nahanton Street/Winchester Street intersection currently meets signal warrants, we are concerned the project is going to increase traffic volume along Nahanton Street over what is there now, resulting in greater impact to this intersection. We also understand the Nahanton Street/Dedham Street intersection also needs major geometry improvements and possibly a new traffic signal, but believe the project is going to create more traffic congestion over what is already occurring there currently. As a result, the City respectfully requests that MassDOT perform baseline traffic counts along Nahanton Street at the intersections with Wells Avenue, Winchester Street and Dedham Street. These counts should be performed prior to the start of construction.

Original Comment:

3. *As indicated at the February 2 meeting with elected officials, City of Newton and Town of Needham staff, and interested citizens, (attended by Jacobs), there is concern about the intersections of the proposed bicycle lanes with the entrance/exit ramps at the Highland*

and Kendrick interchanges.

Response: We have revised the proposed ramp crossings at both Highland Avenue and Kendrick Street as a result of the comments received and recent additional comments received by the NeedhamlNewton Bicycle community. Revisions have been made for the 75% Highway Plan submission and additional revisions will be provided for the 100% design submission. The latest bicycle lane standards will be met for this project.

City Response: City officials attended a meeting at the Needham DPW on November 14, 2012 where MassDOT and their design consultants presented the project. It was evident that several revisions to proposed bicycle lanes and pedestrian accommodations were incorporated into the design. As a result, the City concurs with the response but request that MassDOT continue to engage the City and the bicycle community for input during the 100% and PS&E design phases.

Original Comment:

4. *The Upper Falls Neighborhood Area Council recently voted to recommend that the City Enter a 99-year lease with the MBTA to establish a greenway/bike path on the Newton side of the Charles River. The current MBTA right of way extends across the Charles River into Needham and then over-I-95. Project proponents and other Newton-based bicycle advocates have asked what it would cost to construct a bike/ped bridge in the location of the rail bridge being removed as part of the Add-a-Lane project. Currently, the project proposes to construct a foundation in the median for potential future use as a bridge, but no abutments or bridge structure is included in the scope of work.*

Response: MassDOT is committed to constructing a replacement bridge for the existing railroad bridge once it is determined what type of facility the bridge needs to accommodate. A center pier construction is no longer part of the project, as the proposed 1-95 median is now wide enough to accommodate any future bridge construction. Once the transportation use has been determined by. the Town, City and MBTA then the bridge type and costs can be studied.

City Response: The City concurs with the response and will continue to coordinate with MassDOT regarding the replacement structure.

Submitted by Alderman Yates, Ward 5:

Original Comment:

5. *What is the amount of traffic going southbound on 128 at the Route 9 intersection?*

Response: Please refer to the attached Figures 1 and 2, depicting the 2025 No Build traffic volumes for the weekday morning and weekday afternoon peak hours at the Route 9/Route 128 interchange.

City Response: The City concurs with this response. The existing traffic volumes have been provided.

Original Comment:

6. *How is it divided between through traffic, westbound on Route 9, and eastbound on Route 9?*

Response: Please refer to the attached Figures 1 and 2, depicting the 2025 No Build traffic volumes for the weekday morning and weekday afternoon peak hours at the Route 9/I-95/Route 128 interchange.

City Response: The City concurs with this response. The existing traffic volumes for each direction along Route 9 have been provided.

Original Comment:

7. *What is the division expected to be after the compression of the two exits into one with a stop light?*

   Response: Please refer to the attached Figures 3 and 4, depicting the 2025 Build traffic volumes for the weekday morning and weekday afternoon peak hours at the Route 9/ 1-95/Route 128 interchange.

   City Response: The City concurs with this response. The future traffic volumes have been provided.

Original Comment:

8. *What will the level of service be at the stop light? (How long will cars leaving Route 128 be stopped at the light, particularly during rush hours?)*

   Response: The signalized intersections of Route 9/Route 128 ramps are expected to operate at an overall LOS C or better in the peak hour, with average delays of less than 30 seconds. Individual movements are expected to operate at LOS D or better, and the volume to capacity ratios are all below one.

   MassDOT has initiated an additional study, to further analyze the Route 9 corridor as a system, evaluating the signalization of the Route 9/ I-95/Route 128 interchange ramps relative to the adjacent intersections along Route 9. VISSIM is simulation software and does not utilize HCM methodologies to calculate levels-of-service. However, HCM level-of-service indications can be applied to the average vehicle delay recorded during the VISSIM analysis and will be provided upon review by MassDOT. Generally, the VISSIM model indicates that the traffic along the Route 9 corridor will operate at acceptable levels-of-service under the proposed configuration at the I-95/Route 128 interchange. As already stated, the proposed signals on Route 9 are only 2-phase signals.

   City Response: The City concurs with this response. However, are the future levels of service and queues better or worse than existing?

Original Comment:

9. *How many drivers who anticipate a hold up at the light will be diverted to alternative routes through Newton (Highland Avenue/Needham Street to Oak Street, Centre Street, Quinobequin Road, Chestnut Street, Quinobequin Road, Kendrick Street to Dedham Street to parker Street, or Walnut Street)?*

   Response: The addition of the traffic signals on Route 9 at thel-95/Route 128 interchange are not expected to increase delay enough to encourage people to utilize Quinobequin Road as an alternative route. Again, as already stated, the proposed signals are only 2-phases which amount to minimal red time. The movement from Route 9 westbound onto I-95/Route 128 northbound is not proposed to be under signal control and therefore is not expected to experience additional delay. The ramp entrance will be appropriately modified with the proper storage length. With the efficient traffic operations of this movement, Quinobequin Road is not expected to be a more desirable route to travel northbound to I-95/Route 128. VISSIM analysis indicates that the proposed traffic signal is not expected to result in extensive queuing to vehicles traveling westbound on Route 9 (since it is only a two phase signal). Traveling on Route 9 westbound and continuing onto I-95/Route 128 to be able to travel at highway speed is expected to continue to take less time than traveling at a much lower speed along

Quinobequin Road only to incur delay when turning onto Route 16 to merge onto I-95/Route 128. Also, when the double left turn is actuated onto the 1-95 northbound ramp, the through traffic on Route 9 eastbound continues as a green. There is no queuing time at all. It should also be noted, those traveling northbound on 1-95 intending to take the Route 9 exit eastbound toward Newton will travel down the new ramp (no weave movement) into their own travel lane on Route 9 located beyond the proposed traffic signal. Basically, there is no signal for this movement. Therefore, there is no reason for anyone to use the Kendrick Street of ramp to cut through Newton.

City Response: As previously stated, the City remains concerned that traffic during and after construction will continue to divert onto side streets adjacent to Route 9. Although, we understand traffic simulation and analysis cannot predict this trend, the City respectfully requests that MassDOT perform baseline traffic counts along specific streets that could be impacted by the project. These counts should be performed prior to the start of construction.

Original Comment:

10. What will the level of service be at the light for cars going westbound on Route 9?

Response: The signalized intersections of Route 9/Route 128 ramps are expected to operate at an overall LOS C or better in the peak hour, with average delays of less than 30 seconds. Individual movements are expected to operate at LOS D or better, and the volume to capacity ratios are all below one.

MassDOT has initiated an additional study, to further analyze the Route 9 corridor as a system, evaluating the signalization of the Route 9/ I795/Route 128 interchange ramps relative to the adjacent intersections along Route 9. VISSIM is simulation software and does not utilize HCM methodologies to calculate levels-of-service. However, HCM level-of-service indications can be applied to the average vehicle delay recorded during the VISSIM analysis and will be provided upon review by MassDOT. Generally, the VISSIM model indicates that the traffic along the Route 9 corridor will operate at acceptable levels-of-service under the proposed configuration at the I-95/Route 128 interchange. As already indicated above, when the double left turn is actuated onto the 1-95 northbound ramp, the through traffic on Route 9 eastbound continues as a green. There is no queuing time at all.

City Response: The City concurs with this response. However, are the future levels of service and queues better or worse than existing?

Original Comment:

11. How many cars will be diverted to other routes through Newton by delays at the light?

Response: As already stated, the traffic signal system proposed at the Route 9 Interchange is simply a 2-phased system. The delay is minimal. Other routes do not provide the same access and have speed limitations which diminish the appeal to be used as an alternative route.

City Response: As previously stated, the City remains concerned that traffic during and after construction will continue to divert onto side streets adjacent to Route 9. Although, we understand traffic simulation and analysis cannot predict this trend, the City respectfully requests that MassDOT perform baseline traffic counts along specific streets that could be impacted by the project. These counts should be performed prior to the start of construction.

Original Comment:

12. What is the amount of traffic going northbound on 128 at the Route 9 intersection?

Response: Please refer to the attached Figures 1 and 2, depicting the 2025 No Build traffic volumes for the weekday morning and weekday afternoon peak hours at the Route 9/ I-95/Route 128 interchange.

City Response: The City concurs with this response. The existing traffic volumes for each direction along Route 9 have been provided.

Original Comment:

13. *How is it divided between through traffic? Eastbound on Route 9, and westbound on Route 9?*

Response: Graphics depicting the 2025 Build traffic volumes for the weekday morning and weekday afternoon peak hours at the Route 9/ I-95/Route 128 interchange is provided in the attached Figures 3 and 4. Of the traffic volumes on Route 9 traveling to northbound I-95/Route 128, during the weekday morning peak hour, approximately 30 percent travels from the west and 70 percent from the east. During the weekday afternoon peak hour, approximately 42 percent travels from the west and 58 percent travels from the east.

City Response: The City concurs with this response. The future traffic volumes have been provided.

Original Comment:

14. *What is the division expected to be after the compression of the two exist into one with a stop light?*

Response: Please refer to the attached Figures 3 and 4, depicting the 2025 Build traffic volumes for the weekday morning and weekday afternoon peak hours at the Route 9/ I-95/Route 128 interchange.

City Response: The City concurs with this response. The future traffic volumes have been provided.

Original Comment:

15. *What will the level of service be at the stop light? (How long will cars leaving Route 128 be stopped at the light, particularly during rush hours?)*

Response: Same Response as 8 and 10.

City Response: The City concurs with this response. However, are the future levels of service and queues better or worse than existing?

Original Comment:

16. *How many drivers who anticipate a holdup at the light will be diverted to alternative routes through Newton (Highland Avenue/Needham Street to Oak Street, Centre Street, Chestnut Walnut Street)?*

Response: The delay is minimal in the Route 9 westbound direction, as the proposed signal is only for two-phases. For the Route 9 eastbound traffic the delay is less, as the signal for the thru lanes remain green on the east side of the bridge. Only those wishing to turn left onto 1-95 northbound will stop. Again, the Route 9 eastbound thru lanes remains green. The proposed two-phased signals on Route 9 will not cause traffic diversions through Newton.

City Response: As previously stated, the City remains concerned that traffic during and after construction will continue to divert onto side streets adjacent to Route 9. Although, we understand

traffic simulation and analysis cannot predict this trend, the City respectfully requests that MassDOT perform baseline traffic counts along specific streets that could be impacted by the project. These counts should be performed prior to the start of construction.

Original Comment:

17. *What will the level of service be at the light of cars going eastbound on Route 9?*

Response: The signalized intersections of Route 9/Route 128 ramps are expected to operate at an overall LOS C or better in the peak hour, with average delays of less than 30 seconds. Individual movements are expected to operate at LOS D or better, and the volume to capacity ratios are all below one. Eastbound thru traffic on Route 9 will only need to stop at the signals located on the west side of the bridge. The signal remains green on the east side for the thru lanes.

City Response: The City concurs with this response. However, are the future levels of service and queues better or worse than existing?

Original Comment:

18. *How many cars will be diverted to other routes through Newton by delays at light?*

Response: The added delay from the signalized intersections on Route 9 at the 1-95/Route 128 ramps is not significant enough to make travel times along alternative routes shorter. The proposed signals have only two phases.

City Response: As previously stated, the City remains concerned that traffic during and after construction will continue to divert onto side streets adjacent to Route 9. Although, we understand traffic simulation and analysis cannot predict this trend, the City respectfully requests that MassDOT perform baseline traffic counts along specific streets that could be impacted by the project. These counts should be performed prior to the start of construction.

Submitted by Alderman Kalis, Ward 8

Original Comment:

19. *Given the traffic implications to Newton on Nahanton St, is there any consideration, plans, or dollars to direct to traffic flow improvements at the intersection of Nahanton and Dedham as well as the intersection of Nahanton and Winchester?*

Response: Based on the CTPS traffic projections, future traffic volumes associated with the installation of the Kendrick Street ramp will have a limited impact on Nahanton Street and its signalized intersections. This information has already been forwarded to the City of Newton. Although no traffic improvements are proposed at this time through the Add-A-Lane project, MassDOT will monitor traffic volumes after the proposed Kendrick Street ramps are opened to identify impacts and compare the build traffic data to the existing traffic data along these streets.

City Response: The City is very concerned the project is going to impact traffic along Nahanton Street and appreciates MassDOT's approach to monitor traffic volumes. However, the City respectfully requests that MassDOT perform baseline traffic counts along Nahanton Street at the intersections with Wells Avenue, Winchester Street and Dedham Street. These counts should be performed prior to the start of construction.

Original Comment:

20. *What is the estimated shift of weekday and weekend, as well as commute trips from*

Needham St to Nahanton St?

Response: Please refer to the attached Figure 5, depicting the 2025 Projected Build traffic shifts for the weekday morning and weekday afternoon peak hours along the Nahanton Street and Dedham Street roadways.

City Response: The City concurs with this response. The future traffic volumes have been provided

Original Comment:

21. *Will a study be done to understand traffic flow differences on Winchester St and then downstream, implications to the traffic light at Dedham and Winchester?*

Response: The traffic projections completed by CTPS as the basis of the analysis indicate limited impact on Winchester Street and Dedham Street. At the request of the city, an additional traffic analysis has been conducted for Kendrick Street and Nahanton Street. As explained in the requested traffic study, the intersection of Dedham Street and Nahanton Street currently meets signal warrants under existing conditions. This traffic study memo has already been forwarded to the City of Newton. It is recommended that the City pursue implementation of a traffic signal as soon as it is practical. Once the new interchange at Kendrick Street is complete, the new direct ramp to 1-95 northbound from Kendrick Street will help reduce eastbound flow on Kendrick and Nahanton Street toward Newton.

City Response: Although the City understands the intersection of Nahanton Street and Winchester Street currently meets signal warrants, we are concerned the new Kendrick Street interchange is going to increase traffic along Nahanton over what is there now, resulting in greater impact to these intersections. As previously stated, the City respectfully requests that MassDOT perform baseline traffic counts along Nahanton Street at the intersections with Wells Avenue, Winchester Street and Dedham Street. These counts should be performed prior to the start of construction.

Original Comment:

22. *What is the plan to review actual impact following implementation and will dollars be set aside to address any unforeseen impacts?*

Response: A build traffic monitoring program can be established in order to document the specific impacts of the opening of the Kendrick Street ramps in comparison to the existing traffic data that has already been collected. Although there are no specific funds to be set aside, MassDOT and the City should agree in advance to participate in a build traffic monitoring program, and if necessary, identify appropriate levels of mitigation in relation to the proposed improvements of the I-95/Route 128 project. It should also be mentioned that additional development in the area is the responsibility of the developer, not MassDOT.

City Response: As previously stated, the City is very concerned the project is going to impact traffic along Nahanton Street and appreciates MassDOT's approach to monitor traffic volumes. The City concurs with MassDOT to enter into a build traffic monitoring program and establish specific levels of mitigation.

Original Comment:

23. *Is the new intersection at Kendrick intended to be a full intersection or only an entry from 128 South? Please specify the details of this intersection.*

Response: The proposed Kendrick Street interchange will have four new quadrant ramps. Access to Kendrick Street will be provided both from 1-95 north and southbound directions. There are two

restricted movements for the new interchange:

• Those traveling I-95/Route 128 northbound can only enter Kendrick Street to travel eastbound toward Newton. A left turn to travel westbound on Kendrick Street toward Needham will not be permitted.
• Access to 1-95/Route 128 northbound from Kendrick Street can only occur from the east direction. Those traveling west on Kendrick Street coming from Needham will not be able to take a left to travel northbound on 1-95.

City Response: Duly noted.

Original Comment:

24. *Will the new Kendrick Street Bridge continue to allow flow to and from Needham and Newton?*

Response: Yes, the Kendrick Street Bridge will continue to allow traffic low to and from Needham and Newton.

City Response: Duly noted.

Email # 1 From: Maureen Reilly Meagher

Original Comment:

25. *I would like to ask of our city officials, why intersection of Route 9 and 128 was left off comment letter sent by the mayor's office and Bob Rooney in June to DOT?*

Response: The comment is directed to City officials. Also, please see all the other somewhat repetitive questions/responses concerning the Route 9 interchange.

City Response: Duly noted. Although the City understands the project has a direct impact to the Route 128/Route 9 interchange, the primary focus of the referenced letter was to identify the concerns related to impacts to secondary roads including Quinobequin Road, Nahanton Street and others as well as future development projects. It should be noted that in subsequent correspondence with MassDOT, the City clearly identified concerns related to Route 9 traffic.

Original Comment:

26. *The current design at this intersection was originally seen as a temporary action taken for the duration of the project, when did it become a permanent change and why?*

Response: The proposed alterations to the Route 9/ I-95/Route 128 interchange are proposed in order to improve the safety of the interchange. The operation of the proposed signals on Route 9 were evaluated and determined to be acceptable, as they are only two phase signals. The reconfiguration of the interchange ramps eliminates weave segments on both Route 9 and I-95/Route 128, therefore improving safety of the vehicles traveling through the interchange. The improvements began as temporary measures to accommodate traffic during the staged construction requirements of the I-95/Route 128 Add-A-Lane project. As the design was analyzed further it became apparent that the proposed signal modifications could work with the future traffic volume projections and eliminate dangerous weaves. Furthermore, FHWA has held seminars on interchange improvements recommending the elimination of unnecessary weaving movements at interchanges to enhance safety.

City Response: As previously stated, the City was not provided a copy of the most recent traffic analysis data and therefore cannot comment with respect to existing/future levels of service, vehicle

queues and/or delay along Route 9. However, based on the response to Question #8 herein, it appears the proposed project will result in queues of 30 seconds or less while experiencing a level of service C or better at the ramps, and level of service D or better for individual movements.

Original Comment:

27. I am still wondering if there are existing traffic studies available for Quinobequin Road, Chestnut Street, Ellis Street and can they be made available to residents at the meeting?

Response: These roadways are not part of the scope of work for the Route 128 Add-A-Lane project and they were not included in the traffic analysis study. The additional traffic analysis currently being conducted includes an analysis of the Quinobequin Road on-ramp to Route 9 westbound as it approached the Route 9 Interchange.

City Response: The City is not aware of any existing traffic studies along Quinobequin Road, Chestnut Street or Ellis Street.

Original Comment:

28. Can a discussion of storm water design under highway be part of presentation?

Response: The details of the storm water design have been presented at recent Conservation Commission meetings in Needham and Wellesley. This design material has also been forwarded to DEP and the ACOE, as required. The City of Newton DPW Office has also received electronic copies of the drainage design information that has been included with the Notice of Intent permit filings.

City Response: Duly noted.

Email # 2 Thomas & Valerie Forte-120 Quinobequin Rd

Original Comment:

29. As residents of Quinobequin Road and the surrounding area, we are very concerned about the proposed reconstruction of the ramps, and the addition of traffic lights to the Route 9/123 interchange. There is no question in our minds, this change will negatively impact Quinobequin Road and the surrounding streets. Quinobequin Road is a recreational road owned and maintained by DCR. It has few sidewalks and berms, and few poorly functioning drains. It was designed as a recreational road, winding to follow the footprint of the Charles River. NOT as a by-pass road for an interstate Highway! The abutting densely settled neighborhood cherishes the adjacent open space. We know all too well the negative impacts traffic can have on a neighborhood! We worked diligently and relentlessly with local, state and federal officials, for over a decade to get the sound barrier constructed, to decrease the impacts the traffic has on the river, the open space and the quality and health of the neighborhood. It is almost unimaginable to think we could be threatened with additional negative consequences from increased traffic in this area. We would be negligent if we did not ask you to have the foresight when considering this project, to consider the additional impact from the Riverside project, as well.

Although separate projects, they both will impose dramatic and permanent impacts to this area. Therefore, we trust you will carefully and methodically, consider these projects. Using all means possible to assess and avoid all negative impacts. And make a detailed plan and follow thru for all mitigation. Further we ask, you to advocate for us with all agencies involved, to protect the quality of our lives, our health, the stability of our property values and the beautiful river and slice of cherished open space we all enjoy. Please keep foremost in your minds, we are an established neighborhood. We deserve to

have a good quality of life and live in a healthy surrounding environment.

Response: The addition of the traffic signals on Route 9 at the I-95/Route 128 interchange are not expected to increase delay enough to encourage the traveling public to utilize Quinobequin Road as an alternative route. The proposed signals on Route 9 are only two phase signals. The movement from Route 9 westbound onto I-95/Route 128 northbound is not proposed to be under signal control and. therefore is not expected, to experience additional delay. The ramp entrance will be appropriately modified with the proper storage length. With the efficient traffic operations of this movement, Quinobequin Road is not expected to be a more desirable route to travel northbound to I-95/Route 128. VISSIM analysis indicates that the proposed traffic signal is not expected to result in extensive queuing to vehicles traveling westbound on Route 9. Traveling on Route 9 westbound and continuing onto 1-95/Route 128 to be able to travel at highway speed is expected to continue to take less time than traveling at a much lower speed along Quinobequin Road only to incur delay when turning onto Route 16 to merge onto I-95/Route 128.

The CTPS traffic projections utilized for the analysis of this project include both specific development growth and general growth for areas adjacent to the study area. Also, the Riverside project is located some distance from the study area and the developer is responsible for their traffic analysis.

City Response: As previously stated, the City remains concerned that traffic during and after construction will continue to divert onto side streets adjacent to Route 9. Although, we understand traffic simulation and analysis cannot predict this trend, the City respectfully requests that MassDOT perform baseline traffic counts along specific streets that could be impacted by the project. These counts should be performed prior to the start of construction.

Email # 3 From: Lisa Frank

Original Comment:

30. *We live at 350 Quinobequin Road and are greatly concerned about the increase in traffic to our road. It is already a cut through street with speeding traffic. Any changes that increase the traffic will actually make it extremely dangerous as many people enjoy - walking along this road. There are no sidewalks...*

A permanent road block should be made on Quinobequin rd at the ramp location to go on Route 128 south. I do believe the neighborhood would be saved from all the cut through traffic.

Response: The addition of the traffic signals on Route 9 at the 1-95/Route 128 interchange are not expected to increase delay enough to encourage the traveling public to utilize Quinobequin Road as an alternative route. The movement from Route 9 westbound onto 1-95/Route 128 northbound is not proposed to be under signal control and therefore is not expected to experience additional delay. The ramp entrance will be appropriately modified with the proper storage length. With the efficient traffic operations of this movement, Quinobequin Road is not expected to be a more desirable route to travel northbound to 1-95/Route 128. VISSIM analysis indicates that the proposed traffic signal is not expected to result in extensive queuing to vehicles traveling westbound on Route 9. The proposed signals are only two phase signals. Traveling on Route 9 westbound and continuing onto I-95/Route 128 to be able to travel at highway speed is expected to continue to take less time than traveling at a much lower speed along Quinobequin Road, only to incur delay when turning onto Route 16 to merge onto 1-95/Route 128.

Furthermore, if there is already speeding and cut thru traffic on Quinobequin Road under the existing conditions then the city should contact DCR.

City Response: Although the City remains concerned that traffic during and after construction will

continue to divert onto side streets adjacent to Route 9 including Quinobequin Road we do not support a permanent "road block" along this corridor. The City is coordinating with the Division of Conservation and Recreation (DCR) with regard to speeding enforcement and permanent traffic controls. As stated previously, we understand traffic simulation and analysis cannot predict this trend, the City respectfully requests that MassDOT perform baseline traffic counts along specific streets that could be impacted by the project. These counts should be performed prior to the start of construction.

Email # 4 From: Jeanie Roper

Original Comment:

31. *Could you please let the Aldermen know that a big problem on route128 is that as soon as one gets on 128 N from Rt. 9 it is necessary to get over 2 lanes to avoid the back up from people trying to exit to get on the Pike. Route 128N curves steeply so that getting over to the left while the road curves right is very hard in terms of looking behind to check before changing lanes. Maybe if they expand it they could move the lanes that feed into the Pike over and make it a more gradual curve to get by that on the left for a mile or so south of the Pike exit. I hope this makes sense to you. It really is a dangerous area with lots of people changing lanes to get over to get on the Pike or coming onto the highway and trying to get over to avoid Pike exiters between route 9 and the pike.*

    Response: The Mass Pike interchange is located three interchanges north of the Route 9 interchange. This location is well beyond the limits of work for the Route 128 Add-A-Lane project. The limits of work for the Add-A-Lane project stop at the Route 9 Interchange. The permits and scope of work for the Add-A-Lane project have been denied for numerous years now. To address this request for the Mass Pike exit location is well beyond the scope of work for this project.

    City Response: The City concurs with this response.

Cc: Dave Turocy, DPW Commissioner
Lou Taverna, City Engineer
Kay Khan & Ruth Balser, MA State Rep., Newton
John Rice, Ward 5 Alderman
Deborah Crossley & Brian Yates, Ward 5 Alderman at Large
File

Danielle Delaney

To: ddelaney@newtonma.gov
Subject: (Fwd) Comment re: Add-A-Lane impact on Quinobequin Rd., Waban...
Date sent: Thu, 31 Jan 2013 11:51:00

------ Forwarded message follows -------
From: "Barbara Brustowicz"
To: <ddelaney@newtonma.gov>
Subject: Comment re: Add-A-Lane impact on Quinobequin Rd., Waban...
Date sent: Wed, 30 Jan 2013 23:23:08 -0500

Dear Ms. Delaney,

Kindly forward the following comment for consideration by our elected officials:

Having lived in Waban for the past 30 years and residing on Radcliff Road with property that abuts Quinobequin Road since 2002, we have seen a troubling steady increase in the volume of traffic as well as speeding in excess of the posted speed limits along Quinobequin Road. With the impending Add-A-Lane permanent changes being proposed by the Mass. DOT to the intersection of Rte. 9 and Rte. 128, we are deeply concerned about the troubling negative impact that this project will have on our bucolic neighborhood. The installation of the two proposed traffic lights at the intersection of these two heavily traveled routes will create a traffic back up on Rte. 9 in both directions, causing drivers to seek an escape route. Quinobequin Road and Chestnut Street in Waban will become the cut through route of choice for drivers seeking to avoid sitting in backed up traffic along Rte. 9. This proposed traffic design is ill-conceived and requires further study and consideration of the impact that it will have on the village of Waban.

At the January 23 meeting of the Public Safety and Transportation Committee brief discussion centered on Quinobequin Road, its status as a recreation road, and the lack of an agreement between the DCR and the Mayor's Office that would enable the City Police Dept. to enforce traffic and speed limits on the road. Alderman Yates asked for a Docket item requesting that the DRC attend the next scheduled meeting of the Board of Alderman regarding a follow up discussion concerning Quinobequin Road.

Currently Quinobequin Road, a two-mile winding country road that follows the meandering Charles River, was created as a recreation road to be overseen by the former MDC. Commercial vehicles are prohibited and 20-30 mph speed limits are posted along the roadway. Jurisdiction along Quinobequin Road for traffic enforcement lies with the State Police, but lack of funding means that State Police presence in the area is sporadic at best. Road maintenance and open space preservation belongs to the DRC, but financial restrictions have resulted in a total lack of care or oversight by the Department. As concerned residents of the area we urge the our elected officials to give Quinobequin Road the attention that it deserves and to take any and all necessary measures to maintain the bucolic neighborhood environment, preserve the recreational road as a safe and hazard free roadway, and prevent it from becoming a cut through commuter route.

Respectfully submitted,

Barbara & Robert Brustowicz
Radcliff Road

Danielle Delaney

To: ddelaney@newtonma.gov
Subject: (Fwd) Route 9 and Route 128 Interchange
Date sent: Mon, 04 Feb 2013 09:41:46

------- Forwarded message follows -------
To: ddelaney@newtonma.gov
Subject: Route 9 and Route 128 Interchange
From: Rellertsen
Date sent: Sun, 3 Feb 2013 14:10:09 -0500 (EST)

I believe the cloverleaf interchange for Route 9 and Route 128 should be kept as is.

I believe there is a reason why many major delivery companies use computer software to plot out the daily driving routes for their drivers in a way the minimizes left turns. It is because left turns are much more likely to result in accidents. Unfortunately, the new plan for the interchange eliminates two conventional cloverleaf leaves that require right turns and replaces them with two traffic lights that require left turns.

Currently, if a driver is in Newton on Route 9 going toward Wellesley and wants to go onto Route 128 south, he/she simply drives to the clover leaf, takes a right turn, and merges onto 128.

In the new system, however, the driver would first cross through an intersection with a traffic light that allows drivers from Route 9 in Wellesley to take a left turn onto Route 128 north. If the light is red, the driver from Newton waits for it to turn green. Once through that, the driver from Newton would next get into the left lane and would soon be in another intersection with a traffic light. If the light were red for a left turn, he/she would wait for it to turn green and so that he/she could make a left turn while drivers coming from Wellesley would wait under a red light. When the driver from Newton would turn left on green, he/she would next look to the right while merging onto the entrance road with drivers from Wellesley, make the merge, and then a few moments later would look to the left and merge onto Route 128.

Instead of no traffic lights, there now would be two. Instead of no left turns, there would be one. Instead of one merge, there would be two.

Whatever you can do to save the current cloverleaf would be a great benefit to all motorists using the interchange.

Thanks in advance for whatever efforts you make.

Bob Ellertsen
837 Chestnut Street
Newton, MA 02468

-

Danielle Delaney

To: ddelaney@newtonma.gov
Subject: (Fwd) rt 9/128 exchange project
Date sent: Tue, 19 Feb 2013 08:49:45

------- Forwarded message follows -------
From: "Neil Gladstone"
To: <byates@newtonma.gov>,
<ddelaney@newtonma.gov>
Subject: rt 9/128 exchange project
Date sent: Sun, 17 Feb 2013 17:06:51 -0500

Brian and Danielle,

I am a 21 year resident of Waban at 185 Allen Avenue. I want to register my strong disapproval of the DOT plan to create 2 new traffic lights at the interchange in place of current cloverleaf system. This would create a significant bottleneck on Rt. 9, and present more safety issues as drivers going west on Rt. 9 will need to make a left to enter 128 South. The current cloverleaves accomplish the entrance and exits between RT 9 and Rt. 128 with no lights and no left turns.

I appreciate whatever you can do to influence the DOT.
‘

Sincerely,
Neil Gladstone

Danielle Delaney

From:	"" <byates@newtonma.gov>
To:	rrcexec@regulatoryresearch.com, mreillymeagher@gmail.com, steelch1268@gmail.com, wpaile@newtonma.gov
Date sent:	Fri, 22 Feb 2013 14:36:54 -0500
Subject:	Suggested questions for DOT at March 6 meeting on Route 9 intersection with Add-a-Lane
Copies to:	DDelaney@newtonma.gov, Dkallis@newtonma.gov, Ruth.Balser@statema.gov, Cynthia.Creem@statema.gov., ACiccone@newtonma.gov
Priority:	normal

What problem is this design of the intersection trying to solve?

What data do you have that proves the existence of this problem?

What are accident rates at the various sectors of this intersection? What are the causes of the accidents and how will they be alleviated by the proposed design of the intersection?

Where have similar changes to those proposed for this intersection been implemented previously ? Have they been successul?

Are the proposed changes based on some general State or Federal policy?
If so, please provide a copy of the policy.

As part of the proposed development of the Mass DOT owned site at Riverside, data was collected on a wide range of intersections far beyond the site of the proposed development. Will you collect data on current traffic levels and intersection levels of service that will be affected by the proposed changes to the intersection, including but not limited to Chestnut , Elliot, and Woodward Streets in Newton, Central Avenue and Gould Street in Needham, Quinobequinn Road in Newton, etc?

Will you provide mitigation funds to Newton, Needham, DCR, etc. if major traffic increases or declines in the levels of service are caused by the changes to the intersection?

Are the proposed left turns at the intersection similar to those proposed for elimination in New Jersey described in an article in the New York Times on February 5, 2013?

Will DOD post signs on its access roads to Quinobequin Road warning drivers of commercial vehicles that Quinobequin Road is close to them?

Danielle Delaney

To: ddelaney@newtonma.gov
Subject: (Fwd) Re: Suggested questions for DOT at March 6 meeting on Route 9intersection with Add-a-Lan
Date sent: Mon, 25 Feb 2013 09:09:13

------- Forwarded message follows -------
Date sent: Fri, 22 Feb 2013 16:51:56 -0500
Subject: Re: Suggested questions for DOT at March 6 meeting on Route 9intersection with Add-a-Lane
From: Christopher Steele
To: byates@newtonma.gov
Copies to: rrcexec@regulatoryresearch.com, mreillymeagher@gmail.com, wpaile@newtonma.gov, DDelaney@newtonma.gov, Dkallis@newtonma.gov, Ruth.Balser@statema.gov, Cynthia.Creem@statema.gov, ACiccone@newtonma.gov

Thanks Brian - These provide an excellent starting point

PS - For everyone else on the distribution, I believe that this is the article Brian is referring to: http://www.nytimes.com/2013/02/05/nyregion/bill-to-squelch-new-jerseys-jughandle-turns-is-backed.html?_r=0

However, I believe that the current proposal is not exactly the same as it involves an interstate highway. I'm familiar with many of the situations the article references - In each the more major road would be the equivalent size of Rt 9 and the minor would be the equivalent of, say, Langley.

Thank you!

-Chris
Christopher Steele

The New York Times

N.Y. /Region

Bill to Squelch Convoluted Left Turns Gains in New Jersey Senate

By MATT FLEGENHEIMER

Published: February 4, 2013

It is the peculiar fate of the New Jersey driver, as indelible as a shoreside weekend or a Bruce Springsteen composition, if less easily romanticized.

One of the state's "jughandles," on Route 31 in Clinton Township, N.J.

For when the denizens of Mr. Springsteen's "Born to Run" take their hemi-powered drones for a scream down the boulevard, one detail is perhaps omitted: If ever those renegade drivers resolved to make a left turn, they probably suffered the indignity of taking a right-hand loop first.

The loop is called a jughandle, a traffic formation that looks as it sounds: an unintuitive veer to the far right when you want to turn left.

While other states have been known to use jughandles, none seems to have matched New Jersey in volume or reputation.

After more than a half-century, though, the jughandle — so intertwined with the Garden State that it is also called a "Jersey left" — faces a threat. On Monday, a proposal to ban future jughandles cleared the State Senate's transportation committee, allowing for a full vote and prompting a zealous debate over the state's signature driving quirk.

“I’m from New Jersey for 60 years,” said Daniel Gaskill, who operates the Princeton Driving School. “Jughandles are part of our culture.”

Officials said construction of the state’s hundreds of jughandles dated to the 1940s and grew as part of an effort to keep traffic clusters off main drags. But like the state’s many traffic circles, the jughandle has become a polarizing force.

The bill’s author, State Senator James Holzapfel of Toms River, described the minutes-long wait at a jughandle as “my personal hell.” Since 2003, when Mr. Holzapfel was an assemblyman, he has introduced a jughandle bill every two years. Monday was the first time his plan passed in a committee. “I’ve sat through three, four changes of the light before I could even get over the highway,” he said. “You sit there and say, ‘There’s got to be a better way.’ ”

Officials with the State Transportation Department are not so sure, suggesting that the alternatives — dedicated turn lanes or mixed-use lanes — leave drivers vulnerable to backups in active travel lanes, including high-speed lanes.

“We, as a department, have found that the jughandle design does serve a purpose,” said Tim Greeley, a department spokesman.

A spokesman for Gov. Chris Christie did not respond to a message seeking the governor’s position on jughandles.

Some residents have said the greatest shortcoming of the state’s turning policy is its inconsistency. Some stretches include traditional left turns and jughandles in proximity, leaving a left-leaning driver to guess which lane to enter. Mr. Holzapfel noted that roads by the state’s resort towns were particularly problematic to visitors unfamiliar with the convention.

“They go to the intersection, stop, then try to make a left across a three-lane road,” he said.

Mr. Holzapfel said that intersections once plagued with accidents and backups, including some on Routes 1 and 17, had been remedied in recent years with the use of overpasses and other designs that eliminated the need for jughandles. He estimated that jughandles had caused thousands of accidents. (If passed, the bill would affect the future construction of jughandles, not those that are already in place.)

Maria Prato, 31, who moved from Oklahoma City to North Hanover, N.J., in 2007, said it took her about two weeks to figure out how to make a left turn. “I was like: ‘What is wrong with these people? They don’t need to make left-hand turns?’ ” she recalled. “Eventually one of the locals cued us in.”

But perhaps no New Jerseyan has weighed the jughandle’s merits as thoroughly as Jason Didner, 42, a singer and songwriter. Years before he took a job with a highway construction company, he wrote a tune about his driving experience for “Car Talk” on National Public Radio.

“My experience,” he said in a phone interview on Monday, “was seeing a diner on the left-hand lane, and you can’t get there for another 10 minutes.”

And with that, Mr. Didner offered his entry, “You Can’t Get There From Here in Jersey,” and its chorus:

“You can’t get there from here in Jersey/ You’re always on the wrong side of the road/ You can’t get there from here in Jersey/ I’ve got a case of jughandle turnaround overload.”

A version of this article appeared in print on February 5, 2013, on page A16 of the New York edition with the headline: Bill to Squelch Convoluted Left Turns Gains in New Jersey Senate.