The following memorandum was completed at the request of the Office for Commonwealth Development. It investigated the interim year impacts of the proposed redevelopment plan at that time.



Staff to the Boston Metropolitan Planning Organization

MEMORANDUM

TO: Anne Tate Office for Commonwealth Development

May 19, 2004

FROM: Mark S. Abbott, P.E.

RE: Interim-Year Analysis for Assembly Square Development

At your request, we have reviewed the Assembly Square Transportation Plan¹ in order to analyze interim-year and 2025 traffic conditions without transportation improvements (that is, no new interchange or intersection improvements). The Assembly Square Transportation Plan does not provide interim-year analyses or no-build (no-roadway-improvements) analyses. The interim-year and 2025 no-build traffic conditions estimated as part of the present short study were meant to provide a preliminary understanding of the effects of incremental development in Assembly Square. The analyses in this memorandum were based solely on the above-mentioned report.

Background

The Assembly Square Transportation Plan was prepared by Rizzo Associates for the City of Somerville's Office of Housing and Community Development. It proposes an improvement program to enhance connectivity between all transportation modes and creates a transportation network that will support the future land use vision and serve the needs of the district's employees, employees, and visitors. The report

- identifies the transportation challenges facing Assembly Square;
- evaluates potential improvements in public transportation, pedestrian and bicycle access, and motor vehicle access; and
- recommends a multimodal transportation improvement plan that is designed to help Assembly Square achieve the vision of a vibrant urban village.

The development build out and trip generation outlined in the report are shown in Table 1. The build out information includes the development's proposed land uses and square footage. Trip generation is provided by mode in person trips and vehicle trips.

¹ Rizzo Associates, for the City of Somerville Office of Housing and Community Development, *Assembly Square Transportation Plan: Final Report*, May 13, 2003.

	EXISTING (2002)	PHASE II: Full Development (2025)				
	Developmen	t Build Out				
Land Use	Square Feet	Square Feet	Square Feet			
Residential	-	1,604,300	1,774,800			
Office/R&D	240,000	1,803,800	4,468,000			
Retail	668,284	1,077,616	1,142,616			
Hotel	86,000	86,000	180,000			
Industrial	80,000	42,000	12,000			
Institutional	32,000	32,000	32.000			
Total	1,106,284	4,645,716	7,609,416			
	Trip Ger	eration				
Daily Trip						
Generation	Person (Vehicle)	Person (Vehicle)	Person (Vehicle)			
Transit	650 (n/a)	1,700 (n/a)	34,900 (n/a)			
Auto	32,650 (20,950)	87,250 (56,700)	93,550 (61,450)			
Walk/Bike/Other	1,200 (n/a)	1,650 (n/a)	3,500 (n/a)			
Total	34,500 (20,950)	90,600 (56,700)	132,600 (61,450)			
AM Peak Hour						
Trip Generation	Person (Vehicle)	Person (Vehicle)	Person (Vehicle)			
Transit	20 (n/a)	65 (n/a)	1,875 (n/a)			
Auto	1,875 (1,205)	5,360 (3,480)	7,760 (5,095)			
Walk/Bike/Other	40 (n/a)	75 (n/a)	165 (n/a)			
Total	1,935 (1,205)	5,500 (3,480)	9,800 (5,095)			
PM Peak Hour						
Trip Generation	Person (Vehicle)	Person (Vehicle)	Person (Vehicle)			
Transit	70 (n/a)	150 (n/a)	3,630 (n/a)			
Auto	3,030 (1,950)	8,065 (5,240)	11,430 (7,475)			
Walk/Bike/Other	100 (n/a)	135 (n/a)	325 (n/a)			
Total	3,200 (1,950)	8,350 (5,240)	16,100 (7,475)			

 Table 1
 Development Phases and Trip Generation

Source: Rizzo Associates, for the City of Somerville Office of Housing and Community Development, *Assembly Square Transportation Plan: Final Report*, May 13, 2003.

Table 2 presents level-of-service data from the Transportation Plan report for four key intersections. These four locations were chosen for evaluation in this memorandum because they process the highest amount of traffic entering/exiting Assembly Square. The table shows the existing operations and the future operations under the proposed full development preferred

alternative. As shown in the table, the only intersection which is failing during both future peak hours with full development is the Route 28/Middlesex Avenue intersection.

		-	AM Peak H	lour	PM Peak Hour					
Intersection	Condition	LOS	V/C	Delay	LOS	V/C	Delay			
Route 28 at	2002 Existing	А	0.72	3.4	А	0.74	4.7			
Assembly Sq Dr	2025 Full Development	А	0.84	3.9	С	1.09	31.3			
	Preferred Alt									
Route 28 at	2002 Existing	D	0.80	40.1	В	0.49	12.2			
Middlesex Ave	2025 Full Development	F	1.26	107.0	F	1.23	96.3			
	Preferred Alt									
Route 28 SB at	2002 Existing	D	0.58	35.2	В	0.34	17.7			
Mystic Ave NB	2025 Full Development	D	0.87	49.8	С	0.66	20.7			
	Preferred Alt									
Route 28 at	2002 Existing	D	1.01	38.0	В	0.63	10.1			
Mystic Ave SB	2025 Full Development	Е	1.04	71.4	В	0.66	18.0			
	Preferred Alt									

Table 2Level of Service for 2002 and 2025 at Selected IntersectionsSource: Rizzo Associates, Assembly Square Transportation Plan: Final Report, May 13, 2003.

Analysis

The analysis performed for this memorandum was based upon traffic volumes and signaloperations data provided in the Transportation Plan report.

For the purposes of this analysis, interim-year PM peak hour traffic volumes were developed for 2010, 2015, and 2020. These are shown in Table 3, in addition to traffic volumes for 2002 and 2025 from the Transportation Plan report. The PM peak hour was chosen because the vehicle trips associated with Assembly Square are higher in the afternoon than in the AM peak hour. For each of the interim years it was assumed that 25% of the total proposed development would occur. So, in 2010, 25% of the development would occur; in year 2015 there would be 50% of the development; and so on until full build is achieved in 2025. Also, for intersection traffic volumes a background growth rate was applied based on the growth that was assumed in the Transportation Plan report.

In general, the traffic volumes that were developed show growth from 2002 to 2025, although at the Route 28/Mystic Avenue southbound intersection there is a decrease. This decrease is most likely due to the Central Artery project improvements but cannot be exactly determined without access to the planning model that was used for the Transportation Plan report, developed by Rizzo Associates.

The intersection analysis was performed using Synchro, which was also used for the Transportation Plan report. Analysis conditions and settings for 2002 (existing conditions) from the report were used for the interim-year no-build analyses. No-build refers here to the absence

of roadway improvements; that is, future no-build geometric and signal conditions are the same as exist today.

As Table 4 shows, the level of service (LOS) at the two key Route 28 intersections which are used for direct access to Assembly Square, Assembly Square Drive and Middlesex Avenue, begins to deteriorate to failure in 2010, with only 25% of the development occurring. The LOS at Middlesex Avenue is already F in 2010, and both intersections are well above capacity by 2025, when full development occurs.

				_				_	
Intersection	Annroach	Maxamant	2002*		2010	2015	2020		2025*
Intersection	itersection Approach Movement (I		(Existing)		(25%)	(50%)	(75%)		(Full Development)
Route 28 at	Route 28 SB	Left	120		222	215	100		500
Assembly		Through	130		223	315	408		500
Square		U	1,690		1,781	1,850	1,919		1,990
Dr	Route 28 NB	Through	1,910		2,430	2,845	3,329		3,895
		Right	15		74	133	191		250
	Assembly Sq Dr	Right	195		318	440	563		685
Route 28 at	Route 28 SB	Through	150		178	205	233		260
Middlesex Ave		Right	1,555		1,614	1,652	1,690		1,730
	Route 28 NB	Left	1,525		2,060	2,490	2,989		3,570
		Through	180		628	1,075	1,523		1,970
	Middlesex Ave Left		85		518	950	1,383		1,815
		Right	400		444	488	531		575
Route 28 SB at	Route 28 SB	Left	555		759	957	1,155		1,354
Mystic Ave NB		Through	845		1,158	1,462	1,766		2,071
		Right	240		175	150	132		120
	Mystic Ave NB	Through/Left	585		761	945	1,130		1,320
Route 28 at	Route 28 SB	Left/Through	895		1,185	1,479	1,745		2,071
Mystic Ave SB	Mystic Ave SB	Through	300		382	444	516		600
		Right	625		596	578	561		545
	Mystic Ave NB	Through	1,000		982	971	961		950

Table 3	PM Peak Hour	Intersection	Volumes

Source: Rizzo Associates, Assembly Square Transportation Plan: Final Report, May 13, 2003.

			<u>2002</u>	2 (Exist	ing)*	<u>2010 (25%)</u> <u>2015 (50%)</u>		<u>0%)</u>	<u>2020 (75%)</u>			2025 (Full Development)*					
Intersection	Movement		LOS	V/C	Delay	LOS	V/C	Delay	LOS	V/C	Delay	LO S	V/C	Delay	LOS	V/C	Delay
Route 28 at	Douto 29 ND	Through	А	0.69	6.0	В	0.87	11.8	С	1.02	33.7	F	1.19	104.3	F	1.40	195.0
Assembly Sq	Route 28 NB	Right	Α	0.01	0.0	Α	0.05	0.1	Α	0.09	0.1	Α	0.12	0.2	Α	0.16	0.2
Dr	Poute 28 SP	Left	D	0.82	50.8	F	1.38	232.3	F	1.94	472.3	F	2.51	722.8	F	3.06	969.9
	Koute 28 SD	Through	А	0.34	0.0	Α	0.36	0.0	А	0.38	0.0	Α	0.39	0.0	А	0.40	0.1
	Assembly Sq Dr	Right	А	0.12	0.2	А	0.20	0.3	А	0.28	0.4	А	0.36	0.6	А	0.44	0.9
	Overall		A	0.74	4.7	В	1.06	16.9	D	1.37	44.1	F	1.69	100.5	F	2.02	170.2
Route 28 at		Through	в	0.58	12.0	в	0.79	16.8	C	0.95	26.3	F	1 14	87.0	F	1 37	185.5
Middlesex	Route 28 NB	Right	A	0.12	0.2	A	0.41	0.8	A	0.70	20.5	C	0.99	20.8	F	1.28	174.8
Ave		8						••••									
	Route 28 SB	Left	C	0.24	29.5	C	0.28	29.8	C	0.33	30.1	C	0.37	30.5	C	0.41	30.8
		Ihrough	<u> </u>	0.59	12.9	<u> </u>	0.62	13.3	<u> </u>	0.63	13.6	<u> </u>	0.65	13.8	<u> </u>	0.66	14.0
	Middlesex Ave	Left	D	0.47	37.6	F	2.86	887.6	F	5.24	1,955.0	F	7.63	3,030.3	F	10.00	4,101.0
		Right	A	0.26	0.4	A	0.29	0.5	A	0.32	0.5	A	0.35	0.6	A	0.37	0.7
D (20 CD (Overall	1.0	<u>B</u>	0.49	12.2		0.93	92.5	F	1.39	274.9	<u> </u>	1.86	523.9	<u> </u>	2.25	830.4
Route 28 SB at	D (20 CD	Left	В	0.39	18.2	В	0.54	19.8	C	0.68	22.4	C	0.82	26.9	D	0.96	41.0
Mystic Ave	Route 28 SB	I nrougn	В	0.42	18.4		0.57	20.2		0.72	22.8		0.88	28.0	D	1.03	52.1
NB	Martin Arm ND	Kight Thursen h	B	0.40	18.5	B	0.29	1/.4	B	0.25	1/.0	B	0.22	10./	B	0.20	16.5
	Mystic Ave NB	Inrough	B	0.26	15.2	B	0.34	15.9	B	0.43	10./	B	0.51	1/./	B	0.59	18.9
D	Overall	L . A/Thursday	<u> </u>	0.34	1/.5	<u> </u>	0.45	18.8	<u> </u>	0.5/	20.8		0.08	24.5	<u>D</u>	0.79	<u> </u>
Route 28 at	Route 28 SB	There a h	A	0.42	0.0	A	0.56	0.8	A	0.70	/.0	B	0.84	11.2	B	0.98	18./
Mystic Ave	Mystic Ave SB	I nrougn	В	0.18	15.1	В	0.22	13.5	В	0.26	13.8	В	0.30	14.2	В	0.35	14./
SB		Right 1	<u> </u>	0.82	28.8	<u> </u>	0.78	26.5	<u> </u>	0.75	25.8	<u> </u>	0.73	24.4	<u> </u>	0.71	23.5
	Mystic Ave NB	Inrough	A	0.58	1.2	A	0.57	1.1	A	0.70	/.6	A	0.56	1.1	A	0.55	1.1
	Overall		В	0.63	10.1	A	0.68	9.6	A	U. 73	9.5	В	U. 78	11.0	В	0.83	14.7

 Table 4
 Level-of-Service Analysis for Interim Years at Selected Intersections: PM Peak Hour

*Source: Rizzo Associates, Assembly Square Transportation Plan: Final Report, May 13, 2003.

Summary

The analysis conducted for this memorandum indicates that without major roadway improvements and alternative access points to Assembly Square, development of Assembly Square could possibly be constrained by the capacities of the existing roadway system. For development to occur as envisioned by the Assembly Square Planning Study¹ and the Assembly Square Transportation Plan, improvements to the I-93 interchange like ones described in the reports would be needed. It is likely that with minor geometric and signal-equipment improvements to the intersections, an increased amount of development can occur, but not the full build development that is proposed.

It should be noted that the CTPS analysis documented in this memorandum was based on work by others, and its results should only be used as an approximation of the traffic operations in the area under interim-year no-build conditions with the proposed development.

MSA/msa

¹ The Cecil Group, et al., for the City of Somerville Office of Housing and Community Development, *Assembly Square Planning Study: The Vision and Implementation Plan for the Future*, October 2000.