



Meeting Notes

Date and Time: Wednesday, January 18, 2023
6:00-8:00 PM

Notes Taken By: Project Team

Place: Virtual Meeting via Zoom

Project No.: 15403.00

Re: Route 128/I-95 Land Use and Transportation Study
Public Informational Meeting #3

Meeting Summary

On January 18, 2023, MassDOT held the third and final virtual Public Informational Meeting for the Route 128/I-95 Land Use and Transportation Study. At this meeting, the study team provided updates on the project and discussed the Alternatives Analysis and Recommendations tasks, in which we reviewed and evaluated land use and transportation infrastructure and policy enhancements to improve mobility in and through the study area. The meeting included an overview presentation followed by four different breakout rooms. Participants were assigned to different breakout rooms based on their responses to a question that was asked when participants registered for the meeting. Meeting participants were able to move between breakout rooms. Public attendees were given the opportunity to share comments and ask the team questions within the breakout rooms and at the end of the meeting. In addition, participants were provided a QR code linking to the project website to review material and provide comments after the meeting.

Meeting Notes

Introduction by Liz Williams, MassDOT Project Manager

Liz welcomed everyone to the public meeting.

Zoom Overview by Hung Pham, MassDOT

Hung provided an overview of Zoom, how to use closed captioning, and how to raise hands and ask questions. Participants were asked to state their names prior to saying question/comment and asked to share only one question/comment at a time. Participants were also notified that the meeting was being recorded.

Agenda, Project Overview and Public Meeting #2 Recap by Liz Williams, MassDOT Project Manager

Liz provided an overview of the agenda for the meeting, which is included below:

- > Public Meeting #2 Recap
- > Alternatives Development & Analysis
- > Draft Recommendations
- > Breakout Rooms
- > Next Steps
- > Public Comment

Place: Virtual Meeting via Zoom
Date: 6:00-8:00 PM
Ref: 15403.00
Page 2

Liz presented the project overview, which will establish the future land use, housing, and economic development assumptions along the corridor. The project will also develop and analyze alternatives, present recommendations, and develop an implementation plan.

Liz provided an overview of the study process and outreach phases. The study process is as follows:

- › Task 1: Study Area Goals and Objectives, Evaluation Criteria, Public Participation Plan
- › Task 2: Existing Conditions & Documenting Relevant Efforts
- › Task 3: Future Year No-Build Conditions & Issues Identification
- › Task 4: Alternatives Development
- › Task 5: Alternative Analysis
- › Task 6: Recommendations & Implementation Plan
- › Task 7: Draft and Final Report

The project is currently in between Task 5 and Task 6.

Liz also presented an overview of the MassDOT Project Development Process, which is as follows:

- › Step 1: Planning Studies
- › Step 2: Environmental Study
- › Step 3: Funding Process
- › Step 4: Final Design
- › Step 5: Implementation

Liz provided an overview of the second public meeting. At the second public meeting, over 45 attendees provided live responses to three poll questions using Mentimeter.

Alternatives Development and Analysis by Niki Hastings, VHB Project Consultant

Niki introduced the alternatives process, which is as follows:

- › Long List of Ideas
- › Develop Alternatives
- › First-Level Screening
- › Subset of Targeted Alternatives
- › Detailed Analysis
- › Short-, mid-, long-term Recommendations

Niki discussed the start of the alternatives development process which includes developing a preliminary list of ideas based on existing and future conditions, input from the Working Group, discussions with MassDOT and MBTA, and input from public. Over 100 ideas were generated and used to develop about 80 alternatives broken down into land use/economic development, transportation, and environmental options. A first-level screening of the alternatives resulted in the following:

Place: Virtual Meeting via Zoom
Date: 6:00-8:00 PM
Ref: 15403.00
Page 3

- › 54 Alternatives Advance for Further Study
- › 19 Alternatives Discarded
- › 11 Alternatives Identified for Immediate Action

Niki presented the 11 Draft Immediate (0-1 Year) Recommendations, which include alternatives targeting vehicular, transit, active transportation, and safety improvements.

Niki discussed the evaluation criteria for the 54 alternatives that were advanced for further study. Each of the 54 alternatives were evaluated based on criteria tied to the five study goals. A QR code linking to the project website (<https://www.mass.gov/route-128i-95-study>) was presented on-screen where participants can find additional details on the evaluation criteria.

Niki presented the alternatives scoring, which includes the weighting that was applied to the five study goals based on feedback provided by the Working Group and members of the public. The study goal weighting was used to calculate a weighted index for each alternative that was then factored to a score that could have a maximum value of 100 points.

Niki introduced the five fundamental alternative themes that the study team used to further organized the alternatives, with each alternative allocated to one of the following five fundamental themes:

- › Improve Regional Mobility
- › Expand Transportation Choice
- › Align Policies with Mobility Goals
- › Plan for the Future
- › Address Congestion and Improve Safety

Niki provided an overview of each fundamental theme and listed the alternatives that are allocated to each theme.

Niki discussed how the upcoming breakout rooms were assigned based on the fundamental themes and how each breakout room will discuss in detail the alternatives included one or two of the themes.

Draft Recommendations by Niki Hastings, VHB Project Consultant

Niki presented the overview of the draft recommendations, which are based on stakeholder and public input. The draft recommendations include whether each alternative should be advanced (all or in part), monitored, or discarded. The final recommendations will reflect input from stakeholders and the public. An Implementation Plan will be developed that will categorize each alternative that is recommended to be advanced based on short-term (0-5 years), mid-term (5-10 years), and long-term (10+ years) time frames.

Breakout Rooms by Niki Hastings, VHB Project Consultant

Niki provided an overview of the four different breakout rooms and informed participants on the operations of the breakout rooms. The objectives of the breakout rooms were to present details of study alternatives and collect feedback to inform recommendations. The four rooms were based on the five alternative themes (with "Align Policies with Mobility Goals" and "Plan for the Future" combined into one breakout room) and the study team presented alternatives in each theme and took notes on the discussion. Participants were informed that they were assigned to a breakout room based on a registration poll question and that each breakout room was to last for 30-40 minutes. Participants were informed that they could switch to another breakout room at any time by clicking "Leave Breakout Room".

Place: Virtual Meeting via Zoom
Date: 6:00-8:00 PM
Ref: 15403.00
Page 4

Meeting noted from each individual breakout room are provided later in this document.

After 40 minutes, the participants were reconvened in the main meeting room. At that time, Niki led the project team in providing a report back for each breakout room:

- › Niki Hastings: Breakout Room 1 (Improve Regional Mobility): We heard some comments about really connecting the corridor to the region and considering east/west movement, north/south movement, how land uses and zoning can support transportation, and vice versa. We discussed how transportation options, especially transit and bicycle, need to be further expanded to support mobility throughout the corridor and how we need to think of all micromobility options and not just bicycles. We also talked about connections between Lexington and Alewife in the northern portion of the study area.
- › Michael Ahillen and Matthew Duranleau: Breakout Room 2 (Expand Transportation Choice): We heard a really strong interest in seeing additional transit service in the area as a potential option for a lot of residents of the area, as well as commuters to the area. We were fortunately joined by Susan Barrett from the Town of Lexington, as well as Jeff Bennett, from the 128 Business Council who chimed in on the potential need for different services, as well as the potential to monitor and continue looking at different services in the area. Generally speaking, there was some pretty strong support for a stronger connection between Lexington and Waltham as well as for seeing a fully accessible Auburndale Station. From the bicycle and pedestrian side of things, we heard a lot about the importance of last mile connections and filling in the gap in different bicycle and pedestrian networks and making sure we don't build a facility in a vacuum that doesn't connect to other options. We also heard about making sure bicycle facilities that are designed are safe and are separated from vehicular traffic.
- › Donny Goris-Kolb: Breakout Room 3 (Align Policies with Mobility Goals and Plan for the Future): We had a couple comments, including one regarding the infrastructure bill and does hasten beacons for bicyclists and pedestrians enabling detection by connected cars and improve safety. There was also a comment on workforce housing and affordable housing, thinking about accessory dwelling units (ADUs) and supporting additional housing. Some municipalities like Lexington already allow ADUs, but it can be difficult to get through zoning. We also discussed the equity burden between different communities, including how 40B (affordable) housing gets distributed across the study area.
- › Kathleen Keen: Breakout Room 4 (Address Congestion and Improve Safety): We had a lot of people in our room from the Waltham and Newton areas. Some of the highlights were addressing congestion and safety, which are critical areas that people were particularly aware of. We also noted that any improvement needs to be coupled with appropriate wayfinding signage and traffic control to make sure that users of the roadways know how to get appropriately from Point A to Point B which will help to reduce confusion and congestion. We also had some comments about making sure that improvements and alternatives proposed as part of this study consider and tie into other plans for projects along the corridor, which the study does consider.

Next Steps by Liz Williams, MassDOT Project Manager

Liz discussed the next steps for the Project, which includes finalizing the recommendations in Winter 2023, hosting the last working group meeting in Spring 2023, and finalizing the report in Spring 2023. Liz informed that notices will be sent out when the public comment period opens for everyone to review the draft report and that the project website is available 24/7 where members of the public can provide comments and review previous materials.

Place: Virtual Meeting via Zoom
Date: 6:00-8:00 PM
Ref: 15403.00
Page 5

Public Comments

Hung opened the meeting for public comments. Hung provided an overview of how to share questions and comments on the zoom platform and tells attendees that they can share questions either in the chat or virtually raise their hands to verbally ask a question.

The following comments and answers were made in the main meeting after the presentation. Comments provided in each individual breakout room are provided in the following section.

Elected Officials

- › Representative Kay Khan: An old rail trail exists between Wellesley Lower Falls to Concord Street in Newton Lower Falls, but could continue to Riverside Station, which would then provide easy off road access for many coming on bikes from Natick and Wellesley who are interested in getting to Riverside. Can this be considered?
 - Matthew Duranleau: Thank you for that comment. That's actually one of the alternatives that we looked at in our breakout group, looking at constructing the Lower Falls Shared Use Path. We know there's been some studies and work on this in the past, including a DCR planning study that was completed in 2020. Our recommendation is to take the results of that planning study and progress that forward to build the connection between Wellesley and the Charles River through Lower Falls, crossing Route 128, and then connecting into Riverside to the MBTA stop.

Members of the Public

- › Anonymous: What role do the affected cities/communities have in this process, as opposed to MA state departments?
 - Liz Williams: We have representation from each municipality on the Working Group and we've been very grateful to have the support and input of all the municipalities. We also have several elected officials from the state legislature serving on the Working Group.
- › Josh Ostroff: For people that may not be familiar with the sequence of how things go from an idea in a study to a project, some explanation may be helpful in how this study fits into a project cycle and who is involved. Some of these alternatives are right for immediate action but others are more long term.
 - Liz Williams and Niki Hastings: The recommendations and implementation plan in the report will identify project champions and partner agencies and will identify the next steps needed for each alternative to advance. These logistical questions will have the groundwork laid in the implementation plan.
- › Susan Barrett: Many of us that run transportation services in the area have been trying to work on regionalizing and better coordinating those services, and that's something that's come up awhile. Recently there's been a push through the Boston MPO Regional Transportation Advisory Council and others to regionalize the transit services and make them more coordinated and easier for people to transfer from one to the other. As we think about whatever services might come here, whether it's through the MBTA, a TMA, or a municipality, we should keep in mind not just adding another service, but really thinking about how it is ultimately part of a truly connected network that the public can understand.

Place: Virtual Meeting via Zoom
Date: 6:00-8:00 PM
Ref: 15403.00
Page 6

- Michael Ahillen: We've talked a lot on our team about the potential for transfers from one service to another, and it's pretty clear that there's a variety of policy and fare barriers that make it a little bit of a challenge. But that certainly is not an excuse, and it's something that other regions have been working on, like the Seattle region. I know they've done an enormous amount on fare integration to really coordinate their systems. You and I both know the complexities of all of this, but it's something that I think is really aspirational, and something that could make getting around the region as a whole a lot easier and more convenient for members of the public.
- › Anonymous: The diagrams are too small for a laptop.
- Liz Williams: All material is available on the project website. I will send an email out that will include a link to the location where the documents are all stored. If you're not signed up for those updates, please sign up and when that email goes out you will be able to access the link.
- › Josh Ostroff: I will be organizing a consolidated comment letter from the entire City of Newton planning staff and public works staff. This might be something for the other municipalities to consider so that all the different disciplines within city government are considered. Will the comment period be in March/April?
 - Liz Williams: The comment period will be in April/May. We appreciate any opportunity people have to provide comments. The more feedback we receive the better.
- › James Krikeles: What can be done to engage with local municipalities to make sure that development happens in line with these alternatives? The development project on Main Street in Waltham is going to have impacts and we need to make sure the area is safe for pedestrians.
 - Liz Williams: With respect to this study, we have posted who from each municipality and what elected officials are included in the working group. I would recommend following up and reaching out to members in your local municipality.

Place: Virtual Meeting via Zoom
Date: 6:00-8:00 PM
Ref: 15403.00
Page 7

The following notes summarize the presentation and public comments made in each of the four breakout rooms.

Breakout Room #1: Improve Regional Mobility

by Niki Hastings, VHB Project Consultant

Niki presented the goal to find more reliable and robust multimodal access. Seven alternatives were presented:

Alternative T-5: Create Fitchburg Line Multimodal Hub

- › Representative Kay Khan (State Representative): Would prefer to be in a breakout room based on geography rather than theme. I am specifically interested in Newton.
 - Niki explained how to leave the breakout room and attend another if interested.
- › Mark Andersen (Lexington Transportation Advisory Committee): A lot of people work along the Red Line. I am curious to see how many people can take advantage of alternative T-5. Also curious about the cost – I suggest looking at cost per rider perhaps. I am interested in learning more about the cost estimates. With remote work becoming more prevalent, do we have updated numbers? How does the study deal with transformation of work?
 - Niki talked about the preliminary ridership estimates for this alternative which take into account developments in West Waltham. She noted that the cost per rider detail was not done in this study and that further analysis would be needed by the MBTA and others as the alternative progresses.
 - Niki noted that the study considered impact of Covid on travel demands. While there is fluctuation in trips and ridership, there is still congestion in both ways along the corridor and is projected to continue to grow.
- › Paul Katz (Waltham city councilor): Wondering if this multimodal hub is referring to Weston or Waltham. Want clarification on what a multimodal hub is and if it includes large parking section, bus depo, and commuter rail. I also have a question about North-South bike connection which was from another breakout room (Active transportation alternatives)
 - Niki provided an explanation of potential services and components of a multimodal hub which include parking, bus/shuttle connections, and active transportation facilities.

Alternative LU-12: Identify Opportunities at Route 128/I-95 at I-90 Interchange:

- › Mark Andersen (Lexington Transportation Advisory Committee): I am wondering if this was a Liberty Mutual Insurance parcel. I suggest that it would not be productive to make a truck facility as driving will be automated in the near future, and it would not make sense to build a rest stop. Curious if the parcel is large enough to use for certain things. I am supportive of park and rides and suggest that there should be many all along Route 128/I-95. Something worth considering in the bus space is transit down to New York. With the Amtrak running on the south side, it may make sense to make another stop over here, along with a park and ride for that on the trip to New York.
 - Niki clarified which parcels were the former Liberty Mutual site.
- › Harriet Cohen (Lexington): A lot of these points do not speak to regional mobility – asking for clarification.
 - Niki replied that is a fair point and the park and ride option is most applicable to this theme.
- › Representative Kay Khan (State Representative): I am very familiar with this space and think this may be complicated in

terms of getting in and out of the lot. Narrow lanes that cross over Mass Pike / Route 30 may not be efficiently utilized because it's not easy to get in and out of there. It would take a lot of effort to figure out what to do there. I have noticed truck use there now – they are often stationed in the lot so people cannot get in there at the moment. Wondering if there could be an entrance to I-90 West here, but it is not easily accessible. It does not seem like an easily usable space. Worried about how the Bridge Rehabilitation project (I-90/I-95) could impact this space.

- Niki noted that if this idea progresses, access and egress would be taken into account.

Alternative T-11: Expand Transit Service Span and Increasing Frequency:

- › Representative Kay Khan (State Representative): Newton is not in a good situation in terms of accessibility at three commuter rail stations. I have found that trains do not stop as often as they should.
 - Niki discussed the Newton Stations Accessibility project, on-going by the MBTA.
- › Mark Andersen (Lexington Transportation Advisory Committee): I found that the last bus from Alewife to Lexington leaves at 9:10pm, and there are no other ways (public transportation) to get into Lexington at that hour. I support the expansion of commuting hours.

I have heard about the MBTA proposal for land use – and cannot support anything relating to this until the transportation exists. We need to zone land based on transportation accessibility, to travel freely seven days a week from 5:30am – 12:30am. Creating housing and then making people dependent on private cars is the opposite of what I want to do. Need higher frequency of operation and longer hours of operation to continue with housing projects.

Lexington does not have public transit - people also have jobs in Lexington and cannot take public transport into the town to work there. It is important to provide for a range of economic opportunities and therefore important to provide in the reverse direction as well.

- Niki thanked Mark for his comments.
- › Harriet Cohen (Lexington): I have not taken the bus since pre-COVID, but I am curious about whether there is an express bus into or out of Alewife. It would be ideal to optimize the service and extend the hours. It would be helpful to provide an express option that does not stop at every stop. Wondering if there has been any discussion of additional parking in Lexington - park and rides specifically to connect to the bus service. I agree with Mark that there should be transit in both directions.
 - Niki noted that there are MBTA bus 128 Business Council shuttles connecting to Alewife, but not with express service.

Alternative AT-10: Expand Public Bike Share Program

- › Mark Andersen (Lexington Transportation Advisory Committee): I do not want to limit anyone to bikes, scooters may be a better option to save space and provide similar micromobility.
 - Niki thanked Mark for his comment on micromobility.
- › Representative Kay Khan (State Representative): Curious about how well used the bike program is. I do not see many people on bikes, and I am worried about it being unsafe. Bike lanes are scarce, and not seen as a safe mode of transportation. I am interested in bike use statistics. Also, there are no bike helmets available along with the bikes and people would need to provide their own helmet as well.

Place: Virtual Meeting via Zoom
Date: 6:00-8:00 PM
Ref: 15403.00
Page 9

- Niki noted that Bluebikes posts statistics on their website. Important to expand bike network to support safe travel for people of all ages and abilities in combination with this alternative.

Additional alternatives in this theme were unable to be discussed due to time constraints and include:

- › V-31: Build upon Outcomes of Shared Travel Network Study
- › T-9: Implement Managed Lane: Bus on Shoulder
- › V-26: Convert a General-Purpose Lane on Route 128/I-95 to Managed Lane

Breakout Room #2: Expand Transportation Choices

by Michael Ahillen, FHI Studio Project Consultant, and Matthew Duranleau, VHB Project Consultant

- › Non-auto investments
- › Active and transit transportation modes
- › Multi-modal connections
- › Prioritize: bicycle, pedestrian, transit

Alternative AT-5: Lower Falls Shared Use Path

Connect Wellesley to Lower Falls area and Charles River area. Utilize former railroad bridges over Route 128/I-95

- › Comment: Expand path to include underpass under Worcester Line
- › Comment: Connect path further north to Auburndale community (much support!)
- › Comment: The lower section in Newton is already constructed

Alternative T-1: Provide Additional Transit Service in Northern Portion of Study Area

Provide shuttle bus service between Depot Square (Lexington) and Downtown Waltham

- › Comment: Improve multi-jurisdictional transit connectivity
- › Comment: Strong support from the Town of Lexington and members of the northwest Waltham community
- › Comment: Provide access to job centers in Waltham
- › Comment: Provide mode shift and amenities along corridor
- › Comment: Shuttle Providers? Will it be MBTA, TMAs, Municipalities, etc.?
 - Provider(s) to be determined in part by demand and shuttle vehicle type term
- › Comment: Provide shuttle-bus service to serve underserved northwest Waltham; traffic in the area has grown with new developments, and the area is seen as neglected by MBTA bus service

Alternative T-6: Consider Transit Connection between West Waltham and Worcester Line/Green Line

Provide transit service(s) to connect West Waltham and Worcester Line/Green Line

- › Comment: Need fully accessible connection at Auburndale Station, West Newton, and Newtonville
- › Comment: Expand existing shuttle service (128 Business Council) to ALL passengers - Existing shuttle service NOT open

Place: Virtual Meeting via Zoom
Date: 6:00-8:00 PM
Ref: 15403.00
Page 10

to public. A representative from 128 Business Council clarified that shuttles are open to members of the public, but the shuttles only provide service to customers in the outbound direction in the morning and the inbound direction in the evening. Another suggestion for two-way (inbound & outbound) shuttle service

- › Comment: Provide safe pedestrian and bicycle access – Newton Service Plaza to Riverside MBTA Station. Existing unsafe pedestrian accommodations, workers walk on Grove Street ramps to access McDonalds from Riverside station.
- › Comment: Include bicycle racks on buses and shuttles
- › Comment: Green Line does not allow bikes during rush hour

Alternatives AT-1 & AT-3: North-South Active Transportation Alternatives

Improve north-south active transportation (pedestrian, bicycle, transit) accommodations in Lexington and Waltham along east side of Route 128/I-95

- › Comment: Construct protective and safe continuous north-south bicycle network through Lexington and Waltham; desire to see bike infrastructure that is safe for all users, including small children
- › Comment: Continuous north-south bicycle network should be funded by MassDOT (not municipalities)
- › Comment: Potential paths for cyclists that could be developed along 2nd and 3rd Avenues or Brandeis/Cedarwood areas

Alternatives AT-2 & AT-4: East-West Active Transportation Alternatives

Build a continuous east-west network of local bicycle accommodations

- › Comment: Parallel Highland Avenue (south of the study area)
- › Comment: Green Line could have a bike path on it

Breakout Room #3: Plan for the Future and Align Policy with Mobility Goals

by Donny Goris-Kolb, VHB Project Consultant

Alternative V-29: Consider TSMO Strategies

Donny presented Transportation Systems Management and Operations (TSMO) slide and recommendations, solicited feedback/comments from attendees

- › No comments from attendees

Alternative V-28 Consider Connected/Autonomous Vehicle Technologies

Donny presented slide, concept, recommendation and opened floor to attendee response

- › J Tang: I mention the infrastructure bill; beaconizing bicyclists (all cyclists would have device which communicates with autonomous vehicles) "on the wrong track". I hope that precautions are taken and that this is not the assumption on autonomous/connected vehicles in the future
 - Donny Goris Kolb: Beaconizing cyclists/pedestrians are outside of the scope of this recommendation.

Place: Virtual Meeting via Zoom
Date: 6:00-8:00 PM
Ref: 15403.00
Page 11

Alternative LU-4: Implement Solar Energy Program Expansion

Donny presented slide and recommendations, solicited feedback/comments from attendees

- › No comment from attendees

Alternatives GT-8 and GT-9: EV Infrastructure Alternatives

Donny presented slide and recommendations, solicited feedback/comments from attendees

- › No comment from attendees

Alternatives E-1 through E-4: Environmental Alternatives

Donny presented slide and recommendations, solicited feedback/comments from attendees

- › No comment from attendees

Donny solicited input from local/state government officials/rep

- › No comment from attendees

Donny invited Carlos Vidal (Waltham City Councilor) to comment

- › Carlos Vidal had no comment

Alternative LU-10: Encourage TOD

Donny presented slide, recommendations for TOD sites, solicited feedback/comments from attendees

- › No comment from attendees

Alternative LU-9: Encourage Mixed Use Development

Donny presented slide and recommendations, solicited feedback/comments from attendees

- › No comment from attendees

Alternative LU-8: Encourage Workforce and Affordable Housing

Donny presented slide and recommendations, solicited feedback/comments from attendees

Liz asked if any attendees could comment on these recommendations, different land use opportunities

- › J Tang: Lexington has ADU by right, the number of ADUs being built is relatively small. The permitting process is challenging, it is much easier for developers to chop down trees and build big houses. I wonder if there is a policy incentive to encourage developers to build more ADUs and TOD instead of McMansions
 - Donny Goris-Kolb: There are zoning/permitting challenges around ADUs in other cities. We can incorporate this concern into our recommendations.

Alternative LU-3: Remove or Revise Parking Minimums

Donny presented slide and recommendations, solicited feedback from attendees

- › J Tang: From what I know, developers are happy to reduce parking minimums. People who live nearby tend to be

Place: Virtual Meeting via Zoom
Date: 6:00-8:00 PM
Ref: 15403.00
Page 12

skeptical. You are probably aware of the Parking Reform Network, they have good resources for talking to people about this issue.

Alternative LU-6: Improve Public Gathering Spaces

Donny presented slide and recommendations, solicited feedback/comments from attendees

- › No comments from attendees

Additional Alternatives

Donny presented LU 7 (Improve Cambridge Reservoir Access), LU 5 (Improve Open Space Network), GT-7 (Develop Regional TDM Plan), LU-1 (Conduct Market Analysis), and LU-2 (Implement Resident and Small Business Protections) recommendations, solicited feedback/comments from attendees.

- › No comments from attendees

Donny opened floor to responses on any of the recommendations

- › Frank Craig: My only concern is that there's equity in the burdens that are shared between these communities; "they may seem ubiquitous around the corridor." Lexington, Newton, and Waltham would move their industries to the I-95 corridor. These communities are different. Waltham already shares high burden of housing, would like to see other communities do zoning reform. I mention the recent SJC case Lexington v Waltham and how Waltham bears burden of development while Lexington benefits from solar power. "Waltham has carried a lot of that burden for a long time"
 - Donny Goris-Kolb: Can you clarify between "burden" and "equity"
- › Frank Craig: Chapter 40B developments come in and overruling local zoning, this is not something I see in other communities but is very common in Waltham. This is what I mean by "inequitable distribution of burdens". If state is to encourage zoning reform, it needs to take into consideration different "starting points" of municipalities with different residential makeups, commercial space ratios, etc.

Breakout room #4: Address Congestion & Improve Safety

by Kathleen Keen, VHB Project Consultant

The alternatives which will be presented are focused in Lexington, Waltham, and Newton since the majority of people in the breakout room indicated an interest in these municipalities.

Kathleen noted before getting into each alternative that some interchange projects in Newton/Waltham are already in progress, so for the sake of not duplicating work, additional alternatives at these locations were not considered. However, the study did consider how planned improvements tie into proposed alternatives. For safety and congestion, there is a long list of over 10 alternatives in total, but we will focus on a subset of these located within Waltham, Lexington, and Newton. The full list of alternatives and slides in this category and others will be posted so the public can review after the meeting.

Alternative V-3: Route 128/I-95 SB Exit 45: Construct New C-D Road

This alternative focuses on the intersection of Route 128/I-95 at Route 2. The goal here is to alleviate congestion at interchange, specifically along Route 128 southbound. This involves the construction of a new C-D road (collector-

distributor road) which essentially creates an additional lane connecting the on and off ramps between Route 128 southbound and Route 2 within the interchange. This alternative has the benefits of separating traffic travelling to Route 2 from Route 128/I-95 traffic traveling through the interchange, allowing less friction between traffic lanes, improved safety, and better operations. This alternative has been advanced for further study and design.

- › Joan Brecher: What is a C-D road?
 - Kathleen Keen: Are you familiar with the exit near Costco, the Route 128/Winter Street exit? This will be a similar condition. A C-D road is basically a dedicated lane next to the highway tying together exit/entrance ramps. In this alternative, it would be a dedicated lane for traffic to/from Route 2, allowing traffic destined to/from the ramps to be separated from through traffic.

Alternative V-5: Trapelo Road at Route 128/I-95 Ramps: Improve Intersections

This alternative focuses on the northbound side of the Route 128/Trapelo Road junction and includes improvements to traffic operations and better transitions for people walking and biking with the addition of a roundabout. This allows all vehicle and pedestrian/bicycle movements to occur through one point with better crossing opportunities. This alternative consolidates the number of ramps to/from Route 128 northbound, but still allows full access between Route 128 northbound and Trapelo Road.

- › No comments or questions on this alternative

Alternative V-10: Route 128/I-95 Southbound Exit 43: Construct Two-Lane Off-Ramp

This alternative will provide more capacity for those getting off Route 128 southbound to Winter Street by widening the ramp to add an additional lane leaving Route 128 southbound and entering Winter Street. This will help alleviate queuing in area which often extends onto the mainline. This alternative presents no significant environmental impacts as there is only minor widening required.

- › Judi Burton: On lower right hand side, where hotels are, there are no sidewalks from that intersection down to the light. Walking and biking through this area is also very dangerous. Will you be considering sidewalks and making bike safety more of an issue?
 - Kathleen Keen: Traffic signals will be modified to include pedestrian cross walks and phasing, and while we don't typically put sidewalks next to on/off ramps, in this alternative, pedestrian accommodations will be part of the improvements around this intersection with Winter Street. We acknowledge that there are a lot of people walking here so all modes were considered when coming up with alternatives for this particular location. We had many different ideas and pieces of feedback for this particular site, many had to be discarded due to environmental and operational challenges.
- › Barbara Jacobs: Coming on Winter Street merging with traffic from Route 128 is horrible. If you are coming from Winter Street and take a right, towards Costco near the reservoir, it is difficult and dangerous to deal with traffic from all directions and having to figure out where to turn into local businesses. Putting in two lanes will only add the problems that already exist with that merge. People already have trouble getting into left lane to Home Depot and Costco.
 - Kathleen Keen: There would be improvements to the signal creating opportunity for vehicles coming in each direction to have their own time to travel through the intersection.
- › Karen Walz: When you come up Bear Hill Road to Bertucci's, getting onto Winter Street there is always traffic coming

from the Route 128 exit on the right. If it's not busy, you can safely change over into right lane accessing the "mini mall". But if there's traffic, I don't see how you could safely merge with people coming off the ramp.

- Kathleen Keen: As part of this alternative, at the Winter Street intersection signal improvements will allow each of those three directions to go at their own time coupled with the appropriate traffic control to make sure there are no additional conflicts that happen with all the different directions of traffic coming together.

Alternatives V-17, V-18, and V-19: Route 128/I-95 Southbound Exit 37/38 Alternatives

These exits are right by the Newton service plaza and the McDonalds that Liz was talking about in her introduction. We are aware that there tends to be a lot of congestion in this area which leads to safety concerns, delays, and operational issues. These alternatives considered a variety of options, including consolidating some of these ramps, such as the service plaza and Grove Street ramps, which are currently very close to one another. These alternatives assume the service plaza is maintained, but some contemplate shifting access to be further away from the other ramps to improve safety. Our recommendation is for further study due to the complexity of the issue in this specific location. A subsequent study focused in this area can build upon the alternatives considered and seek to find the best solution for all the issues in this area. It should be noted that there is a proposed future project to redevelop the Riverside MBTA station nearby, which includes substantial street improvements on Grove Street.

- › Judi Burten: I use that exit all the time. When the Route 16 interchange was constructed, there were so many problems it would take a long time to get into all of it. It really is confusing if you're going south and want to get into any of the businesses around this area. Adding the whole Grove Street development will cause such an increase in traffic that I am frightened of what will happen. This area is also dangerous for bicycles, it feels like you are taking your life into your own hands. I think about this all the time, and I'm very concerned about what more cars in this area coming from all different directions will do in terms of safety. I hope all of this will be considered in the solutions here.
 - Kathleen Keen: This will be considered given the proximity to the MBTA station. We want to provide as many connections as possible without making the area feel dangerous to get around.
- › Judi Burten: "Q" is a lovely road, I ride my bike on it now, but cars already don't follow the speed limit and it may be more dangerous should the number of cars increase any further.
 - Kathleen Keen: The alternative options consider accommodation for all modes of travel, not just cars. Bikes, pedestrians, transit, and vehicles will all be considered in further study.
- › Adrian Ayala (Traffic Engineer with City of Newton): Do we have any updates or idea about the timeline for the work being considered at Riverside Station?
 - Kathleen Keen: That would best be answered by the Riverside project development team. All the information I have is what has been made publicly available thus far.
- › Joanne Brecher: I am hesitant every time I hear about roundabouts, people just don't know how to use them. People will also have a hard time getting to the service plaza if they have to first go through the intersection before taking another road to get to the service plaza entrance. I'm worried about all the traffic being funneled into this area. I hope you are having serious meetings with all the elected officials and communities in this area because as of right now I am overwhelmed with the amount of information. Some of these are really major changes, the maps are too small, and all of it is hard to understand.
 - Kathleen Keen: We fully understand your concerns about this area and our recommendation is that there should be

significant further study. We have been engaging with representatives from all the communities in the study area, along with key stakeholders and shared these alternatives. We'll also be posting all this information presented tonight on the study website for further review.

- › Karen Walz: Exit 41 for Route 20 heading southbound on I-95 is the most ridiculous exit I have ever seen, and I'm surprised no one has gotten killed yet. With all the merges and cross overs, it feels like you have to play chicken with traffic to get in. First of all, the cross-over really should have been a fly-over. Either way, this is really dangerous. Was this included in the plan?
 - Kathleen Keen: This interchange is within the study area, however there are improvement plans to address the existing safety and operational issues which are already in the design phase and are anticipated to be constructed in the next few years.
- › Douglas Hall: I want to thank you all for doing this, I think it all looks really terrific. The only thing I want to emphasize is that with all these changes there needs to be a lot of high-quality signage to make sure people can find their way around and know where to, and where not, to turn.
 - Kathleen Keen: That's a great point and something that will be included if these alternatives advance for further design. We want to make sure that there aren't any wayfinding issues improvements are implemented.

Alternative V-2: Route 128/I-95 Northbound Exits 44-46: Construct New C-D Road

This alternative improves travel between Trapelo Road and Route 2 via Route 128 northbound by providing a dedicated lane connecting Trapelo Road and Route 2. Vehicles traveling between these two points would be able to stay in the lane, and not have to merge into the mainline and shortly after diverging.

- › No comments or questions on this alternative

Alternative V-12: Route 128/I-95 Northbound Exit 43: Extend On-Ramp Acceleration Lane

The goal here is to extend the ramp length, allowing more time for vehicles to get up to speed before merging into mainline Route 128 northbound. While this alternative does involve some widening of the ramp, our review has not indicated there would be any significant environmental impacts.

- › James Krinkleles: I'm a bit apprehensive about C-D roads. If they were used like they are supposed to be then they're a good solution, however, people just use them as a way to bypass traffic that has bottled up.
 - Kathleen Keen: Unfortunately, that is sometimes the case. However the benefits typically outweigh the challenges.

Place: Virtual Meeting via Zoom
Date: 6:00-8:00 PM
Ref: 15403.00
Page 16

Meeting Attendees

MassDOT

- › Makaela Niles
- › Liz Williams
- › Hung Pham
- › MJ Riekert
- › Nicholas Zavalas
- › Aanchal Gupta
- › Nathaniel Kerr

Project Team

- › Niki Hastings
- › Kathleen Keen
- › Donny Goris-Kolb
- › Rob Nagi
- › Matt Duranleau
- › Michael Ahillen

Elected Officials

- › State Representative Kay Khan (11th Middlesex)
- › Mayor Jeannette McCarthy (Waltham)
- › City Councilor Kathy McMenimen (Waltham)
- › City Councilor Paul Katz (Waltham)
- › City Councilor Carlos Vidal (Waltham)

Working Group Members

- › State Representative Kay Khan (11th Middlesex)
- › Mayor Jeannette McCarthy (Waltham)
- › Josh Ostroff (City of Newton)

Place: Virtual Meeting via Zoom
Date: 6:00-8:00 PM
Ref: 15403.00
Page 17

Attendees

- > Robert Coleman
- > Frank Craig
- > James Krikeles
- > Ted Chapman
- > Tracy Ukura
- > Leo Knightley
- > Jeremy Davidson
- > Linda Pinkow
- > Stacey Hickey
- > Caren Dunn
- > Adrian Ayala
- > Kevin Doyle
- > Douglas Hall
- > Andrew Mullin
- > Bruce Green
- > George Kirby
- > Rich Kelleher
- > Tom Lawrence
- > Rita Cramer
- > Cheryl Salvucci
- > Jeff Bennett
- > Steven Parry
- > Martha Creedon
- > Barry Nelson
- > Gene Muzyka
- > Maureen Reilly Meagher
- > Barbara Jacobs
- > Patrick Butera
- > Victoria Zissman
- > Judi Burten
- > Robert Primak
- > Marwan Eieadah

Attendees (cont.)

- > Lisa Stiglich
- > Michael Lewis
- > Scott Neagle
- > Lucia Dolan
- > Andrew McBride
- > Kellye Stanley
- > Joshua Regan
- > Mark Anderson
- > William Fenstemacher
- > Sonja Wadman
- > Joshua Matt
- > Joanne Brecher Kay
- > Scott Bosworth
- > Betty Barrer
- > Harriet Cohen
- > Martina Jackson
- > Kathleen Boyce
- > Susan Barrett
- > Rena Getz
- > Danny Kaloupek
- > Concetta Boyce
- > Bruce Horwitz
- > Ben Fields
- > Karen Walz
- > Julia Brown
- > Arlene Hecht
- > Sharon Marr
- > Margaret Ward
- > Jacquelyn Goddard
- > Joe Zissman
- > J Tang
- > D Guttormsen