





Wellington Circle Study Report



Prepared for:



Prepared by:

McMahon, A Bowman Company

with HNTB, HMMH, Cambridge Systematics, IBI Group, Keville Enterprises, and TrafInfo Communications

DRAFT
May 2023

Table of Contents

<i>Executive Summary.....</i>	<i>i</i>
1. Introduction	1
1.1 Study Process and Background	1
1.2 Study Area	2
1.3 Study Goals and Objectives.....	3
1.4 Evaluation Criteria.....	4
1.5 Public Involvement Plan	5
1.6 Working Group	7
2. Existing and Future Conditions.....	9
2.1 Land Use and Economic Development.....	11
2.1.1 Land Use.....	11
2.1.2 Employment	14
2.1.3 Zoning.....	15
2.1.4 Planned Developments (Proposed and Under Construction)	16
2.2 Socioeconomic Conditions	18
2.2.1 Population	18
2.2.2 Households	22
2.2.3 Environmental Justice	24
2.2.4 Employment	26
2.3 Public Health Conditions	29
2.3.1 Community Health Needs Assessments (CHNA)	29
2.3.2 Baseline Public Health Information	31
2.3.3 Injuries and fatalities related to crashes.....	36
2.3.4 Built Environment and Public Health.....	36
2.4 Environmental Conditions	42
2.4.1 Wetlands and Waterbodies	44
2.4.2 Floodplains	45

2.4.3	Impaired Waterbodies	45
2.4.4	Tidelands	46
2.4.5	Protected Wildlife Habitat	46
2.4.6	Historic and Archeological Resources	47
2.4.7	Open Space and Recreational Areas	52
2.4.8	Hazardous Materials and Sites	52
2.4.9	Air Quality	54
2.4.10	Noise	58
2.5	Multimodal Transportation Network	62
2.5.1	Roadways	62
2.5.2	Signalized Intersections	65
2.5.3	Pedestrian Facilities and Conditions	67
2.5.4	Bicycle Facilities and Conditions	69
2.5.5	Multimodal Volumes	71
2.5.6	Safety Analysis	78
2.5.7	Operational Analysis	81
2.6	Transit	85
2.6.1	Bus Routes	86
2.6.2	Ridership	87
2.6.3	Wellington Station Access	87
2.6.4	Travel Time and Travel Time Variability	89
2.6.5	Excess Passenger Minutes	91
2.7	Origin-Destination Data Analysis	93
2.7.1	Predominant Movements	94
3.	<i>Alternatives Development</i>	<i>96</i>
3.0	Chapter Summary	96
3.1	Alternative Development Context	96
3.1.1	Issues and Opportunities	96
3.1.2	Working Group Feedback	97
3.2	Concept Development	98

3.2.1	Process and Methodology	98
3.2.2	Basic Concepts	100
3.2.3	Roundabout Concepts	104
3.2.4	Advanced Concepts	105
3.3	Alternatives Development	109
3.3.1	Short-/Medium-Term Alternatives	109
3.3.2	Long-Term Alternatives	112
3.4	Final Alternatives	121
4.	<i>Alternatives Analysis.....</i>	<i>122</i>
4.0	Chapter Summary	122
4.1	Alternatives Analysis Framework	122
4.1.1	Summary of Alternatives Considered	122
4.1.2	Evaluation Criteria Framework.....	122
4.2	Alternatives Analysis	123
4.2.1	Safety.....	123
4.2.2	Mode Considerations.....	126
4.2.3	Vehicle Operations.....	130
4.2.4	Pedestrian Experience.....	136
4.2.5	Bicycle Experience	142
4.2.6	Transit Operations and Access	144
4.2.7	Environment.....	151
4.2.8	Land Use & Economic Development	161
4.2.9	Public Health	167
4.2.10	Environmental Justice	170
4.2.11	Cost.....	171
4.3	Alternatives Analysis Summary	172
5.	<i>Findings and Recommendations.....</i>	<i>174</i>
5.0	Chapter Summary	174
5.1	Findings and Recommendations	174

5.1.1	Alternatives Analysis Findings.....	175
5.1.2	Recommendation Summary.....	176
5.2	MassDOT Project Development Process.....	179
5.2.1	MassDOT Design Process	180
5.2.2	Securing Funding and Constructing the Project	181
5.3	Potential Funding Sources	182
5.3.1	Encore Boston Harbor Casino	182
5.3.2	Regional Transportation Improvement Plan	182
5.3.3	State-Prioritized Federal Funding	185
5.3.4	Federal Discretionary Funds	185
5.4	Next Steps	186

List of Figures

Figure 1.1-1: Study Process	1
Figure 1.2-1: Traffic Study Area	2
Figure 1.2-2: Regional Study Area	3
Figure 2.1-1: Study Area Land Use	12
Figure 2.1-2: Ten Largest Employers in Study Area.....	14
Figure 2.1-3: Study Area Zoning.....	15
Figure 2.1-4: Developments (Proposed and Under Construction).....	17
Figure 2.2-1: 2020 Population Density in Study Area	19
Figure 2.2-2: Study Area Population Change 2020-2040	20
Figure 2.2-3: Age Distribution in Regional Study Area Cities	21
Figure 2.2-4: Racial Composition by City.....	21
Figure 2.2-5: Household Sizes by City	22
Figure 2.2-6: Study Area Household Change 2020-2040	23
Figure 2.2-7: Commuter Mode Shares in Regional Study Area Cities.....	24
Figure 2.2-8: Environmental Justice Populations	26
Figure 2.2-9: Employment Density in Study Area	27
Figure 2.2-10: Study Area Employment Change 2020-2040	28
Figure 2.3-1: Local Health Access	41
Figure 2.3-2: Local Food Access	42
Figure 2.4-1: Wellington Circle Wetlands and Floodplains.....	44
Figure 2.4-2: Wellington Circle Impaired Waterbodies and Tidelands	46
Figure 2.4-3: Wellington Circle Protected Wildlife Habitat	47
Figure 2.4-4: Wellington Circle Natural, Historic and Cultural Resources.....	49
Figure 2.4-5: Wellington Circle Hazardous Materials and Sites	54
Figure 2.4-6: Ozone Exceedance Trends (2010-2019) Based on the 0.070 PPM Standard	55
Figure 2.4-7: Sulfur Dioxide Trends (2010-2019)	56
Figure 2.4-8: Nitrogen Dioxide Trends (2010-2019)	56
Figure 2.4-9: Carbon Monoxide Trends (2010-2019).....	57
Figure 2.4-10: PM2.5 Trends (2010-2019)	57
Figure 2.4-11: Wellington Noise Layout	61

Figure 2.5-1: Intersection Geometry – Wellington Circle	65
Figure 2.5-2: Intersection Geometry – Expanded Area	66
Figure 2.5-3: Sidewalk obstructions	67
Figure 2.5-4: High frequency of driveways	67
Figure 2.5-5: Poor pavement conditions	67
Figure 2.5-6: Crossing of several lanes of traffic and high vehicle speeds.....	67
Figure 2.5-7: Wellington Pedestrian Crossing.....	68
Figure 2.5-8: Santilli Circle Pedestrian Improvements	69
Figure 2.5-9: Bike Facilities in Wellington Circle Study Area.....	70
Figure 2.5-10: Traffic Count Intersections	72
Figure 2.5-11: Wellington Circle Existing Vehicle Flow Diagram - AM	74
Figure 2.5-12: Wellington Circle Existing Vehicle Flow Diagram - PM	75
Figure 2.5-13: Pedestrian Volumes	77
Figure 2.5-14: Wellington Circle Crashes.....	78
Figure 2.5-15: Study Area Crashes.....	79
Figure 2.5-16: Wellington Circle Existing Vehicle Queues and LOS - AM	83
Figure 2.5-17: Wellington Circle Existing Vehicle Queues and LOS - PM	83
Figure 2.5-18: Wellington Circle Operational Comparison – Existing and Future No-Build (2040) ..	84
Figure 2.6-1: MBTA Bus Routes Serving the Study Area	86
Figure 2.6-2: Change in Modes of Access to Wellington Station.....	88
Figure 2.6-3: Inbound Travel Time and Travel Time Variability.....	90
Figure 2.6-4: Outbound Travel Time and Travel Time Variability.....	91
Figure 2.6-5: Excess Passenger Time (XPT)	92
Figure 2.6-6: Daily Bus Passenger-Minutes	92
Figure 2.7-1: AM Peak Origin-Destination Locations.....	93
Figure 2.7-2: AM Peak Origin-Destination Trip Proportions Through Wellington Circle.....	94
Figure 2.7-3: AM Peak Flows Through Wellington Circle.....	94
Figure 3.2-1: Alternatives Development Process.....	98
Figure 3.2-2: Five-leg Intersection	100
Figure 3.2-3: Middlesex Avenue at Fellsway Intersection	101
Figure 3.2-4: Removal of Right-Turn Channelization.....	102
Figure 3.2-5: Prohibition of Left Turn Movements.....	103

Figure 3.2-6: Roundabout Concept	104
Figure 3.2-7: Roundabout Capacity	105
Figure 3.3-1: Short-/Medium Term Alternative Option A.....	110
Figure 3.3-2: Short-/Medium Term Alternative Option B	111
Figure 3.3-3: Square Concept	113
Figure 3.3-4: Triangle Concept.....	114
Figure 3.3-5: Transit Enhanced Concept.....	116
Figure 3.3-6: Pedestrian Bridge	117
Figure 3.3-7: Above Grade-Separated Single Quadrant (plan view)	118
Figure 3.3-8: Above Grade-Separated Single Quadrant (isometric view)	118
Figure 3.3-9: Overpass Bridge Geometry	119
Figure 4.1-1: Evaluation Criteria Framework Graphic	123
Figure 4.2-1: Mode Considerations Chart	127
Figure 4.2-2: Cross-section – Future No-Build vs. Short-Term.....	128
Figure 4.2-3: Cross-section – Future No-Build vs. Square	129
Figure 4.2-4: Cross-section – Future No-Build vs. Triangle.....	129
Figure 4.2-5: Cross-section – Future No-Build vs. Grade-Separated.....	130
Figure 4.2-6: Cross-section (Quadrant Roadway) – Triangle vs. Transit Enhanced.....	130
Figure 4.2-7: Level of Service Analysis Results – Existing (2020) vs. Short-Term Option A (2020)	132
Figure 4.2-8: Level of Service Analysis Results – Existing (2020) vs. Future No-Build (2040)	132
Figure 4.2-9: Level of Service Analysis Results – Future No-Build (2040) vs. At-Grade Square (2040)	133
Figure 4.2-10: Level of Service Analysis Results – Future No-Build (2040) vs. At-Grade Transit Enhanced (2040)	133
Figure 4.2-11: Level of Service Analysis Results – Future No-Build (2040) vs. Grade-Separated (2040).....	134
Figure 4.2-12: Short-/Medium Term Pedestrian Connectivity	137
Figure 4.2-13: Long-Term At-Grade Square Pedestrian Connectivity.....	138
Figure 4.2-14: Long-Term At-Grade Triangle Pedestrian Connectivity.....	138
Figure 4.2-15: Long-Term Grade-Separated Pedestrian Connectivity.....	139
Figure 4.2-16: Representative Pedestrian Route	140
Figure 4.2-17: Average Number of Crossings for Fastest Route	140
Figure 4.2-18: Pedestrian Travel Times	141

Figure 4.2-19: Bicycle Connectivity Comparison Short-/Medium-Term vs. Long-Term alternatives	143
Figure 4.2-20: Bicycle Experience.....	144
Figure 4.2-21: MBTA Routes Through Wellington Circle	145
Figure 4.2-22: Relative Sizes of Traffic Movements Through Wellington Circle	148
Figure 4.2-23: Transit Times by Alternative	150
Figure 4.2-24: Estimated Transit Travel Time QOS Between Wellington Station and the Fellsway at Riverside Avenue	151
Figure 4.2-25: Environmental Consequences.....	152
Figure 4.2-26: Contours for Future No-Build.....	156
Figure 4.2-27: Contours for At-Grade Square Alternative	156
Figure 4.2-28: Contours for At-Grade Triangle Alternative	157
Figure 4.2-29: Contours for At-Grade Alternative Transit Enhanced Alternative	157
Figure 4.2-30: Contours for Grade-Separated Alternative	158
Figure 4.2-31: Discussion of Study Area Corridors in the Medford Comprehensive Plan.....	162
Figure 4.2-32: Developments Under Construction or Proposed in Study Area.....	163
Figure 4.2-33: Lots Identified for Enhanced Development by Community	164
Figure 4.2-34: Ratio of Employment in the Enhanced Development Scenario vs. 2018 by TAZ	165
Figure 4.2-35: Ratio of Population in the Enhanced Development Scenario vs. 2018 by TAZ	165
Figure 4.2-36: Effect of Overpass on Community Cohesion	166
Figure 4.3-1: Alternatives Analysis Summary Table.....	172
Figure 5.1-1: Alternatives Analysis Summary.....	175
Figure 5.1-2: Long-Term At-Grade Transit Enhanced Alternative	176
Figure 5.1-3: Existing MBTA Bus Routes	177
Figure 5.1-4: MBTA BNRD Bus Routes (existing roadways)	178
Figure 5.1-5: MBTA Bus Routes (proposed roadways)	178
Figure 5.2-1: MassDOT Project Development Process.....	179
Figure 5.2-2: MassDOT Design Process	181
Figure 5.3-1: TIP Project Funding Process	183
Figure 5.3-2: Major Infrastructure Project Scoring Criteria	184

List of Tables

Table 1.3-1: Wellington Circle Study Goals and Objectives.....	4
Table 1.4-1: Wellington Circle Study Evaluation Criteria	5
Table 1.5-2: Wellington Circle Study Meeting Schedule.....	6
Table 1.7-1: Working Group Representatives	8
Table 2.2-1: Local and Regional Study Area Population	18
Table 2.2-2: Household Changes 2020-2040	22
Table 2.2-3: Household Income Brackets	24
Table 2.2-4: Employment Change in Local and Regional Study Area, 2020-2040.....	28
Table 2.3-1: CHNA Findings Summary.....	30
Table 2.3-2: Annual Average Age Adjusted Rates of Hospital Admission for Asthma per 10,000 People (2012-2016)	31
Table 2.3-3: Annual Average Age Adjusted Rates of Hospital Admission for COPD per 10,000 People (2012-2016)	32
Table 2.3-4: Annual Average Age Adjusted Rates of Hospital Admission for Myocardial Infarction per 10,000 People Age 35+(2012-2016)	32
Table 2.3-5: Youth, High School, and Adult Nationwide and State Obesity Rates	33
Table 2.3-6: Overweight or Obese Children in Grades 1, 4, 7, 10 in Massachusetts School Districts (2010-2011)	33
Table 2.3-7: Massachusetts Adults with Obesity (2016)	33
Table 2.3-8: Pediatric Diabetes Type I Cases per 1,000 Students (School Year 2016-2017, Public charter and private schools combined)	34
Table 2.3-9: Pediatric Diabetes Type II Cases per 100,000 Students (School Year 2016-2017, Public, charter and private schools combined)	34
Table 2.3-10: Adult Diabetes (2016)	34
Table 2.3-11: Pediatric Asthma Prevalence per 100 Students (School Year 2016-2017, Public, charter and private schools combined)	35
Table 2.3-12: Child and Adult Nationwide and State Asthma Prevalence (2017)	35
Table 2.3-13: 5-year Average Crashes by Severity and Municipality (2015-2019).....	36
Table 2.3-14: 5-year Average Crashes by Type and Municipality (2015-2019)	36
Table 2.4-1: Key Environmental Resources and Compliance Considerations.....	43
Table 2.4-2: Historical Resources within the Immediate Study Area	48
Table 2.4-3: Release Sites with AUL Limitations	53
Table 2.4-4: Noise Abatement Criteria by Activity Category	58



Table 2.4-5: Results of the Short-Term Noise Monitoring on October 10, 2020	59
Table 2.4-6: Results of Noise Model Validation	60
Table 2.5-1: Fellsway	63
Table 2.5-2: Mystic Valley Parkway.....	63
Table 2.5-3: Revere Beach Parkway.....	64
Table 2.5-4: Middlesex Avenue	64
Table 2.5-5: Bike Facilities Existing and Proposed in Study Area.....	70
Table 2.5-6: Traffic Count Sources	71
Table 2.5-7: Summary of Entering Vehicle Volumes by Approach	76
Table 2.5-8: Wellington Circle Intersection Existing Conditions Synchro Analysis	82
Table 2.6-1: Fall 2019 Average Daily Weekday Boardings	87
Table 2.6-2: Gated Station Entries	89
Table 3.2-1: Multimodal Considerations	99
Table 3.2-2: Advanced Concepts Considered	106
Table 4.2-1: Conflict Point Comparison	125
Table 4.2-2: Summary of Volumes & Average Travel Speeds.....	135
Table 4.2-3: Travel Time QOS Ratings	146
Table 4.2-4: Estimated Transit Travel Times for Future No-Build in 2040 (seconds)	147
Table 4.2-5: Estimated Transit Travel Times for Long-Term At-Grade Square in 2040 (seconds) ..	147
Table 4.2-6: Estimated Transit Travel Times for Long-Term Transit Enhanced in 2040 (seconds) ..	149
Table 4.2-7: Estimated Transit Travel Times for Long-Term Grade-Separated in 2040 (seconds) ..	149
Table 4.2-8: Daily Emissions for the Communities of Medford, Somerville, and Everett based on the Wellington Circle Scenario.....	153
Table 4.2-9: Future Build and Existing Condition Results.....	159
Table 4.2-10: Noise Abatement Criteria by Activity Category.....	159
Table 4.2-11: Public Health – Air Quality Emissions Reductions Summary.....	167
Table 4.2-12: Public Health – Built Environment Summary	169
Table 4.2-13: Summary of EJ Population Impacts, Benefits, and Burdens	171
Table 4.2-14: Construction Cost Estimates.....	172



Appendices

Public Engagement	A
Land Use & Economic Development	B
Public Health, Environmental Justice	C
Environmental, Noise, Air Quality.....	D
Traffic.....	E
Origin Destination	F
Transit.....	G
Cost.....	H

Executive Summary

The Massachusetts Department of Transportation (MassDOT) initiated the Wellington Circle Study (the study) to evaluate existing and future multimodal transportation conditions at Wellington Circle (the Circle) in the City of Medford, and to develop Short-/Medium- and Long-Term alternative conceptual designs to improve the overall transportation system both within and through the Circle.

Situated at the intersection of Massachusetts Routes 16 and 28, Wellington Circle is a crucial transportation link through Medford, as well as the wider region. The intersection connects adjacent communities including Malden, Everett, and Somerville to each other, to the Wellington MBTA Station, and to regional routes such as Interstate 93 and Route 1. Most vehicular trips through the Circle are between local communities, with 60% of morning trips and 64% of afternoon trips destined for either Medford, Malden, Everett, Somerville, or Melrose. Similarly, trips related to Wellington Station and the Encore Casino are also from local communities. The prevalence of trips starting and ending within neighboring municipalities demonstrates an opportunity to shift these vehicular trips to more sustainable modes. This supports the study's focus on the redesign of the Circle to improve multimodal connectivity and mobility. This is done by examining and evaluating alternatives to improve transportation conditions in the context of vehicular, bicycle, pedestrian, transit, land use, and cost, as well as resulting economic, social, and cultural benefits and impacts.

Alternatives were evaluated and compared in the context of the study's goals and objectives. There were four overarching goals for the study:

- **Safety:** Improve safety conditions for all transportation modes and users in the Wellington Circle area.
- **Connectivity:** Improve local and regional connectivity to support businesses and future development.
- **Mobility/Access:** Improve mobility and access for all transportation modes and users in the Wellington Circle area.
- **Quality of Life:** Improve quality of life for residents in the Wellington Circle area.

Evaluation criteria were developed to support the goals of the study, and to help define and measure the objectives related to each goal. The evaluation criteria were vetted through the Public Involvement Process. Public participation was critical in refining the study's goals and objectives, evaluation criteria, and the Alternatives Development process. The Public Involvement Process included six meetings with the stakeholder Working Group, consisting of federal, state, regional, and local representatives, and three public information meetings with the general public.

The study assessed Existing Conditions at the Circle, including an analysis of Future No-Build conditions, to understand issues that need to be addressed, and opportunities that can be leveraged in the redesign of the Circle. Current issues identified include:

- **Safety for all modes:** The need for multiple lane changes and left turns, and wide turn radii, create conflict points and potential for crashes. High vehicle speeds through the Circle also present safety concerns. Vehicular crashes with pedestrians have occurred at most Circle intersections.

- **Multimodal connectivity and infrastructure:** The current configuration has wide roadways and multiple lanes of traffic with a general lack of pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure creating barriers to local destinations, including Wellington Station.
- **Vehicular congestion:** Traffic congestion causes delay for both private vehicles and buses, particularly east of the Circle.

The Existing and Future Conditions analysis led to the Alternatives Development process, where a variety of preliminary intersection configuration elements were considered to address the issues and opportunities. These included four-leg and five-leg intersections, roundabouts, jughandles, restricted crossing U-turns (RCUT), continuous flow intersections, and quadrant roadways. Each preliminary concept was addressed for fatal flaws, defined as the inability to provide sufficient capacity for existing vehicle volumes within the Circle and the inability to sufficiently accommodate pedestrian, bicycle, and/or transit access to meet Study goals. Overall, the quadrant roadway concept showed the most potential for improving access and connectivity and accommodating vehicle volumes at the Circle. The quadrant roadway configuration was used as the framework to develop the Long-Term At-Grade alternatives.

The iterative Alternatives Development process ultimately led to the Alternatives Analysis process, where a Short-/Medium-Term and Long-Term alternatives were more thoroughly evaluated and compared to understand which configuration would best address the study's goals and objectives. Four alternatives advanced to this evaluation:

- Short-/Medium-Term (Options A and B) – shown in Figure 1
- Long-Term At-Grade Dual Quadrant (Square and Triangle Concepts) – shown in Figure 2
- Long-Term At-Grade Transit Enhanced Dual Quadrant – shown in Figure 3
- Long-Term Grade Separated Single Quadrant – shown in Figure 4

Figure 1: Short-/Medium-Term (Options A and B)



Option A



Option B

Figure 2: Long-Term At-Grade Dual Quadrant (Square and Triangle Concepts)



Square



Triangle

Figure 3: Long-Term At-Grade Transit Enhanced Dual Quadrant



Figure 4: Long-Term Grade Separated Single Quadrant



While each of the final alternatives that were evaluated in the Alternatives Analysis process revealed improvements over the existing and Future No-Build configuration, the **Long-Term At-Grade Transit Enhanced Alternative** showed the most potential in meeting the study's goals and objectives and was selected as the recommended alternative.

The recommended **Long-Term At-Grade Transit Enhanced Alternative** would include dedicated transit lanes on Revere Beach Parkway to the east of the Circle and on the Fellsway to the north of the Circle, providing bus priority for MBTA bus routes 100, 108, and 134 to/from Wellington Station. Additionally, this alternative would provide dedicated bus phase signals (transit signal priority) and floating bus stops. A floating bus stop provides a curb extension at a bus stop to serve as a

boarding/alighting platform, with a separated bicycle lane running behind this passenger waiting area, effectively creating an island. Floating stops are used to reduce conflict between bicyclists and buses, leading to a greater level of comfort for the bicyclist and more efficient bus operations by allowing buses to stop in-lane to pick up and drop off passengers. Together, these transit treatments would help increase transit speed, reliability, and accessibility.

While the design improves pedestrian connectivity through the Circle, a crosswalk directly across Revere Beach Parkway at the eastern most portion of the Circle was determined to be infeasible due to high vehicle turning volumes. To provide a crossing at this location, the Long-Term At-Grade Transit Enhanced Alternative could accommodate a pedestrian bridge to create a more direct connection to Wellington Station. An overview of the recommended alternative is shown in Figure 5.

Figure 5: Recommended Alternative – Long -Term At-Grade Transit Enhanced with Pedestrian Bridge Option



A comparison of the Future No-Build cross-section with the Long-Term At-Grade Transit Enhanced Alternative cross-section on Route 16 is shown in Figure 6. The Transit Enhanced Alternative would reallocate roadway space from vehicles to bicyclists and pedestrians, with the addition of two-way bicycle facilities on both the northern and southern sides and sidewalks with space for landscaping/plantings. Vehicle lanes would be reduced from twelve to five. On the quadrant roadway segment of the intersection, the Transit Enhanced alternative would allocate dedicated space for transit vehicles through the addition of bus lanes on both sides. Figure 7 shows a cross-section of the quadrant roadway.

Figure 6: Cross-Section – Future No-Build vs. Transit Enhanced Alternative (Route 16)





Figure 7: Cross-Section – Transit Enhanced Alternative (Quadrant Roadway)



The Long-Term At-Grade Transit Enhanced Alternative would provide several benefits over the other alternatives. It is the only alternative that would measurably benefit transit operations and access, while also providing the same multimodal and quality of life benefits as the other Long-Term At-Grade alternative. As with all the Long-Term At-Grade alternatives, vehicle operations would remain largely the same as under the Future No-Build condition, with similar total vehicle capacities and delay for vehicles. Under both the existing and future conditions (Future No-Build and the Build alternatives) modeled, intersections operate similarly to most urban areas, as many movements are shown to operate at level of service (LOS) F, while very few operate at LOS A or LOS B. The Long-Term At-Grade Transit Enhanced Alternative is projected to somewhat impact vehicle operations compared to Future No-Build conditions, but this is due to benefits received by other modes, such as increased pedestrian signal time at intersections and reductions in bus travel time. Significant improvements to safety are also anticipated, with the overall driver experience expected to be safer and less confusing, and the provision of dedicated space for walkers, bikers, and transit users. These benefits



provide an opportunity for trips to shift to alternative modes of transportation and reduce the number of vehicles using the Circle in the future.

As a conceptual planning study, the Wellington Circle Study is only the beginning of improving connectivity and mobility throughout the Wellington Circle area for the City of Medford and surrounding region. This study examined transportation needs for those who drive, walk, bike, and use transit, as well as land use and development, environmental conditions, and economic, social, and cultural impacts. The result was the identification of a recommended alternative, the Transit Enhanced Alternative, which would advance the study goals of improving safety, mobility and access, local and regional connectivity, and quality of life, while also measurably improving transit operations and access.

The next step for the study is for the City of Medford, in coordination with MassDOT District 4, to initiate a project through the MassDOT Project Development Process. This will process will further define the project design, costs, timeline, impacts, and responsibilities, and secure approval from the MassDOT project Review Committee, as well as any permits. Funding will need to be pursued to advance into the design process for the future implementation of improvements that will benefit those who live in, work in, and travel through Wellington Circle.