Working Group Meeting #10

UMASS Springfield – Tower Square
Springfield, Massachusetts

June 28, 2017
Welcome & Introductions

- Ethan Britland – Project Manager (MassDOT)
- Michael Clark – Transportation Planner (MassDOT)
- Mark Arigoni, L.A. – Principal-in-Charge (MMI)
- Van Kacoyannakis, P.E. – Traffic (MMI)
- Tim Baird, AICP – Planner (MMI)
- John Hoey - QA/QC (MMI)
- Sarah Paritsky – Public Involvement (Regina Villa)
Agenda

- Welcome and Introductions
- Three Alternatives
- Evaluation Criteria (Presentation & Workbook Walk Through)
  - Evolution of Evaluation Criteria
  - Evaluation of No-Build & the (3) Alternatives
  - Discussion of Ratings
- Discussion of Recommendations
- Next Steps/Process
**Conceptual Planning Study:** This graphic represents a hypothetical development scenario that could be representative of potential future development along the I-91 Viaduct Corridor and is shown for general informational purposes. Any actual future development that occurs along this corridor may vary from this conceptual representation.
Conceptual Planning Study: This graphic represents a hypothetical development scenario that could be representative of potential future development along the I-91 Viaduct Corridor and is shown for general informational purposes. Any actual future development that occurs along this corridor may vary from this conceptual representation.

Alternative #2

- Elevated Park over Existing Railroad
- Sunken I-91 shifted Alignment Adjacent to Railroad Alignment
- Realigned East-West Columbus Boulevard
- Columbus/Boland/Memorial Round-about
Conceptual Planning Study: This graphic represents a hypothetical development scenario that could be representative of potential future development along the I-91 Viaduct Corridor and is shown for general informational purposes. Any actual future development that occurs along this corridor may vary from this conceptual representation.
Evolution of Evaluation Criteria

- Completion of Comprehensive Evaluation Criteria & Ratings
  - Mobility & Accessibility, Safety, Environmental Effects
    - Additional Air & Noise Analysis Completed
  - Land Use & Economic Development
  - Community Effects, and Cost

- MASSDOT & MASSDPH Coordination Continues
Refinement of Evaluation Criteria

- Mobility & Accessibility
- Safety
- Environmental Effects
- Land Use & Economic Development
- Community Effects
- Cost

A lot of Detail – too much to present on a screen
A workbook was developed to function as a stand alone document that provides support information along with the actual Evaluation Criteria. The support information is intended to assist in the understanding of the Detailed Evaluation Criteria and includes the Criteria, Descriptions, Ratings, and Mapping.

### Evaluation Criteria Work Book

**1. Mobility and Accessibility**
- This set of criteria was developed to evaluate each alternative ability to maintain or improve the conveyance of regional traffic through the corridor, while enhancing the connectivity of all modes of transportation into and around the City and its waterfront.

**2. Roadway Operational Functionality**
- **1.1.1 Intersection Level of Service**
  - Level of service (LOS) is a measure and a quantification of the operating conditions of a roadway based on factors such as queue length, movement delay, delay, and safety. The level of service is determined using a standard, A to F, with A representing the best operating conditions and F the worst. For this criterion, the level of service is for operating conditions.
- **1.1.2 Volume to Capacity Ratio**
  - Volume to capacity ratio is the ratio of the volume of vehicles passing a point in one hour and the capacity (V/C) of the maximum number of vehicles that can pass a point in one hour. The volume to capacity ratio determines the operating effectiveness of the roadway. A lower ratio value indicates a more effective ratio.
- **1.1.3 Queue Length**
  - Queue length is the line of vehicles waiting to proceed through an intersection. Study station criteria state that the queue is not seen as normally considered part of the queue. The normal queue dynamic can involve stops and starts. A question arises if a vehicle is seen stopped in a normal queue or a stoppage. In this criterion, the line was added for the purpose of not all of the potential interventions. Any reduction in queue lengths would be considered.

---

**June 28, 2017**
The Evaluation consists of a rating system that provides a value to each criteria. The alternatives have been assessed based upon the criteria and a value/rating has been given for each alternative and the no-build. These ratings are based upon the information provided and can be either qualitative, quantitative, or both.

Harvey Ball System

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ranking</th>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>Better</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>●○</td>
<td>Same-Better</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>Same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td>○○</td>
<td>Same-Worse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2</td>
<td>○○○</td>
<td>Worse</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Project Schedule

**Project Extension to October 2017**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SEP</td>
<td>OCT</td>
<td>NOV</td>
<td>DEC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Area, Goals &amp; Objectives, Evaluation Criteria, and Public Involvement Plan</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Conditions, Future No Build Conditions and Issues Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternatives Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternatives Analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 6.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Comment Period</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Working Group Meeting
- Public Meeting
- Working Group Meeting #10
- Working Group Meeting #11
Next Steps

- Recommend Preferred Alternative

- Additional Working Group Meeting

- Final Public Informational Meeting

- Final Report & Public Comment Period
Contacts:

Ethan Britland, Project Manager
Phone: 857-368-8840
Email: ethan.britland@state.ma.us

Michael Clark, Transportation Planner
Phone: 857-368-9800
Email: michael.clark@state.ma.us

Study Website Link:
www.massdot.state.ma.us/i91viaductstudy
THANK YOU FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION