

Nadia Khan

From: Andreae Downs
Sent: Monday, February 24, 2020 1:32 PM
To: Richard Lipof; Nadia Khan
Cc: Barney Heath; Jennifer Caira
Subject: Riverside Comments for Mark Development--Transportation

Sending ahead so is part of the public record, but will only raise those that are not covered by other councilors.

Positives:

The initial proposal is much improved in this proposal--I am particularly excited by the PROTECTED bike lanes, the TRAIL network and connections to the site, and the innovative and gameified TDM options outlined. Very creative stuff--and will make this a new model for Newton and the region!!

Driving:

1. Traffic Counts: I prefer **permanent count stations** at all exterior driveways
2. If there are no dedicated, protected facilities for cycling on Main Street, it will need to be a Slow Zone (max 15mph), because despite all the good intentions, cyclists will want to be on Main Street vs. Grove Street and will take the sidewalk if Main feels unsafe. A slow zone here will also make walking and shopping more enjoyable.
3. The NB 128 exit on to Rt. 16/WA St. needs a signal.
4. The Quinobequin NB signal needs a pedestrian call button at Rt. 16/WA street, as well as bike detection. This is a heavily-used bike route (Quino to Rt. 16 to Concord NB to Rt. 30 & to Grove and/or Newton St.)

Walking:

1. There are several crossings (I can show on a map) that will need to be carefully planned for the safety of pedestrians. Anything coming off the highways, in particular, and where desire lines and traffic conflict: both sides of the roundabout, grove/Recreation; Main St. entrance off Recreation/128; Crossing of Grove between buildings 6&7.
 - a. Pedestrians will want a crossing at the condo building across Grove Street.
2. Regional Trail Network:
 - a. how many switchbacks will be needed to connect Recreation Road to the Two Bridges Trail?
 - b. An at-grade connection from the development to the Two Bridges Trail -- is it included? If not, please do!
 - c. Please also CONSTRUCT the 2-bridges part of the 2-bridges trail.

Biking:

1. ALL new bike infrastructure should be CONNECTED and PROTECTED
 - a. ESPECIALLY the bike lane on the golf course side of Grove St (6 feet is preferable to 5 feet)
 - b. all the way to & through the roundabout

- c. all the way to & under the MBTA overpass
- d. Rt. 16/Washington St. from Lower Falls to Beacon needs protected and connected bike and pedestrian paths--these are currently dangerous and totally out of compliance for ADA
- 2. Bike Parking for the T needs to move to the garage (covered), not be located in the Transit plaza. Bad to have cyclists expected to play "frogger" with buses
 - a. Use that square for great sculpture or a massive tree/forest!
- 3. Ensure space in the garage for BlueBikes or other Bike Share stations, plus funding for future bike share

Transit/TDM:

- 1. All bus shelters should have real time displays of bus arrivals and alternatives
- 2. Lose the subjunctive tense (replace may with shall) on pages 5&6 of the TDM proposal.

General/open space: The traffic circle at 128 and Grove--could be a park! Add a noise barrier and trees/benches/bocce court...

Andreae Downs
Newton City Council

Nadia Khan

From: Joshua Krintzman
Sent: Wednesday, February 26, 2020 6:59 PM
To: Nadia Khan
Cc: Richard Lipof
Subject: Questions on Riverside Traffic

Hi Nadia:

Below are some of the questions that I have regarding Riverside. I would appreciate these being included in any requests made of either the Developer or Peer Reviewer.

- 1) Please demonstrate how/where the traffic estimates for TNCs was included in traffic projections as well as parking analysis
- 2) Is it possible to restrict parking spaces within the garage to certain uses during certain hours of the day? If so - will enforcement be possible?
- 3) Is the developer willing to include the city and or the neighbors in the selection of the TDM manager or association?
- 4) The developers described a 4 year period for monitoring of traffic. Four years seems insufficient to ensure adequate implementation. How about 7 years, with counts every 3 months, or any period with 36 consecutive months (12 consecutive counts) with counts demonstrating counts below 110% of projection?
- 5) Will the developer please provide a simulation of the traffic upon full build out (including how the roundabouts will function)?
- 6) Will the peer reviewer please provide a complete analysis of the proposal to remove the bike lane on the South Side of Grove Street and any benefits / drawbacks that would result?

Thank you very much,

Josh Krintzman

[Councilor-at-large, Ward 4](#)

When responding, please be aware that the Massachusetts Secretary of State has determined that most email is public record and therefore cannot be kept confidential.

Transportation Questions for Land Use Item 27-20 Riverside

prepared by Councilor Bowman 2/28/2020

I have organized my questions using the categories suggested by Councilor Laredo. I would like to suggest an additional category **MBTA Operations and Improvements and Regional Transportation Impacts on Project Area** as that didn't seem to fit in elsewhere.

Exterior roadways

- Two safe pedestrian and bike crossings need to be created along Grove in front of the project. One close to condominiums at 416 Grove St. (there is a crossing there now) is essential. A second crossing close to the T entrance is also necessary. I am concerned about the planned placement of this crossing as it is immediately adjacent to a wide driveway to the maintenance facility for Woodland.
- The redesign for 95 seems like it will return Grove St to more of an arterial roadway as opposed to a highway on and off ramp, including creating safer entrances and exits. Please confirm that the neighborhood will still have access to both 128S and 128N (one of the commenters said he would no longer have access to 128N).
- I support seeing a traffic simulation as suggested by Councilor Krintzman. It should include pedestrians and bike movements.
- Will left turn movements from Deforest and Pierrepont be safe enough given roadway changes? Might it be faster and safer to have right out only?
- What plans are being made for the group home that currently loads their van from Grove St. I believe the address is 511 Grove. Stopping here with new road configuration will be dangerous and impact bi-directional path.
- Would city consider a narrower lane width past site? 10' each lane and 9' for right turn lane? Will keep traffic safe steady speed and give room for landscaped buffer on east side of Grove.

Bike lanes on Grove (Should be Mobility Lanes Surrounding Site)

- Mobility lanes (designed to be attractive to people biking, on scooters, in wheelchairs and other) should to be designed on Grove from Lower Falls Community Center past the Riverside site. On the east side of Grove, it should be a raised sidewalk level path going one direction. This will provide people coming from Washington and Quinobequin (which will be getting a multiuse path along the DCR land). If it could be created with a grass buffer that would be best. On the west side/project side, there should be a bi-directional protected path so that residents of LF have the most direct and safest way to access Riverside.
- The multiuse path along Recreation Road (part of Riverside Greenway) needs a protected intersection/safe connection to the MWRA path. This intersection does not have good sightlines and the intersection will have more vehicle traffic after Recreation Road is made two way. Making this connection along with the work being done as part of the Riverside Greenway will create an easy connection from Riverside to the Auburndale Commuter Rail and Auburndale businesses by walking or biking and the Brandeis Commuter Rail and the Blue Heron Trail by bike.

- Completion of the Two Bridges is critical to support connectivity from Lower Falls to the site, Lower Falls to the trail network and the site to recreational and open space at Leo J Martin and beyond.

Access to site by mode

- Is there a place for TNC drop-off and other drop-off on Grove? What will prevent a car from just stopping to discharge a passenger?
- What is the plan for deliveries to residences?
- There is a potential conflict of bikes and cars at entrance of Main St (between bldgs. 1 and 2) and 128 N off ramp.
- What will be the connection from the Two Bridges to the site? I am concerned that a drop down to Recreation Road will involve significant switch backs to achieve ADA compliant grade change.
- What can be done to increase the ease of biking to the site from across Newton? Suggested key points that could be addressed. Comm Ave Carriage Lane; Waban, Upper Falls and Newton Highlands (either Beacon St or Quinobequin); West Newton (neighbor ways to carriage lane?)
- Bike connections from Auburndale, Waltham, Weston, and Wellesley will be made safer and more direct with the completion of the Riverside Greenway.
- Is there a planned space for bike share to access nearby transit or run errands? What about bike share for recreational use? Having bikes available for casual use may encourage people to bike more frequently.

Circulation within site

- The site should be easily navigable by people on bike, meaning a clear and safe route into the site and easy access to bike parking. There are four use cases: Employees, MBTA Riders, Retail Customers, Residents
- Transit signal priority is a good idea. How can it be implemented at this site? Does MBTA have a standard yet? Should be made available to all larger shared rides (shuttles).
- How is the space behind Building 1 being used? Is this for commercial trucks? MBTA?
- Are there detailed accessibility plans for MBTA access? Where is the HP parking? Where is drop-off? What is the distance from parking and drop-off? How are platforms reached?

Parking

- Is there a plan to deal with spillover parking in the neighborhood?
- How can additional bike parking be accommodated if need be?
- Will there be bike parking specifically for hotel workers? Should there be bike parking directly in the office building including access to showers?
- Bike parking in buildings should have direct access to outside if possible, rather than going through building lobbies. Bike parking should also have easy access to charging facilities as some bikes have internal batteries or person biking may not have access to charging while at the site (eg. They stopped for lunch or don't have a safe place at work to charge)

Plan for future

- A multiuse path along Quinobequin is being designed by DCR. Connecting from there to Grove will create another important Newton and regional connection.
- Multi-use path along the Green Line Eliot to Riverside could provide much needed regional connectivity

MBTA Operations and Improvements and Regional Transportation Impacts on Project Area

- The Green Line improvements and expected dates of improvement to service levels and capacity is important to the project. Green International's report showed a chart detailing ridership vs. capacity currently vs. policy changes vs. implementing supercars. Without the purchase of supercars capacity at peak periods will be an issue. What is the demonstrated commitment to fully fund super cars?
- What is the expected impact on Riverside and Green Line usage during I-90 improvements? How does the timing of that align with the project timeline for Riverside?
- What is the vision for inner core rail at this site? Per advocates? What commitments has the MBTA Control Board made on this?

Nadia Khan

From: Marc C. Laredo
Sent: Saturday, February 29, 2020 11:14 AM
To: Nadia Khan
Cc: City Council; Barney Heath; Jennifer Caira; Neil Cronin
Subject: Comments on Riverside Transportation

Colleagues,

I am submitting these comments and questions pursuant to the request of Chair Lipof. I ask that Ms. Khan post them on our website.

On a general note, can we get a copy of the agreement between the developer and the MBTA. Has the Planning Department reviewed this agreement and, if so, what comments does it have on it?

As I suggested at our meeting, I think it would be helpful to break our discussion down into the following six categories (there may be others that would be appropriate as well given the amount of information and the number of issues):

- Exterior Roadways
- Bike lanes
- Access to the site
- Circulation within the site
- Parking within the site
- Future access to Urban Rail, bike trails, and expanded T use and service

I will try put my questions and comments into these categories (not in order of importance):

Exterior Roadways

Who is paying for the exterior roadway improvements?

Who will be doing the work for the exterior roadway improvements and, if not the City, who will have oversight of this work?

The developer stated that it intends to take down trees and bushes in the area where a car enters the roundabout. Who will be paying for this work and who will be doing it in the future?

Please have the peer reviewer comment on putting the ramp under the bridge.

Bike Lanes

Please describe in more detail the proposed bike lanes not only in front of project but down the full length of Grove Street and think more broadly about bike lanes on the full length of Grove Street

Please have the peer reviewer comment on the extra bike lane proposed for the far side of Grove Street.

I have concerns about unprotected bike lanes - they are not safe enough for cyclists and more difficult for drivers.

Please comment on the current number of cyclists versus drivers in this area and anticipated changes with bike lanes.

Access to the site

How will we measure the amount of traffic going into and leaving the site? Please provide specifics.

Will those measures include counting vehicles used for delivery services and ride sharing?

What **specific** TDM measures will be in place if the amount of traffic is greater than expected?

Who will be responsible for determining the need for added TDM measures and subsequent enforcement?

The time for oversight of traffic should continue for several years after the site is fully built and occupied.

Circulation within the site

When were the counts for the total of existing trips done?

Where will dumpsters be located and how will they be accessed?

What limits will there be on deliveries to the site?

Please have the peer reviewer comment on the plan for central storage of bikes.

Please have the peer reviewer plot the actual queuing locations for buses, shuttles and other common carriers.

Parking within the site

Who will pay for attendants and other extra personnel on game days?

What assurance do we have that those extra employees will be in place?

Who will pay for maintenance of the parking structures?

Please provide more information on handicap parking.

Please provide more information about parking during construction.

Please explain what, if any, ability there will be to expand parking if ridership on the T increases.

Does the parking for the hotel take into account events that may be held there in addition to the number of rooms.

Please have the peer reviewer comment on potential traffic back-ups within the parking garages.

What limitations will there be on parking on neighboring streets adjacent to the site?

Future Access

Please provide more detailed information about future access to urban rail.

Please provide more information about future access to bike trail networks.

Thank you in advance for your responses.

Marc

Nadia Khan

From: Susan Albright
Sent: Monday, March 2, 2020 11:00 AM
To: Nadia Khan; City Council
Subject: Riverside traffic questions

[DO NOT OPEN links/attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.]

Hi Nadia,
Here are my questions from the transportation meeting. Thanks Susan

1. We saw how you come off 128 going north and how you get back onto 128 going north. How does one get back on to 128 going the other way from site?
2. I learned that there will be a database of license plates by usage. Could this system be better described?
3. What are the highest priority intersections to address - the ones that will be directly effected by the project and what should be done about them to mitigate the effects?
4. At an earlier meeting several of us raised questions regarding the rotary by the T and the conflicts there between cars, busses, pedestrians and bikes. this was not discussed at this meeting at all. Please address this conflict point to let us know how safety will be addressed. A statement was made that they will be "opening up" the transit loop. What does that mean?
5. Lines of traffic at several intersections were predicted by the LFIA presentation. Do the peer reviewers agree with this? If so what is the resolution? If not, please explain.
6. Problem was raised regarding the inability of a group home to load and unload a van at the roundabout. Does the peer reviewer believe this is a problem and if not why not? If so what is the solution? Is there a driveway at the group home that can be used by the van rather than the street?

--

Susan Albright
Councilor-at-Large Ward 2
Newton City Council