

Mobility in the Boston Region

Existing Conditions and Next Steps

The 2004 Congestion Management System Report



A report produced by the
Central Transportation
Planning Staff for the
Boston Region Metropolitan
Planning Organization

Mobility in the Boston Region: Existing Conditions and Next Steps

The 2004 Congestion Management System Report

Project Manager and Principal Author

Lourenço Dantas

Project Principal

Efi Pagitsas

Contributing Author

Heather Ostertog

Principal Data Analysts

Lourenço Dantas

Heather Ostertog

Contributors

Tom Lisco

Tom Nixon

Karl H. Quackenbush

Robert Sievert

Alicia P. Wilson

Geographic Information Systems

Mark Scannell

Kathy Jacob

David Knudsen

Hiral Gandhi

Data Collection

Dan Bullenkamp

Hiral Gandhi

Andrew K. Smith

Kate Wall

Larry Winer

Jessica Belcher

Michael J. Casey

Holly Holmes

Anu Mehta

With additional help from:

Liz Baker

Stanley Genthner

Tom Nixon

Heather Ostertog

Leo Sullivan

Chen-Yuan Wang

Cover Design

Jane M. Gillis

The preparation of this document was supported by the Federal Highway Administration through MHD 3C PL contracts #32057, #33101, #34023 and #35008.

Central Transportation Planning Staff

Directed by the Boston Region Metropolitan Planning Organization. The MPO is composed of state and regional agencies and authorities, and local governments.

December 2004

This document can be downloaded at www.bostonmpo.org/bostonmpo/resources/reports.htm. To obtain additional printed copies or to request it in an accessible format, please contact us:

Mail CMS Project Manager
Traffic Analysis and Design Group
Central Transportation Planning Staff
10 Park Plaza, Suite 2150
Boston, Massachusetts 02116

Telephone 617-973-7100
617-973-7089 (TTY)

Fax 617-973-8855

E-mail cms@ctps.org

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF FIGURES AND TABLES	ix
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	ES-1
1 INTRODUCTION	1-1
1.1 REPORT ORGANIZATION (HOW TO USE THIS DOCUMENT).....	1-2
2 BACKGROUND	2-1
2.1 FEDERAL LEGISLATION	2-1
2.2 THE CMS WORK PLAN FOR MASSACHUSETTS	2-1
2.3 CMS MONITORING AND THE TRANSPORTATION PLANNING PROCESS	2-2
3 ROADWAYS	3-1
3.1 CMS ROADWAY NETWORK.....	3-1
3.2 TRAVEL-TIME-BASED PERFORMANCE MEASURES	3-1
3.2.1 ROADWAY TRAVEL TIME MEASURES.....	3-1
3.2.1.1 Average Observed Travel Speeds.....	3-2
3.2.1.2 Travel Speed Index.....	3-7
3.2.1.3 Delay.....	3-8
3.2.2 TRAVEL TIME DATA COLLECTION METHOD.....	3-8
3.3 ROADWAY MONITORING RESULTS.....	3-9
3.3.1 ARTERIAL ROADWAYS.....	3-9
3.3.1.1 Average Observed Travel Speeds.....	3-9
3.3.1.2 Speed Index	3-16
3.3.1.3 Delay per Mile.....	3-22
3.3.1.4 Delay at Intersections	3-23
3.3.1.5 Traffic Volumes.....	3-33
3.3.1.6 Roadway Safety.....	3-33
3.3.1.7 Mobility Along CMS Arterial Roadways.....	3-39
3.3.2 LIMITED-ACCESS HIGHWAYS.....	3-46
3.3.2.1 Average Observed Travel Speeds.....	3-46
3.3.2.2 Comparison between 1994–1995 Data and 1999–2000 Data.....	3-47
3.3.2.3 Traffic Volumes.....	3-48
3.3.2.4 Roadway Safety.....	3-48
3.3.2.5 Interchange Analysis: Bottlenecks and Congested Segments on Limited-Access Highways.....	3-59
3.3.2.6 Traffic Volumes and Congestion Levels on Limited-Access Highways in the Boston Metropolitan Region	3-70

3.4 REGIONAL ROADWAY TRAVEL TRENDS.....	3-75
4 PUBLIC TRANSIT	4-1
4.1 SYSTEM RIDERSHIP	4-1
4.2 TRANSIT PERFORMANCE MEASURES	4-2
4.2.1 ON-TIME PERFORMANCE (SCHEDULE ADHERENCE)	4-2
4.2.2 PASSENGER CROWDING	4-2
4.3 RAIL TRANSIT MONITORING RESULTS	4-4
4.3.1 ON-TIME PERFORMANCE (SCHEDULE ADHERENCE)	4-4
4.3.2 PASSENGER CROWDING	4-5
4.4 BUS TRANSIT MONITORING RESULTS.....	4-6
4.4.1 ON-TIME PERFORMANCE (SCHEDULE ADHERENCE)	4-6
4.4.2 PASSENGER CROWDING	4-11
5 PARK-AND-RIDE LOTS	5-1
5.1 PARK-AND-RIDE LOT PERFORMANCE MEASURES	5-1
5.1.1 LOT UTILIZATION	5-1
5.1.2 THE TIME A LOT FILLS UP	5-1
5.1.3 DATA COLLECTION METHOD	5-2
5.2 PARK-AND-RIDE LOTS AT TRANSIT STATIONS: MONITORING RESULTS	5-2
5.2.1 PARK-AND-RIDE LOT UTILIZATION	5-2
5.2.2 COMPARISON WITH PAST FINDINGS	5-2
5.3 MASSHIGHWAY PARK-AND-RIDE LOTS: MONITORING RESULTS.....	5-7
5.3.1 PARK-AND-RIDE LOT UTILIZATION	5-7
5.3.2 COMPARISON WITH PAST FINDINGS	5-7
6 HIGH-OCCUPANCY-VEHICLE (HOV) LANES AND TRAVEL DEMAND MANAGEMENT (TDM) PROGRAMS	6-1
6.1 HIGH-OCCUPANCY-VEHICLE (HOV) LANES.....	6-1
6.1.1 BACKGROUND AND DESCRIPTION OF HOV OPERATIONS	6-1
6.1.2 HOV LANE PERFORMANCE MEASURE: TRAVEL TIME SAVINGS	6-3
6.1.3 DATA COLLECTION METHOD	6-3
6.1.4 HOV LANE CORRIDOR TRAVEL TIME OBSERVATIONS	6-3
6.2 TRAVEL DEMAND MANAGEMENT (TDM) PROGRAMS.....	6-8
6.2.1 DESCRIPTION OF SERVICES	6-8
6.2.1.1 Commuter Education, Information, and Ridematching	6-8
6.2.1.2 Worksite-Based Programs.....	6-8
6.2.1.3 Vanpool Program Operation	6-9
6.2.1.4 TMA Services	6-9

6.2.2	UTILIZATION OF TDM SERVICES: RIDEMATCHING, VANPOOLS, AND SUBURBAN TRANSIT SHUTTLES.....	6-10
6.2.2.1	Ridematching.....	6-10
6.2.2.2	Vanpools.....	6-10
6.2.2.3	Suburban Transit: Shuttle Services.....	6-10
7	BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN FACILITIES	7-1
7.1	TRANSIT STATION ACCESS.....	7-1
7.1.1	PEDESTRIAN CROSSINGS.....	7-2
7.1.2	BICYCLE PARKING AVAILABILITY AND UTILIZATION	7-2
7.2	BICYCLING NETWORK.....	7-4
7.2.1	ON-STREET NETWORK: THE SUITABILITY FOR BICYCLING OF THE CMS ROADWAY NETWORK	7-4
7.2.2	OFF-STREET NETWORK	7-6
8	CONCLUSIONS	8-1
9	SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	9-1
9.1	ARTERIAL ROADWAYS	9-1
9.1.1	SUMMARY OF FINDINGS	9-1
9.1.2	RECOMMENDATIONS.....	9-3
9.1.2.1	An Intersections Improvements Program to Address Congested and High- Crash Intersections	9-3
9.1.2.2	Traffic Signal Coordination.....	9-3
9.1.2.3	Studies of the Most Congested Arterial Roadway Corridors	9-4
9.1.2.4	Intersection Design: Signs and Markings.....	9-5
9.1.2.5	Enforcement of On-Street Parking Regulations	9-5
9.2	LIMITED-ACCESS HIGHWAYS.....	9-7
9.2.1	SUMMARY OF FINDINGS	9-7
9.2.2	GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS	9-7
9.2.2.1	Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS)	9-7
9.2.2.2	Interchange Improvements	9-7
9.2.2.3	Correction of Travel-Lane Continuity Inconsistencies.....	9-8
9.2.3	CORRIDOR- AND INTERCHANGE-SPECIFIC FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	9-8
9.2.3.1	Route 1 North, between I-95, Peabody, and I-93, Charlestown	9-8
9.2.3.2	Route 60–Route 1A, between Route 1, Revere, and Callahan/Sumner Tunnels, Boston.....	9-10
9.2.3.3	Route 2, between Route 27, Acton, and Route 16/Alewife Brook Parkway, Cambridge	9-10
9.2.3.4	Storrow Drive and Fresh Pond Parkway, between Route 2 at Route 16, Cambridge, and Route 28/Leverett Circle, Boston.....	9-11
9.2.3.5	Route 3 North, between the New Hampshire State Line and I-95/Route 128, Burlington.....	9-12
9.2.3.6	Route 3 South, between Route 14, Duxbury, and I-93, Braintree	9-12

9.2.3.7	I-93/Southeast Expressway, between Route 3, Braintree, and Storrow Drive, Boston	9-13
9.2.3.8	I-93 North, between the New Hampshire State Line and I-95/Route 128, Reading	9-14
9.2.3.9	I-93 North, between I-95/Route 128, Woburn/Reading, and Route 28, Somerville	9-15
9.2.3.10	I-93 South, between Route 3, Braintree, and I-95, Canton	9-15
9.2.3.11	I-95/Route 128 (Southern/Western Section), between I-95, Canton, and I-93, Woburn/Reading	9-16
9.2.3.12	I-95/Route 128 (Northern Section), between I-93, Woburn/Reading, and the I-95–Route 128 Split, Peabody	9-16
9.2.3.13	Route 128, between I-95, Peabody, and Blackburn Circle, Gloucester	9-17
9.2.3.14	Route 24, between I-495, Bridgewater, and I-93, Randolph.....	9-17
9.2.3.15	I-95 South, between I-495, Foxborough, and I-93/Route 128, Canton.....	9-18
9.2.3.16	I-90 (Massachusetts Turnpike/Massachusetts Turnpike Extension) between Interchange 13, Framingham, and the Central Artery, Boston	9-18
9.2.3.17	I-495, between Route 109, Milford, and Route 2, Acton.....	9-18
9.2.3.18	I-495, between Route 2, Littleton, and Route 125, Haverhill	9-19
9.3	PUBLIC TRANSIT	9-20
9.3.1	SUMMARY OF FINDINGS.....	9-20
9.3.1.1	Schedule Adherence (On-Time Performance).....	9-20
9.3.1.2	Passenger Crowding.....	9-20
9.3.2	RECOMMENDATIONS	9-21
9.3.2.1	Regionally Significant MBTA System Expansion and Service Improvement Projects.....	9-21
9.3.2.2	Bus Mobility Strategies.....	9-22
9.4	PARK-AND-RIDE LOTS	9-24
9.4.1	SUMMARY OF FINDINGS.....	9-24
9.4.2	RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PARK-AND-RIDE LOTS AT TRANSIT STATIONS.....	9-24
9.4.3	RECOMMENDATIONS FOR MASSHIGHWAY PARK-AND-RIDE LOTS	9-26
9.5	HIGH-OCCUPANCY VEHICLE (HOV) LANES	9-27
9.5.1	SUMMARY OF FINDINGS.....	9-27
9.5.2	RECOMMENDATIONS	9-27
9.5.2.1	HOV Lane System Plan	9-27
9.5.2.2	HOV Lane Connections	9-27
9.6	TDM AND RIDESHARING PROGRAMS.....	9-28
9.6.1	SUMMARY OF FINDINGS.....	9-28
9.6.1.1	Ridematching	9-28
9.6.1.2	Ridesharing: Vanpools.....	9-28
9.6.1.3	Ridesharing: Park-and-Ride Lots.....	9-28
9.6.1.4	Suburban Transit: Shuttle Services	9-28
9.6.2	RECOMMENDATIONS	9-29
9.6.2.1	Support Commuter Ridesharing and Related TDM Services	9-29
9.6.2.2	Study Suburban Transit Opportunities for Subregions	9-29
9.7	BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN FACILITIES	9-30
9.7.1	SUMMARY OF FINDINGS.....	9-30
9.7.1.1	Pedestrian and Bicycle Access to MBTA Stations	9-30

9.7.1.2	The Suitability of CMS Roadways for Bicycling.....	9-30
9.7.1.3	The Off-Street Bicycle Network.....	9-31
9.7.2	RECOMMENDATIONS	9-31
9.7.2.1	Bicycle Parking at Transit Stations.....	9-31
9.7.2.2	Bicycle Transportation Plan	9-31
9.7.2.3	Bicycle and Pedestrian Planning: Studies and Programs.....	9-31
9.8	OTHER CONGESTION-REDUCING STRATEGIES AND PROGRAMS	9-33
9.8.1.1	Travel Demand Management	9-33
9.8.1.2	Land Use Management	9-33

APPENDICES

- A. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PROCESS, OUTREACH, AND WRITTEN RESPONSES**
- B. PERFORMANCE MEASURES—TABLES AND GRAPHICS (MAPS)**
- C. CORRIDOR STUDIES: SUMMARY OF PROJECT RECOMMENDATIONS AND IMPLEMENTATION STATUS—TABLE**

LIST OF FIGURES AND TABLES

Figure 1.1	Boston Region MPO: Municipalities and Regional Transportation Corridors.....	1-3
Figure 2.1	Congestion Management System Elements Within the Transportation-Planning Process	2-3
Table 3.1	Roadway Performance Measures and Congestion Thresholds.....	3-2
Figure 3.1	CMS-Monitored Roadways.....	3-3
Figure 3.2	CMS Roadway Classification.....	3-5
Table 3.2	Level of Service Based on Average Travel Speed: Arterial Roadways	3-7
Table 3.3	Level of Service Based on Average Travel Speed: Limited-Access Highways.....	3-7
Figure 3.3	Average Travel Speeds on Arterial Roadways (featuring the western suburban communities in the MetroWest subregion, evening peak period)	3-11
Table 3.4	Summary of Average Observed Travel Speeds: Arterial Roadways, 2001–2003.....	3-13
Table 3.5	Average Travel Speeds on Arterial Roadways (Urban Street Class III) in the Morning Peak Period: A Comparison between 1996–1999 Data and 2001–2003 Data.....	3-14
Table 3.6	Average Travel Speeds on Arterial Roadways (Urban Street Class III) in the Evening Peak Period: A Comparison between 1996–1999 Data and 2001–2003 Data.....	3-15
Figure 3.4	Speed Index on Arterial Roadways (featuring the MAGIC subregion, evening peak period).....	3-17
Table 3.7	Summary of Speed Index: Arterial Roadways, 2001–2003	3-19
Table 3.8	Speed Index on Arterial Roadways (Urban Street Class III) in the Morning Peak Period: A Comparison between 1996–1999 Data and 2001–2003 Data.....	3-20
Table 3.9	Speed Index on Arterial Roadways (Urban Street Class III) in the Evening Peak Period: A Comparison between 1996–1999 Data and 2001–2003 Data.....	3-21
Table 3.10	Average Delay per Mile on Arterial Roadways (Urban Street Class III): A Comparison between 1996–1999 Data and 2001–2003 Data.....	3-22
Table 3.11	Delay at Signalized Intersections, Morning Peak Period: Approaches with Delays of 80 Seconds or More, Regionwide	3-24
Table 3.12	Delay at Signalized Intersections, Evening Peak Period: Approaches with Delays of 80 Seconds or More, Regionwide	3-26
Figure 3.5	Signalized Intersections with Worst Average Approach Delay (featuring the North Shore communities in the NSTF subregion)	3-31
Table 3.13	Top 60 Crash Locations on Arterial Roadways, 1997–1999.....	3-34
Figure 3.6	Crash Locations: 1997–1999 (featuring the the north suburban communities in the NSPC subregion)	3-37
Table 3.14	Mobility Characteristics of CMS Arterial Roadway Corridors.....	3-41
Table 3.15	Regional Summary of Peak-Period Travel Speeds on the Limited-Access Highway Network, 1999–2000.....	3-47

Table 3.16	Comparison between 1994–1995 and 1999–2000 Travel Speeds on the Limited-Access Highway Network.....	3-48
Figure 3.7	Average Observed Travel Speeds on Limited-Access Highways and Connecting Urban Principal Arterials: 1999–2000 (Morning Peak Period)	3-49
Figure 3.8	Average Observed Travel Speeds on Limited-Access Highways and Connecting Urban Principal Arterials: 1999–2000 (Evening Peak Period).....	3-51
Figure 3.9	Change in Average Observed Travel Speeds on Limited-Access Highways and Connecting Urban Principal Arterials: 1994–1995 vs. 1999–2000 (Morning Peak Period).....	3-53
Figure 3.10	Change in Average Observed Travel Speeds on Limited-Access Highways and Connecting Urban Principal Arterials: 1994–1995 vs. 1999–2000 (Evening Peak Period).....	3-55
Table 3.17	Top 60 Crash Locations on Limited-Access Highways, 1997–1999.....	3-57
Table 3.18	Analysis of Interchanges on the Limited-Access Highways.....	3-60
Figure 3.11	Daily Traffic Volumes and Congestion Levels on Limited-Access Highways in Eastern Massachusetts: Year 2000.....	3-71
Figure 3.12	Daily Traffic Volumes and Congestion Levels on Limited-Access Highways in Eastern Massachusetts: Years 1970–2000	3-73
Table 4.1	Transit Performance Thresholds: Passenger Crowding and On-Time Performance	4-3
Table 4.2	On-Time Performance (Schedule Adherence): Rail Transit	4-4
Table 4.3	Passenger Crowding: Rail Transit (Peak 30 Minutes)	4-5
Table 4.4	Bus Routes That Violate Schedule Adherence in the Morning Peak Period	4-7
Table 4.5	Bus Routes That Violate Schedule Adherence in the Evening Peak Period	4-9
Table 4.6	Bus Routes That Violate Passenger Crowding Standard, Peak 30 Minutes in the Morning Peak Period.....	4-11
Table 4.7	Bus Routes That Violate Passenger Crowding Standard, Peak 30 Minutes in the Evening Peak Period	4-11
Figure 4.1	Bus Route Performance: Peak Period Schedule Adherence and Passenger Crowding (featuring the communities in the middle Inner Core subregion)	4-13
Table 5.1	MBTA Commuter Rail and Ferry Transit Park-and-Ride Lot Inventory	5-3
Table 5.2	MBTA Rapid Transit Park-and-Ride Lot Inventory	5-6
Table 5.3	MassHighway Park-and-Ride Lot Inventory	5-7
Figure 5.1	Park-and-Ride Lot Utilization: Lots at Public Transit Stations	5-9
Figure 5.2	Park-and-Ride Lot Utilization: Ridesharing Lots	5-11
Figure 6.1	HOV Lane System in the Boston Area	6-2
Table 6.1	Average Travel Times in I-93 North HOV Lane Corridor, Southbound, Morning.....	6-5
Table 6.2	Average Travel Times in I-93/Southeast Expressway HOV Lane Corridor, Northbound, Morning	6-6

Table 6.3	Average Travel Times in I-93/Southeast Expressway HOV Lane Corridor, Southbound, Evening.....	6-7
Table 7.1	Commuter Rail Stations without Bicycle Racks	7-3
Table 7.2	Rapid Transit Stations without Bicycle Racks	7-3
Table 7.3	Light Rail Transit Stations without Bicycle Racks.....	7-4
Table 7.4	Roadway Characteristics Associated with Bicycling Suitability Classifications	7-6
Table 7.5	CMS Roadway Segments with Bicycling Suitability of Medium or Best	7-7
Figure 7.1	Bicycling Suitability Classification of CMS Arterial Roadways	7-9
Table 9.1	Transit Station Park-and-Ride Lots: Recommended Lots for Expansion.....	9-25

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report of the Congestion Management System (CMS) for the Boston Region Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) documents the region's mobility concerns. The report contains the most recent performance-monitoring information on the regional transportation system. The information and general analysis of it provide the basis for the MPO's Central Transportation Planning Staff (CTPS) to set forth recommendations to the MPO for congestion-reducing and mobility-enhancing actions to be considered in the MPO planning and programming processes.

The CMS is an ongoing program of the MPO. The purpose of the CMS is to provide decision-makers (primarily the MPO's Transportation Planning and Programming Committee) and transportation planners with timely information about transportation system performance and make recommendations in the areas where congestion and other mobility deficiencies are found. This information is also available to the public, who may choose to use the CMS information to provide input to the planning and programming of transportation improvements through the MPO's public participation process.

THE CMS PROCESS

The CMS program's goals are achieved by conducting a systematic and continuous process that consists of the following four elements:

1. Data collection for system monitoring and analysis
2. Recommendations for the various transportation system elements that are monitored
3. Management of monitoring databases
4. CMS reports

The performance of the following components of the region's transportation system was monitored during the latest cycle of the CMS program and is reported in the present document:

- **Roadways** (limited-access highways and arterial roadways), where performance is measured in terms of travel speeds and delays, which are complemented by additional measures, such as average daily traffic and crashes.
- **Public transit**, where performance is measured in terms of schedule adherence and in-vehicle passenger crowding, with a special focus on MBTA bus routes.
- **Park-and-ride lots**, where performance is measured in terms of capacity, use, and the time of day at which lots fill up.
- **High-occupancy-vehicle (HOV) lanes**, where performance is measured in terms of the travel time saved compared to general-purpose-lane travel.
- **Travel demand management (TDM)**, which includes services provided by MassRIDES and various transportation management associations (TMAs) in the region. Performance measures include the number of vanpools, TMA shuttle ridership, and ridematching assistance.
- **Bicycle and pedestrian mobility**, where performance is measured in terms of bicycle and pedestrian accessibility to transit stations and the suitability of the CMS-monitored arterial roadways for on-street bicycle use.

This report—the fourth CMS report produced for the Boston Region MPO—contains performance-monitoring information gathered since the last report was compiled in 2000 and sets forth recommendations based on that information. Many of the CMS components and performance measures presented in this report—average daily traffic, crashes, park-and-ride lot filling times, bicycle and pedestrian accessibility to transit stations, arterial roadway assessment using the bicycle suitability index, HOV lane travel time savings, and TDM activities—are newly explored areas of performance monitoring for this region.

FINDINGS

The following are highlights of the findings for each of the six elements that are monitored and/or examined as part of the CMS program.

Arterial Roadways

CMS arterial roadway data and analysis have shown that, since the previous monitoring, average peak-period speeds have dropped and delay has increased. Average peak-period speeds are now below the posted speed limit on about 40 percent of the monitored network. Of the two peak periods, the evening is the worse, with 15 percent of the monitored signalized intersections having at least two approaches at an unacceptable level of service.

Limited-Access Highways

Travel speed data show that during the latest monitoring period, 10 percent more of the region's expressway network had average morning peak-period speeds of less than 50 mph than during the previous monitoring period five years earlier. In the evening, however, the findings do not indicate that speeds have changed significantly between the two monitoring periods, possibly because deterioration of speeds during the evening peak period is harder to detect and measure, as the network is more congested at the outset of the evening peak period than at the outset of the morning peak period.

Public Transit

The performance measures of schedule adherence and passenger crowding offer a glimpse into the performance of the MBTA transit system. In the case of bus performance, these measures are an indication of roadway congestion, as encountered by the buses. Of the morning peak-period bus trips, 36 percent arrive more than five minutes late; of the evening peak-period trips, 39 percent arrive more than five minutes late. The MBTA standard for passenger crowding is violated by 5 percent of the morning peak-period bus trips and 4 percent of the evening peak-period bus trips.

Park-and-Ride Lots

Of the 107 MBTA commuter park-and-ride lots that were observed, 76 (71 percent) reached capacity (defined as being filled to 85 percent of capacity or more). Furthermore, 49 of the lots (46 percent) reached capacity well before the last morning peak-period inbound train. With regard to the five MassHighway park-and-ride lots in the MPO region, only one (Milton) reached capacity, and three of them were underutilized.

High-Occupancy-Vehicle Lanes

The I-93/Southeast Expressway HOV lane carries a daily average of about 8,700 vehicles, which corresponds to an estimated daily average of 33,660 persons. Approximately 95 percent of the

vehicles are automobiles with carpooling passengers; the remainder of the vehicles are vanpool vans, public and private transit buses, and motorcycles. Information on numbers and types of users is not available for the I-93 North HOV lane.

A user of the I-93/Southeast Expressway HOV lane saves nearly six minutes on the morning-peak-period downtown-bound approach and nearly five minutes on the evening-peak-period southbound approach, compared to the general-purpose lanes, according to 2003 monitoring. On the I-93 North HOV lane heading southbound, the morning-peak-period travel-time savings are approximately six and a half minutes.

Travel Demand Management

This CMS report documents key TDM activities in the region, largely performed by MassRIDES and TMAs. For example, 40 vanpools are currently in operation; the vans originate in or are destined to urban and suburban locations in the Boston region, and they have an average daily round-trip mileage of 113 miles. Significant markets include commuters traveling from Cape Cod, southern New Hampshire, Worcester, and areas west of Worcester.

Bicycle and Pedestrian

Three pedestrian and bicycle transportation elements were examined: (1) pedestrian and bicycle access to transit, (2) the suitability of the CMS arterial roadway network for on-street bicycle use, and (3) the off-street bicycle network. The report identifies stations where safer street crossings for pedestrians could be provided and stations that lack minimal bicycle parking facilities. In terms of the suitability of CMS roadways for use by bicyclists during peak travel periods, the analysis indicates that only 14 percent of the network miles (directional¹) can be rated “medium” or “best.” For rating the CMS roadways, CTPS created a bicycle suitability index.

CONCLUSIONS

Presented below are conclusions based primarily on findings regarding various performance measures and trends for the Boston region. The basis of the conclusions also includes findings from congestion monitoring and research which, though they were conducted by other agencies and research organizations in the country, shed light on our own region’s experiences regarding congestion and travel demand. These conclusions provide a frame that informs the nature of the recommendations (see Chapter 9 of this report).

Congestion and economic growth in the region have been closely related – According to figures used in the Regional Transportation Plan, employment in the Boston Region MPO area grew by about 52 percent between 1970 and 2000 and by 22 percent between 1980 and 2000.² The Plan also notes that suburban job growth outpaced that of the urban core during this period. Along with this economic growth came more congestion: between 1982 and 2001, daily vehicle-miles traveled (VMT) grew by 38 percent, and annual person-hours of delay more than tripled.³

¹ One mile of two-way roadway equals two directional miles.

² Central Transportation Planning Staff, *2004–2025 Regional Transportation Plan of the Boston MPO*, September 11, 2003, p. 2-2.

³ David L. Schrank and Timothy J. Lomax, *Annual Urban Mobility Report*, Texas Transportation Institute (TTI), the Texas A&M University System, September 2003. Available at <http://mobility.tamu.edu/ums>.

Travel in the region will most likely continue to grow in the future as the region's economy grows – Every new job that is created in this region adds 14,500 miles of travel to the system annually.⁴ As this region moves out of the recent recession and new jobs are added to the economy, VMT—and delay—should also be expected to grow.

Operational strategies can extract additional capacity from the region's arterial roadways and limited-access highways – As building new capacity is not always possible or desirable, it is important to maximize the capacity of the existing infrastructure. Mitigating the effects of roadway events (incident management) and improving the system's operational efficiency for all roadway users, including bus riders, are the two key areas where this strategy reduces congestion. Operational efficiency strategies include HOV lanes, traffic signal coordination, intersection redesign, intelligent transportation system strategies, and reversible commuter lanes.

Public transportation is already a very important contributor to congestion relief in this region, and it can continue to be one in the future – Annual person-hour delay on the roadways of this region is 70 percent lower than what it could have been without public transportation.⁵ Annual passenger-miles on public transportation tripled between 1982 and 2001,⁶ largely due to expansions of commuter rail service and of park-and-ride lots. Between 1995 and 2002, over 12,000 spaces were added to the MBTA park-and-ride system, an increase of 57 percent. Between 1992 and 2002, total MBTA ridership increased by 9 percent.

Travel demand management can be part of the integrated solution to reduce congestion and improve mobility – Though the impact on congestion of TDM measures, such as ridesharing, shifting the time of travel, and telecommuting, is limited, they can improve mobility for certain traveler markets and help reduce VMT as part of the mix of solutions.

Regulatory policies to manage urban growth and form can reduce congestion – According to the 2004–2025 Regional Transportation Plan, the MPO region had 2.5 percent more developed land in 1999 than in 1991.⁷ The Plan also notes that this rate “averages out to about 7.6 acres a day. The majority of the new land consumption was for single-family housing [and] most of this development took place on formerly agricultural and forested lands.”⁸ Furthermore, based on a Metropolitan Area Planning Council analysis of land use/sprawl trends, in the 1990s more land was developed per increase in population in the suburbs than in the Inner Core communities. This lower-density development results in higher VMT and is also difficult to serve by traditional public transportation modes. “Smart growth” practices, transit-oriented development, access management, and funding incentives, can reduce VMT and delays by affecting development densities and promoting sustainable development. In this region, land use is controlled at the local level, but a number of initiatives have already been taken at the state level in that direction.

⁴ Based on employment growth (as provided by the Regional Transportation Plan) and VMT (as listed in Schrank and Lomax, *Annual Urban Mobility Report*, 2003).

⁵ Schrank and Lomax, *Annual Urban Mobility Report*, 2003.

⁶ Ibid.

⁷ CTPS, *2004–2025 Regional Transportation Plan*, p. 2-2.

⁸ Ibid.

Addressing safety can have secondary beneficial effects on congestion – Safety and congestion have a cause-and-effect relationship. Often, addressing safety has beneficial effects on congestion as well.

Key conclusion – The single most important conclusion that can be drawn from the regional data analysis contained in this report is that *congestion and mobility are complex issues that require a multimodal and comprehensive program of strategies and policies to address them, including growth management tools*. Hopefully, the preceding conclusions convey the thinking that led to this key conclusion and provide decision-makers and planners with some guidelines that, together with the findings in this report and the recommendations presented in the next chapter, will help them address congestion in the short and long run.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The final conclusion above is embodied in the breadth and multimodal nature of this report's recommendations for strategies and studies to address congestion and mobility within the six elements that were monitored as part of the CMS. The CMS recommendations consist of congestion-reduction and mobility-enhancement strategies and studies for the Boston Region MPO and other lead entities to undertake in concert with other efforts they are already making. These recommendations are too numerous to list here; they are listed in Chapter 9 of this report.