



Vanasse Hangen Brustlin, Inc.

101 Walnut Street
P. O. Box 9151
Watertown, MA 02471-9151
617 924 1770
FAX 617 924 2286

Memorandum

To: Ken Schwartz
Scott Schilt

Date: January 8, 2003

Project No.: 08157

From: Ana Fill, P.E.

Re: Symmes Hospital Reuse Alternatives
Draft Transportation Alternatives

This memorandum presents a planning level evaluation of the potential transportation impacts associated with three redevelopment alternatives for the Symmes Hospital site. Two of the three alternatives consist mostly of residential uses; the third contains a significant commercial component as part of the building program. For all three alternatives, site access is provided from two locations: Hospital Road intersecting with Summer Street and Woodside Lane. While this document focuses primarily on traffic and parking issues, pedestrian, bicycle and public transportation recommendations for the redevelopment scenarios are also provided.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

- The former hospital use generated 245 vehicle trips during the morning peak hour and 255 vehicle trips during the evening peak hour. The proposed alternatives propose between 245 and 535 vehicle trips during the morning peak hour, and between 325 and 790 vehicle trips during the evening peak hour.
- Alternative 2: Commercial/Medical Development is the most traffic intensive use, primarily due to traffic generated for a medical office component. In this scenario, if general office is used rather than medical use, traffic is reduced by approximately one-third, however, the traffic generated is still significantly higher than the other alternatives.
- Alternative 1: Mixed Income Housing and Alternative 3: Infrastructure Reuse both generate less traffic than when Symmes Hospital was in full operation.
- Alternative 2: Commercial Medical Development demonstrates the greatest demand for parking due to the rates required for office and commercial uses.
- Analysis indicates that all three plans provide insufficient parking to meet the demands of a 50,000 square foot Wellness Center and 40,000 square foot medical use on "The Ridge." To provide sufficient parking for the Wellness Center would require either construction of structured parking at that location, or provisions for shared parking elsewhere on the site.
- The close proximity of the existing Hospital Road to the Summer Street/Brattle Street/Hemlock Street intersection will make access and egress to/from the site difficult, and realignment of the Hospital Road intersection further to the east is recommended. Provisions should be made to provide separate right and left-turning lanes at the Hospital Road exit.

- Signalization may be required at the Hospital Road Intersection with Summer Street under all of the alternatives, and definitely will be required for Alternative 2. Mitigation at the Summer Street/Grove Street and the Summer Street/Oak Hill Drive intersections may warrant signalization due to the fact that these intersections already experience poor levels of service.
- It is not anticipated that the Woodside Lane access to Hospital Road will be significantly used for access to the site, as most users of Woodside Lane would be those parking at “The Top.” Since Alternatives 1 and 2 propose residential uses for “The Top” and Alternative 3 proposes a limited number of housing units and a community park, it is not anticipated that significant “cut through” traffic would occur on Woodside Lane.
- Sidewalks should be provided along Hospital Road, preferably with a landscaped buffer from the traffic lanes. Additional provisions should be made to provide pedestrian connections and access to the nearby Stratton and Bishop schools, and the Minuteman Bikeway—including a “formal” connection to the bikeway from Grove Street.
- An evaluation of potential bus ridership should be conducted to maintain the current MBTA bus service, including determination of the need to provide full access to “The Top” at select times while only stopping at the entrance at Summer Street at other times.

TRIP GENERATION

The rate at which any development generates traffic is dependent upon a number of factors, including the size and density of the project, its location, and the concentration of surrounding land uses. The number of vehicle-trips estimated to be generated by the three alternatives proposed for the Symmes site are based on trip generation rates published in the Institute of Transportation Engineers *Trip Generation*¹ report. This section presents the assumptions for each of the proposed uses along with the estimated trip generation for each of the alternatives.

Proposed Uses

Residential

Four potential residential components were evaluated for the Symmes site, including:

- Retirement Housing (55 and older): Although this residential use is generally restricted to persons age 55 and older, ITE senior housing data are geared toward institutions for elderly residents that contain special services such as medical facilities, dining facilities and some limited, supporting retail facilities. Due to the potential demographics involved with age restricted housing, with more seniors leading active lifestyles, VHB determined that the most appropriate land use code for this residential component is LUC 230 (Residential Condominium/ Townhouse). If the retirement housing program becomes more defined, the trip generation land use code may be modified. However, using the LUC 230 land use code for age restricted housing will provide a more conservative trip generation estimate than other typical ITE retirement uses.
- Assisted Living Housing: Unlike the previously discussed age restricted land use code, this use is designed to accommodate elderly residents who require greater health care needs and services. For this use, ITE land use code LUC 253 (Elderly Housing – Attached) was deemed the most appropriate.

¹ Institute of Transportation Engineers, *Trip Generation*, Sixth Edition, Washington, D.C., 1997.

- Affordable Housing/Market Rate Housing: The trip generation rates expected for affordable housing units and for market rate residential units are similar. Based on the envisioned housing development at the site, VHB determined that the most appropriate land use code for these residential components is LUC 230 (Residential Condominium/Townhouse).
- Luxury Housing: The most appropriate ITE land use code for this component of the residential program is deemed to be LUC 233 (Luxury Condominium/Townhouse). It should be noted that this land use's data should be used with care as the ITE rates are based on a limited number of studies (four). Furthermore, no data is available for the weekday daily and Saturday daily and midday peak hour traffic conditions. At these time periods, LUC 230 (Residential Condominium/Townhouse) was utilized to approximate the trip generation for luxury housing uses.

Wellness Center

The Wellness Center is envisioned to provide both recreational/therapeutic related activities such as an aquatic pool and cardiovascular training facilities, as well as medical service facilities. Therefore, to estimate its trip generation, the center was separated into two categories:

- Recreational/Therapeutic Center: The ITE database has relatively few data for land uses similar to the proposed Wellness Center. The closest approximation would be land use code is LUC 495 (Recreational Community Center). Although the characteristics of this ITE land use code reflect those anticipated for the Wellness Center, the trip generation rates were derived based on a limited number of studies (two). Therefore, the resulting estimates should be used with care.
- Medical Office: Approximately 40 percent of the Wellness Center (40,000 square feet \pm) is envisioned to accommodate some form of medical services. VHB determined that the most appropriate ITE land use code for this use is LUC 720 (Medical-Dental Office Building).

Commercial

Three potential uses are envisioned for the commercial component of the Symmes site, including:

- Office: The ITE trip generation rate most appropriate for this use is LUC 710 (General Office Building).
- Research and Development: ITE land use code LUC 760 (Research and Development Center) is deemed the most appropriate for this proposed use.
- Medical Office: As mentioned previously, VHB determined that the most appropriate ITE land use code for this use is LUC 720 (Medical-Dental Office Building).

Site-Generated Traffic Volumes

Alternative 1: Mixed Income Housing

Alternative 1 presents mostly residential uses on "The Top" and "The Overlook," with a Wellness Center located on "The Ridge". The "Summer Street" area of this alternative remains as open space. The proposed building program for this alternative includes:

- "The Top": Mixed Income Housing, including 32 units of Affordable Housing units and 28 units of Market Rate Housing;
- "The Overlook": 25 units of Luxury Housing and 56 units of Market Rate Housing; and
- "The Ridge": 50,000 square feet of Wellness Center and 40,000 square feet of Medical Office uses.

Table 1 depicts the building program for this alternative along with its associated daily vehicle trip generation by use category.

**TABLE 1
 ALTERNATIVE 1 TRIP GENERATION**

Location	“The Top”	“The Overlook”		“The Ridge”		
Land Use	Mixed Income Housing ^a	Luxury Housing ^b	Market Rate Housing ^a	Recreation Center ^c	Medical Office ^d	Total
Size	60 units	25 units	56 units	50,000 sf	40,000 sf	---
Weekday						
<i>Daily</i>	420	200 ^e	400	1,150	1,420	3,590
<i>Morning</i>						
Enter	5	5	5	45	80	140
Exit	<u>30</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>110</u>
Total	35	20	30	65	100	250
<i>Evening</i>						
Enter	25	10	25	30	40	130
Exit	<u>15</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>60</u>	<u>105</u>	<u>200</u>
Total	40	15	40	90	145	330
Saturday						
<i>Daily</i>	650	520 ^e	630	460	360	2,620
<i>Midday</i>						
Enter	30	25 ^e	30	30	85	200
Exit	<u>30</u>	<u>25</u> ^e	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>60</u>	<u>175</u>
Total	60	50 ^e	60	60	145	375

- a. ITE Trip Generation LUC 230 (Residential Condominium/Townhouse)
- b. ITE Trip Generation LUC 233 (Luxury Condominium Townhouse).
- c. ITE Trip Generation LUC 495 (Recreational Community Center).
- d. ITE Trip Generation LUC 720 (Medical-Dental Office Building).
- e. No data available; used LUC 230.

Alternative 2: Commercial/Medical Development

Alternative 2 contains residential uses on “The Top”, commercial uses on “The Overlook” and a Wellness Center on “The Ridge”. The “Summer Street” area of this alternative, similarly to Alternative 1, remains as open space. The proposed building program for this alternative includes:

- “The Top”: Mixed Income Housing, including 22 units of Affordable Housing and 34 units of Market Rate Housing;
- “The Overlook”: 140,000 square feet of Office, Research and Development or Medical Office space; and
- “The Ridge”: 50,000 square feet of Wellness Center and 40,000 square feet of Medical Office.

Table 2 depicts the building program for this alternative along with its associated trip generation. In the situations where a definite land use has not been determined all potential uses are presented with the most traffic intensive use shaded. The overall trip generation column presents the most conservative projection for this alternative.

**TABLE 2
 ALTERNATIVE 2 TRIP GENERATION**

Location	“The Top”	“The Overlook”			“The Ridge”		
Land Use	Mixed Income Housing ^a	General Office ^b	R&D Office ^c	Medical Office ^d	Recreation Center ^e	Medical Office ^d	Total
Size	56 units	140,000 sf			50,000 sf	40,000 sf	---
Weekday							
<i>Daily</i>	400	1,720	1,230	5,510	1,150	1,420	8,480
<i>Morning</i>							
Enter	5	215	145	270	45	80	400
Exit	<u>25</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>70</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>135</u>
Total	30	245	175	340	65	100	535
<i>Evening</i>							
Enter	25	40	25	140	30	40	235
Exit	<u>15</u>	<u>195</u>	<u>130</u>	<u>375</u>	<u>60</u>	<u>105</u>	<u>555</u>
Total	40	235	150	515	90	145	790
Saturday							
<i>Daily</i>	630	330	270	1,260	460	360	2,710
<i>Midday</i>							
Enter	30	30	15	290	30	85	435
Exit	<u>30</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>220</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>60</u>	<u>340</u>
Total	60	55	30	510	60	145	775

- a. ITE Trip Generation LUC 230 (Residential Condominium/Townhouse)
- b. ITE Trip Generation LUC 710 (General Office)
- c. ITE Trip Generation LUC 760 (Research and Development Center).
- d. ITE Trip Generation LUC 720 (Medical-Dental Office Building).
- e. ITE Trip Generation LUC 495 (Recreational Community Center).

Alternative 3: Infrastructure Reuse

Alternative 3 contains residential uses on “The Top,” “The Overlook” and “Summer Street” and a Wellness Center on “The Ridge”. “The Top” is also envisioned to include a community park. The proposed building program for this alternative includes:

- “The Top”: 21 units of Market Rate Housing
- “The Overlook”: 76 units of assisted living housing, 25 units of Luxury Housing and 32 units of Market Rate Housing;
- “The Ridge”: 50,000 square feet of Wellness Center and 40,000 square feet of Medical Office; and
- “Summer Street”: 20 units of Affordable Housing and 12 units of Market Rate Housing

Table 3 depicts the building program for this alternative along with its associated trip generation. The overall trip generation column presents the total estimates for this alternative.

**TABLE 3
 ALTERNATIVE 3 TRIP GENERATION**

Location	“The Top”	“The Overlook”			“The Ridge”		“Summer Street”	
Land Use	Market Rate Housing	Assisted Living ^a	Luxury Housing ^b	Market Rate Housing ^c	Recreation Center ^d	Medical Office ^e	Mixed Income Housing ^c	Total
Size	21 units	76 units	25 units	32 units	50,000 sf	40,000 sf	32 units	---
Weekday								
<i>Daily</i>	180	270	200 ^e	250	1,150	1,420	250	3,720
<i>Morning</i>								
Enter	5	5	5	5	45	80	5	150
Exit	<u>10</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>15</u>	95
Total	15	5	20	20	65	100	20	245
<i>Evening</i>								
Enter	10	5	10	15	30	40	15	125
Exit	<u>5</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>60</u>	<u>105</u>	<u>10</u>	200
Total	15	10	15	25	90	145	25	325
Saturday								
<i>Daily</i>	510	190	520 ^e	550	460	360	550	3,410
<i>Midday</i>								
Enter	25	10 ^f	25 ^e	30	30	85	30	235
Exit	<u>25</u>	<u>10^f</u>	<u>25^e</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>60</u>	<u>25</u>	200
Total	50	20	50 ^e	55	60	145	55	435

- a. ITE Trip Generation LUC 253 (Elderly Housing – Attached)
- b. ITE Trip Generation LUC 233 (Luxury Condominium Townhouse).
- c. ITE Trip Generation LUC 230 (Residential Condominium/Townhouse)
- d. ITE Trip Generation LUC 495 (Recreational Community Center).
- e. ITE Trip Generation LUC 720 (Medical-Dental Office Building).
- f. No directional data available; assumed even split.
- g. No data available; used LUC 230.

Trip Generation Comparison

Table 4 presents the most conservative trip generation estimates for each alternative. It also includes the trip generation associated with the Symmes Hospital when it was fully operational. The hospital trip generation is presented using two different methodologies. The first methodology bases the trip estimates on counts conducted at the Symmes Hospital driveways on May 11th, 1982, when the facility was in full operation. The second methodology, based on ITE trip generation rates for hospital uses, is included to provide a comparison basis between the projected trips with those that were actually observed.

**TABLE 4
 TRIP GENERATION COMPARISON**

	Former Hospital		Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3
Weekday	Counts ^a	ITE Data ^b			
<i>Daily</i>	n/a	4,540	3,590	8,480	3,720
<i>Morning</i>					
Enter	195	200	140	400	150
Exit	<u>50</u>	<u>65</u>	<u>110</u>	<u>135</u>	<u>95</u>
Total	245	265	250	535	245
<i>Evening</i>					
Enter	75	70	130	235	125
Exit	<u>180</u>	<u>210</u>	<u>200</u>	<u>555</u>	<u>200</u>
Total	255	280	330	790	325
Saturday					
<i>Daily</i>	n/a	3,060	2,620	2,710	3,410
<i>Midday</i>					
Enter	n/a	185	200	435	235
Exit	<u>n/a</u>	<u>110</u>	<u>175</u>	<u>340</u>	<u>200</u>
Total	n/a	295	375	775	435

a. Based on counts conducted at the hospital entrances, Hospital Road and Woodside Lane, on May 11th, 1982.

b. Based on LUC 610 (Hospital) for 175,000 square feet and LUC 720 (Medical-Dental Office Building) for 25,000 square feet.

As can be seen in Table 4, Alternative 2 is the most traffic intensive alternative. The significant difference in trips between this alternative and the others is mostly due to the office component, which generates more traffic than residential uses. It should also be noted that the most conservative uses were utilized in these projections, namely all the commercial space in Alternative 2 was considered to be medical office. If general office were the proposed land use, the trip generation on weekdays would be reduced to close to one-half of the total trips (510 trips) during the evening peak hour, and would be reduced by approximately one-third throughout the day (4,690). During the weekends the trip reduction would be even more pronounced with the office component contributing to only approximately 55 trips during the midday peak hour. Regardless of the proposed office use, however, Alternative 2 will be the most traffic intensive alternative on weekdays, generating at least 60 percent more traffic than the other alternatives.

Table 4 also shows that the observed traffic generation for the hospital, while in full operation, is somewhat similar to those expected for Alternatives 1 and 3. Moreover, the comparison between the counts and ITE data indicate that the ITE predictions are slightly higher than those observed.

Based on the trip generation estimates, the most critical traffic condition involves Alternative 2 during the evening peak hour. Furthermore, the traffic conditions for Alternatives 1 and 3 should be similar to those present during the years Symmes Hospital was in full operation.

PARKING

Parking rates for the Symmes site were determined through discussions with the Town of Arlington and the Arlington Redevelopment Board on December 9, 2002. This section compares these rates with other industry standards, namely the Urban Land Institute and the Institute of Transportation Engineers. It also evaluates the adequacy of the proposed parking supply at the site.

Parking Rates

Table 5 depicts parking rates for the different uses proposed for the site.

TABLE 5
PARKING RATES

Land Use	Town of Arlington Rates	ULI Rates	ITE Rates
Office	3.3 spaces/1,000 sf	3.0 spaces/1,000 sf	2.79 spaces/1,000 sf
Medical Office ^a	3.3 spaces/1,000 sf	3.0 spaces/1,000 sf	4.11 spaces/1,000 sf
Luxury Housing ^b	2.0 spaces/D.U.	1.0 spaces/D.U.	1.11 spaces/D.U.
Market Rate Housing ^b	1.5 spaces/D.U.	1.0 spaces/D.U.	1.11 spaces/D.U.
Affordable Housing ^b	1.0 spaces/D.U.	1.0 spaces/D.U.	1.11 spaces/D.U.
Assisted Living ^c	0.4 spaces/D.U.	0.27 spaces/D.U.	0.27 spaces/D.U.
Recreational Center ^d	3.3 spaces/1,000 sf	3.0 spaces/1,000 sf	4.0 spaces/1,000 sf

a. No separate rate available for the Town of Arlington and ULI; assumed same as office.

b. No separate rate available for ULI and ITE; assumed residential condominium uses.

c. No separate rate available for ULI; assumed same as ITE.

d. No separate rate available for ULI; assumed same as office.

As can be seen in Table 5, the Town of Arlington parking rates are generally higher than those recommended by ULI and ITE, the exceptions being the medical office use for which ITE recommends 4.11 spaces/1,000 square feet and the Recreational Center with a recommended 4.0 spaces/1,000 square feet. The following section will evaluate the number of parking spaces required to accommodate the parking supply according to the three different rates.

Parking Demand and Supply

Based on the building program, and the parking demand rates, the parking demand for the site for each of the proposed alternatives was determined. Given the mixed-use nature of the proposed developments, the opportunities for shared parking² among the site's tenants were investigated and utilized to determine the final parking demand. For example, the peak parking demand for residential uses occur at night and early in the morning, while the peak demand for office uses occur in the middle of the day. Consequently, the demand requirements for these uses complement each other, providing an ideal condition for shared parking, which reduces the required parking supply. Table 6 summarizes the parking demands for each alternative in the worse case scenarios during the day and at night as well as the proposed parking supply.

² Based on Urban Land Institute, *Shared Parking*, Washington, D.C., 1983.

**TABLE 6
 PEAK PARKING DEMAND AND SUPPLY**

	<u>Alternative 1</u>		<u>Alternative 2</u>		<u>Alternative 3</u>	
	Day	Night	Day	Night	Day	Night
Town of Arlington	386	377	756	256	379	367
ULI	318	295	680	222	311	284
ITE	407	361	918	284	397	348
Supply	344		700		323	

As shown in Table 6, Alternative 2 demonstrates the most demand for parking, which as with the vehicle trip generation rates described earlier is due to the parking demands for office and medical uses. It should be noted that the parking denoted for market rate and affordable residential uses at “The Top” and “Summer Street” locations on the site does not include garage space within the housing units. The townhouse or condominium units in these areas could be designed to include ground level garage space with the housing units above to meet the additional parking demand. Parking for all of the Luxury Housing units in each of the alternatives assumes covered parking below the buildings.

It should also be noted that in each of the alternatives, the parking provided adjacent to the Wellness Center meets less than one-half of the required parking for that use. To provide sufficient parking for the Wellness Center would require either construction of structured parking at that location or provisions to be made for shared parking for the Wellness Center parking elsewhere on the site.

POTENTIAL TRANSPORTATION IMPACTS AND IMPROVEMENTS RECOMMENDATIONS

Traffic

The trip generation estimates for the three Symmes Hospital site alternatives were presented previously along with the observed traffic volumes of the hospital while in full operation. The projected trip generation for Alternatives 1 and 3 indicated that the traffic volumes associated with these alternatives should be similar to those experienced by the former hospital. Alternative 2, which contains a commercial component, is expected to generate significantly more traffic than either Alternatives 1 and 3 or the Symmes Hospital.

Regardless of the final development program, the close proximity of Hospital Road (at its current location) to the Summer Street/Brattle Street/Hemlock Street intersection makes access and egress to/from the site difficult. Consequently, we recommend that the Summer Street access to the site be moved further away from the signalized intersection. Ideally, Hospital Road should be aligned with Grove Street, however, site constraints may render this option unfeasible. Under Alternative 2, the Hospital Road site access will very likely require the installation of a signal. The other alternatives, although generating the same traffic volumes as the former hospital, may also require a signal at the Hospital Road access point. The heavy traffic along Summer Street may cause significant delays for exiting vehicles without the presence of a signal. These delays could cause long vehicle queues on Hospital Road, which would be particularly problematic due to the geometry and slope of this driveway. Finally, separate right and left-turning lanes should be provided at the Hospital Road exit.

As mentioned in an earlier assessment, the intersections of Summer Street at Grove Street and Summer Street at Oak Hill Drive are both currently unsignalized and operating at LOS F during the morning and the evening peak hours. These intersections were also ranked by residents as problem

intersections within the Town of Arlington, according to the Town of Arlington Transportation Assessment Study³. The development of the Symmes Hospital site is expected to, at a minimum, return the traffic volumes to those experienced when the hospital was operating at full capacity. The site traffic will place an additional burden at these locations. Therefore, some mitigation measures will likely be required at these intersections once the site is redeveloped. These improvements may involve the installation of a signal at the Summer Street/Grove Street intersection or/and at the Summer Street/Oak Hill Drive intersection.

Counts conducted at the Hospital Road and Woodside Lane entrances to the site while the hospital was operating at full capacity indicate that the overwhelming majority of users (90 percent) accessed the site via the Summer Street entrance. Given that parking was provided at "The Top" portion of the site, this distribution indicates that drivers preferred to utilize the main entrance to the site even though the parking field was located closer to the Woodside Lane driveway. Although traffic volumes have increased since the time the counts were conducted, the overall trip distribution characteristics are not expected to have been significantly modified. Thus, the Woodside Lane driveway should be significantly less utilized than the Hospital Road entrance with the most likely users being those parked at "The Top" portion of the site. Since two alternatives propose residential uses for "The Top" while Alternative 3 proposes a community park and a few housing units, no significant "cut-through" traffic is expected to occur. Consequently, only minor improvements associated with the site's redevelopment should be needed at this location. Furthermore, any mitigation measures developed for the Summer Street at Oak Hill Road intersection should be designed to accommodate any additional site-generated traffic traveling through this location.

Pedestrian and Bicycle

Pedestrian connectivity within the site should be provided for all the alternatives. Both sidewalks and paths should be considered to connect the different uses within the site. Although the specific pedestrian connections needs will depend on the final site design, all alternatives should consider providing sidewalks along Hospital Road to Summer Street preferably with a landscaped buffer from the traffic lanes. Sidewalk improvements should also be implemented off-site to connect the site with other uses in the Town. Since all the alternatives present a residential component, particular attention will be needed for pedestrian access to the nearby Stratton and Bishop schools.

Although the steep grades of the site present a challenge for bicyclists, bicycle accommodations should be provided within the site. Furthermore, a clear connection between the site and the Minuteman bikeway should be established. Other potential bicycle improvements include providing bike lanes on Summer Street between Grove Street and Brattle Street where wide shoulders currently exist and providing a "formal" connection to the Minuteman bikeway from Grove Street.

Public Transportation

Currently, an MBTA bus stop is provided within the site for the Route 67 bus service. Due to the steep grade of the primary site access roadway, however, the MBTA buses have to labor to climb the hill creating noise and air impacts on the site and in the adjacent neighborhood. The buses presence also competes with automobiles, pedestrians and bicyclists. Thus, an evaluation of the potential ridership associated with the final development program for the site should be conducted to achieve an appropriate balance of bus users and service. In addition to ridership potential, the type of use should be considered (e.g., if senior citizens need to access the site). An appropriate scheme should be considered to address the needs of the site, which could include providing full access (to "The Top") at select times while only stopping at the entrance on Summer Street at other times.

³ The Louis Berger Group, *Transportation Assessment Study – Town of Arlington, Massachusetts*, May 2002.